DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES
HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION—SIXTEENTH PARLIAMENT

19-20 GEORGE V, 1929

VOLUME II, 1929

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FOURTH DAY OF APRIL, 1929, TO THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF MAY, 1929, INCLUSIVE

BEING

VOLUME CLXXXI FOR THE PERIOD 1875-1929

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME



OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1929

SASK. LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
JUN 9 - 1930
REGINA

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Thursday, April 4, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

DEATH OF MARSHAL FOCH

ACKNOWLEDGMENT BY FRENCH MINISTER OF TRIBUTE BY HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following message:

Legation of the
French Republic
in Canada.

Ottawa, March 23, 1929.

Dear Mr. Speaker,—

On my return to Ottawa, I was deeply moved to learn of the manifestations of condolence by the House of Commons to the memory of Marshal Foch.

Appreciating highly the words of admiration and gratitude uttered with respect to the great leader of our armies during the war, I wish to express to you and beg you to so express to the House of Commons the deep feelings of gratitude on behalf of my government.

Kindly accept, dear Mr. Speaker, the assurances of my highest esteem.

J. Knight.

Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux,
Speaker,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 84, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Totzke.

Bill No. 85, to incorporate The Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada.—Mr. Young (Saskatoon).

SOCKEYE SALMON FISHERIES TREATY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table a copy of the convention between Canada and the United States for the protection, preservation and extension of the sockeye salmon fishery in the Fraser river system, signed at Washington, March 27, 1929.

I beg to move:

That 750 copies in English and 300 copies in French of the convention for the protection, preservation and extension of the sockeye salmon fishery in the Fraser river system signed at Washington, March 27, 1929, tabled this day, be printed forthwith; and that standing order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GOVERNMENT AUTOMOBILES, 1927-28

Mr. KAISER:

1. How many automobiles were purchased or obtained by the several ministers of the government for their own use during the years 1927 and 1928, respectively?

2. What is the name and respective price of each of the said cars?

3. What are the names of the agent or dealer through which the said cars were purchased?

Mr. RINFRET:

The government has no knowledge of any automobiles being purchased or obtained by the several ministers for their own use, but the following automobiles have been purchased by various departments for official use:

1. 1927, 5; 1928, 3, total 8.

2. Pierce Arrow at $8,400 (less allowance of $3,000 for old car), Royal Auto Sales. Stutz at $6,250 (less $2,100 for old car), Royal Auto Sales. Willys-Knight at $4,500, The Carleton Motor Sales, Ltd. Cadillac sedan at $4,975, Emerson Motors Limited. Pierce Arrow limousine at $3,840 (plus old car), Royal Auto Sales. McLaughlin-Buick at $3,200 (less $750 for old car), The Pink and Blackburn Company, Ltd. Pierce Arrow limousine at $5,400 (less $2,200 for old car), Royal Auto Sales. Cadillac sedan at $5,200, Dundas Motor Sales Limited, Toronto, Ont.

PENITENTIARY INMATES UNDER EIGHTEEN YEARS

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. How many prisoners, male and female respectively, under eighteen years of age are confined at the present time in the penitentiaries of Canada?

2. What are the nationalities of these by numbers and not by name of inmate?

3. How many were sentenced by, (a) magistrates; (b) judges?

4. How many non-citizens of Canada are confined in penitentiaries of Canada?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Males, 46; females, none.

2. Canadian, 37; American, 4; Italian, 1; Newfoundlanders, 1; Scottish, 1; Norwegian, 2.

3. 24 by Magistrates; 22 by Judges.

4. 611.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—FREE PASSES TO CLERGYMEN

Mr. EVANS:

1. How many clergymen ride on free passes on the Canadian National Railways?
2. To what churches or denominations do they belong?

Mr. DUNNING:

1. Sixty-five.
2. Thirty-four of these sixty-five clergymen are of Protestant faith, and thirty-one of Roman Catholic.

GOVERNMENT VESSELS—VISITORS

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. Are officials or officers in charge of vessels owned or operated by the Department of Public Works or any other department of the government service, allowed to invite visitors or friends to take trips on such vessels?
2. If so, who may be invited and what is the charge per diem?
3. If allowed, does the government or any department of the government assume any responsibility in case of accident?
4. What invitations, if any, have been issued during the year 1928?

Mr. RINFRET:

National Revenue Department:

1. No.
2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.
4. None.

Marine Department:

1. No.
2. The contract for feeding the crews permits a charge of $1.20 per diem for passengers.
3. No.
4. The department is not aware of any invitations having been issued.

Fisheries Department:

Officials of the department or officers in charge of vessels owned or operated by this department are not permitted to issue invitations to friends or visitors to take trips on such vessels.

National Defence Department, Naval Service:

1. Only with the consent of the department.
2. Persons approved by the department, at the charge of the officer inviting such persons.
3. No.
4. Admiral Sir Charles E. Kingsmill, late Director of the naval service, with the consent of the chief of the naval staff, on board H.M.C.S. Vancouver.

Militia Service:

1. No. Civilians may be permitted to travel on regular duty trips in harbours, if in possession of a "pass" signed by the district supply and transport officer, or by his representative.
2. Nil. As in (1) above.
3. Individuals travel at their own risk.
4. Nil.

Public Works Department:

1. No.
2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.
4. No information in the department.

Department of Railways and Canals:

Officials or officers in charge of vessels owned and operated by the department are not allowed to invite visitors or friends to take trips on such vessels.

CIVIL SERVICE—MINIMUM SALARY

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Has the Department of Labour fixed the sum of $85 per month as the minimum amount necessary for the bare necessities of food, house rent, fuel and light for the average Canadian family?
2. If so, what additional amount is estimated as reasonable to provide for clothing, medical attendance, insurance, education and recreation or amusement?
3. How many employees of the Customs Department, Post Office Department, Interior Department or Public Works Department in the cities of Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver receive $65 per month? How many receive between $65 and $75? And how many between $75 and $85 per month?
4. Has the government received requests from organized bodies of the civil service to fix through the Civil Service Act a minimum salary of $100 per month for employees of the government?
5. If so, when will the government be prepared to make an official statement on the matter?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. No. The weekly family budget published monthly in the Labour Gazette, February issue, page 237, shows the cost of certain staple foods, fuel and light and rent in January, 1929 ($21.55), as compared with the cost at certain previous dates. A footnote states that the budget is intended to show the changes in the cost of the items included, not to show the minimum cost for an average family; another footnote states that an allowance for the cost of clothing and sundries would increase the figures by about fifty per cent.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Customs department:

	Salary $65 per month and under	Salary between $65 and $75 per month	Salary between $75 and $85 per month
Ottawa			
(Customs and Excise divisions)	1	—	—
(Income tax)	—	—	11
Head office			
(Customs and Excise divisions)	13	—	11
(Income tax)	22	15	12
Montreal			
(Customs and Excise divisions)	4	8	9
(Income tax)	13	4	8
Toronto			
(Customs and Excise divisions)	9	1	6
(Income tax)	30	12	13
Winnipeg			
(Customs and Excise divisions)	5	—	—
(Income tax)	5	7	5
Vancouver			
(Customs and Excise divisions)	3	—	5
(Income tax)	15	4	15

NOTE.—All of the above employees are in the lower grades such as junior clerks, junior stenographers, junior typists, messengers, watchmen and labourers.

Post Office department:

	Number of employees receiving $65 a month	Between $65 and $75 a month	Between $75 and $85 a month
Ottawa (Inside service)	2	1	67
(Outside service)	nil	nil	nil
Montreal	1	nil	nil
Toronto	1	nil	8
Winnipeg	nil	nil	nil
Vancouver	nil	nil	nil

Department of the Interior:

City	$65 per month	Between $65 and $75 per month	Between $75 and $85 per month
Ottawa	10	4	29
Montreal	none	none	none
Toronto	none	none	none
Winnipeg	none	none	none
Vancouver	none	none	none
	10	4	29

Department of Public Works:

In the outside service of the Department of Public Works there are no employees in the cities mentioned who receive a salary with a maximum which is not greater than $85.00 per month, except one messenger at Ottawa who is receiving $65.00 per month with a maximum of $85.00.

4. Yes.

5. No information.

F. G. H. M'DONAGH

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. Is F. G. H. McDonagh, barrister, of Toronto, retained or employed by the Department of National Revenue or the Department of Justice?

2. If so, on what terms and what remuneration does he receive?

3. If paid by any department, is he allowed to collect fees from parties who are prospective defendants in an action by the department employing him?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Mr. McDonagh has been retained by the Department of National Revenue, through the Department of Justice, in ten cases during the past five years.

2. The terms are made by the Department of Justice. The sum of $280.40 has been paid to Mr. McDonagh for services in the cases referred to, after the bills had been certified at the Department of Justice.

3. Answered by the first sentence of No. 2.

Income Tax Division

1. Yes.

2. (a) Prosecutions

$10 for each case not defended.

$20 for each case defended.

(b) Collections

10 per cent of amounts collected; adjustable fee non-collectible accounts, usually $1 per case.

3. No.

H. F. S. PAISLEY

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has H. F. S. Paisley, editor of the Sydney, Nova Scotia, Record, been appointed publicity agent for the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

2. If so, when was he appointed, what is his salary and what are his duties?

3. Was his appointment made by and through the Civil Service Commission?

4. If not, under what authority was he appointed?

5. Is he still continuing to act as editor of the Record?

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Cardin):

1. Mr. Paisley, who was editor of the Sydney Record, was appointed director of publicity in the fisheries branch.

2. His notification of appointment from the Civil Service Commission was dated January 23rd, 1929. He reported for duty on February 27th, 1929. $3,420 per annum. To gather and disseminate information regarding the production of fish, market conditions, etc.; to direct the collection and analysis of all fisheries statistics; to investigate transportation facilities for fish; to prepare and edit fisheries publicity material and related work.

3. Yes.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. No.

CASE OF GEORGE STARK

Mr. NEILL:

1. Has the attention of the government been called to the case of George Stark, who was sentenced to two years imprisonment and twenty lashes for an alleged robbery at a ticket office of the Montreal Tramways in Montreal? He was convicted of having held up a tramway employee named Caisse, but the said Caisse has now been convicted of having been the principal in the robbery, and has been convicted of perjury at the trial of the said George Stark?

2. Will the government take into consideration compensating this man for the unfortunate miscarriage of justice, under which he suffered?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1 and 2. The matter is not one which concerns this government. The administration of justice in the province is within the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the provincial legislature.

DOMINION MAPS—FRENCH EDITION

Mr. LACOMBE:

1. Are there any maps of the Dominion of Canada published in the French language?

2. If not, is it the intention of the government to have such maps printed and distributed?

3. When will such action be taken by the government?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

WINDSOR, ONT., CUSTOMS PORT

Mr. GOTT:

1. What was the customs revenue for the port of Windsor, Ontario, each year since 1920?

2. What was the total salaries paid customs officials at Windsor each year since 1920?

Mr. EULER:

1.

	Import Duty	Excise Taxes	Excise Duty	Sundry collections	Total
*1920-21	$2,936,993 21			$10,412 65	$2,947,405 86
1921-22	2,172,953 37	$ 873,476 07	$102,727 42	38,340 09	3,187,496 95
1922-23	3,292,942 39	1,687,741 48	138,032 13	27,653 94	5,146,369 94
1923-24	3,069,492 24	1,764,148 73	155,319 99	29,424 52	5,018,385 48
1924-25	2,496,791 00	1,104,902 56	69,936 65	30,092 94	3,701,723 15
1925-26	4,034,525 75	1,624,072 18	106,901 93	33,472 06	5,798,971 92
1926-27	2,828,222 63	1,903,360 46	99,761 94	40,199 16	4,871,544 19
1927-28	3,168,289 94	1,749,321 81	93,772 49	37,082 64	5,048,466 88
1928-29 (11 Mos.)	3,761,037 54	2,178,094 56	105,293 90	25,931 92	6,070,357 92

*Excise revenue is not available for 1920-21 as the inland revenue divisions did not correspond to customs ports or outports.

No. 2.

1920-21	$ 96,010 57
1921-22	108,549 21
1922-23	106,391 77
1923-24	98,231 95
1924-25	114,764 37
1925-26	127,264 78
1926-27	138,294 66
1927-28	155,843 01
1928-29 (11 months)	161,624 22

LEAMINGTON, ONT., CUSTOMS PORT

Mr. GOTT:

1. What was the customs revenue for the port of Leamington, Ontario, each year since 1920?

2. What was the total salaries paid customs officials at Leamington since 1920?

Mr. EULER:

See statement attached.

1.

	Import Duty	Excise Taxes	Excise Duty	Sundry Collections	Total
*1920-21	$ 89,799 24			$ 83 72	$ 89,882 96
1921-22	89,592 43	$21,564 82	$12,704 29	532 34	124,393 88
1922-23	143,337 97	32,891 36	14,096 23	499 92	190,825 48
1923-24	166,350 69	36,190 50	14,852 68	500 00	217,893 87
1924-25	139,722 30	23,717 68	10,704 77	.....	174,144 75
1925-26	115,843 58	24,224 83	11,394 96	4 80	151,468 17
1926-27	175,305 18	26,645 29	12,692 99	5 00	214,693 46
1927-28	243,421 83	19,810 66	15,147 75	30 00	278,410 24
1928-29 (11 Mos.)	229,204 97	14,144 02	15,967 36	164 10	259,480 45

*Excise revenue is not available for 1920-21 as the inland revenue divisions did not correspond to customs ports or outports.

2.

1920-21	$ 1,692 00
1921-22	4,821 25
1922-23	4,755 00
1923-24	4,815 00
1924-25	4,110 00
1925-26	3,716 67
1926-27	4,320 00
1927-28	4,590 00
1928-29 (11 months)	4,235 00

POST OFFICE

Mr. GOTT:

1. When was the post office at Leamington, Ontario, built?
2. What was total cost of building?
3. What revenue has it produced each year since construction?
4. What amount was paid in salaries each year?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. 1909-1911.
2. $30,837.50 (site and construction).
3 and 4. Post Office Department.

	Revenue	Salary
1910	$ 5,470 10	$1,730 00
1911	5,540 75	1,891 00
1912	6,944 07	1,912 00
1913	6,401 54	2,473 09
1914	7,431 66	2,256 50
1915	8,269 92	2,607 00
1916	12,453 99	2,864 00
1917	13,171 58	3,289 00
1918	13.054 68	3,351 00
1919	14,478 09	3,465 00
1920	14,098 54	4,236 00
1921	15,685 07	4,236 00
1922	15,759 35	4,455 00
1923	19,011 78	4,560 50
1924	17,845 86	5,278 00
1925	17,461 21	5,195 50
1926	18,422 55	5,085 50
1927	17,627 26	5,249 00
1928	19,203 98	5,249 00

4. Department of Public Works.

1911-1912	$ 376 46
1912-1913	450 00
1913-1914	450 00
1914-1915	450 00
1915-1916	450 00
1916-1917	450 00
1917-1918	466 66
1918-1919	549 96
1919-1920	969 96
1920-1921	1,249 98
1921-1922	1,129 00
1922-1923	1,287 00
1923-1924	1,095 00
1924-1925	1,095 00
1925-1926	1,259 57
1926-1927	1,080 00
1927-1928	1,116 00
1928-1929 (to March 1, 1929)	990 00

WINDSOR, ONT., POST OFFICE

Mr. GOTT:

1. When was the post office at Windsor, Ontario, built?
2. What was total cost of building?
3. What revenue has it produced each year since construction?
4. What amount was paid in salaries each year?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. 1879-1880.
2. $66,868.35 (site and construction).
3 and 4.

Post Office Department:

Year	Revenue	Salary
1880	$ 5,535 18	Figures
1881	7,500 49	not
1882	8,027 65	avail-
1883	8,384 95	able
1884	9,059 52	$ 9,010 12
1885	8,353 70	9,355 04
1886	8,741 12	11,085 26
1887	9,171 01	11,777 00
1888	9,865 28	11,336 68
1889	11,164 02	11,094 11
1890	11,679 98	11,110 37
1891	11,512 85	10,043 34
1892	13,099 64	9,877 14
1893	15,431 25	9,916 78
1894	14,913 72	9,840 00

Post Office Department—*Concluded*

Year	Revenue	Salary
1895	14,037 71	10,231 83
1896	16,069 49	10,710 00
1897	18,106 14	10,453 33
1898	18,878 24	8,640 00
1899	17,791 14	8,638 00
1900	17,059 90	8,639 00
1901	18,957 71	8,100 30
1902	21,224 34	7,600 37
1903	28,910 26	8,543 84
1904	31,436 53	8,277 75
1905	27,266 33	8,294 63
1906	30,220 90	7,640 53
1907	25,194 36	5,913 24
1908	37,237 85	8,922 57
1909	40,330 18	12,648 09
1910	43,575 48	14,536 46
1911	48,927 67	15,966 13
1912	53,550 22	17,667 32
1913	61,011 98	21,288 72
1914	69,751 90	25,966 48
1915	75,228 92	31,460 78
1916	102,039 45	33,420 85
1917	141,376 11	34,927 25
1918	113,400 81	41,563 10
1919	132,210 96	54,061 63
1920	156,425 62	70,490 63
1921	208,672 58	105,348 70
1922	193,049 90	107,308 64
1923	298,296 03	109,487 69
1924	327,917 73	147,510 23
1925	316,871 07	147,387 64
1926	361,233 01	160,632 63
1927	367,142 34	165,965 87
1928	386,622 09	182,839 20

Public Works Department:

No. 4. No information previous to 1884-1885.

Year	Salary
1884-1885	$1,000 08
1885-1886	1,033 41
1886-1887	1,000 03
1887-1888	1,015 10
1888-1889	1,000 00
1889-1890	1,000 00
1890-1891	1,000 00
1891-1892	1,000 00
1892-1893	1,000 00
1893-1894	1,000 00
1894-1895	1,000 00
1895-1896	1,000 00
1896-1897	900 00
1897-1898	660 48
1898-1899	783 13
1899-1900	783 33
1900-1901	786 66
1901-1902	810 00
1902-1903	800 00
1903-1904	800 00
1904-1905	800 00
1905-1906	799 96
1906-1907	669 97
1907-1908	919 96
1908-1909	919 96
1909-1910	919 96
1910-1911	909 96
1911-1912	1,200 75
1912-1913	1,219 92
1913-1914	1,149 92
1914-1915	1,273 22
1915-1916	1,292 86
1916-1917	1,257 49
1917-1918	1,272 50
1918-1919	1,612 91
1919-1920	2,429 50
1920-1921	2,536 01
1921-1922	3,129 38
1922-1923	3,170 76
1923-1924	3,353 68
1924-1925	3,348 55
1925-1926	3,308 10
1926-1927	3,656 94
1927-1928	4,023 00
1928-1929 (To March 1, 1929)	3,583 48

WALKERVILLE, ONT., CUSTOMS PORT

Mr. GOTT:

1. What was the revenue for the port of Walkerville, Ontario, each year since 1920?

2. What was the total salaries paid customs officials at Walkerville each year since 1920?

Mr. EULER:

1.

	Import Duty	Excise Taxes	Excise Duty	Sundry Collections	Total
*1920-21	$5,803,253 75			$ 4,867 56	$5,808,121 31
1921-22	3,504,722 03	$1,101,105 89	$ 509,229 34	12,856 70	5,127,913 96
1922-23	4,145,510 89	1,828,768 87	1,260,132 92	21,961 87	7,256,374 55
1923-24	5,418,003 57	2,619,653 32	1,289,676 03	34,618 79	9,361,951 71
1924-25	4,179,619 74	3,293,963 46	1,136,085 45	21,223 16	8,630,891 81
1925-26	5,065,699 18	3,558,950 22	955,020 66	10,728 55	9,590,398 61
1926-27	6,124,695 53	3,683,582 00	944,745 51	10,979 20	10,764,002 24
1927-28	6,075,075 71	1,981,236 19	3,012,089 12	20,322 06	11,088,723 08
1928-29 (11 Mos.)	12,281,866 65	2,436,251 60	5,230,535 67	38,039 76	19,986,693 68

*Excise revenue is not available for 1920-21, the inland revenue divisions did not correspond to customs ports or outports.

No. 2.

1920-21	$23,796 72
1921-22	43,899 57
1922-23	39,101 28
1923-24	55,742 26
1924-25	57,162 18
1925-26	62,160 02
1926-27	63,444 63
1927-28	82,312 98
1928-29 (11 months)	83,829 72

AMHERSTBURG, ONT., CUSTOMS PORT

Mr. GOTT:

1. What was the customs revenue for the port of Amherstburg, Ontario, each year since 1920?

2. What was the total salaries paid customs officials at Amherstburg since 1920?

Mr. EULER:

1.

	Import-Duty	Excise Taxes	Excise Duty	Sundry Collections	Total
*1920-21	$87,697 75	.....	.....	.....	$87,697 75
1921-22	17,965 70	$ 4,398 97	$110 00	$1,280 20	23,754 87
1922-23	23,395 38	7,826 35	58 00	1,894 60	33,174 33
1923-24	20,288 89	11,014 48	.....	1,685 00	32,988 37
1924-25	14,855 72	9,324 67	.....	1,629 00	25,809 39
1925-26	34,757 55	12,041 81	.....	1,616 20	48,415 56
1926-27	29,257 78	12,365 39	.....	1,646 80	43,269 97
1927-28	44,072 91	10,168 95	.....	1,619 00	55,860 86
1928-29 (11 Mos.)	41,437 60	7,240 41	.....	2,314 90	50,992 91

*Excise revenue is not available for 1920-21, the inland revenue divisions did not correspond to customs ports and outports.

No. 2.

1920-21	$6,080.19
1921-22	4,660.50
1922-23	4,585.58
1923-24	4,700.00
1924-25	5,100.00
1925-26	3,733.33
1926-27	3,570.00
1927-28	3,780.00
1928-29 (11 mos.)	4,035.00

THOMAS H. BURNS

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain):

1. How many days was Thomas H. Burns, of the Department of National Revenue, Ottawa, absent from duty, and on what dates, in (a) fiscal year 1923-24; (b) fiscal year 1924-25; (c) fiscal year 1925-26; (d) fiscal year 1926-27; (e) fiscal year 1927-28; (f) fiscal year 1928-29?

2. How many days sick leave did he have and on what dates during the same periods?

3. How many days did he receive salary during the same periods?

Mr. EULER:

1 and 2.

Fiscal Year 1923-24.

Absence from duty.

Dates	Days
May 21st and 22nd	2
July 16th to 31st	14
August 1st to 4th	4
September 29th and 30th	2
October 1st to 31st	31
November 1st to 3rd	3
February 4th to 6th	3
Total	59

Absence re sick leave

Dates	Days
September 29th and 30th	2
October 1st to 31st	31
November 1st to 3rd	3
Total	36

1924-25.

Absence from duty.

Dates	Days
April 4, 5, 14, 15, 16	5
June 9th to 11th	3
July 14th to 31st	16
August 15th	1
October 16th to 31st	14
November 1st to 11th	8
January 9th	1
February 19th to 28th	9
March 1st to 7th	6
Total	63

Absence re sick leave.

	Days
August 15th	1
February 19th to 28th	9
March 1st to 7th	6
Total	16

1925-26.

Absence from duty.

Dates	Days
June 18th to 30th	11
July 13th to 31st	17
August 1st	1
Total	29

Absence re sick leave.

	Days
June 18th to 30th.....	11

1926-27.

Absence from duty.

	Days
Dates: April 7th to 16th.....	9
July 2nd and 3rd and 19th to 31st.....	14
August 11th	1
November 9th to 11th	3
December 8th and 28th	2
Total.....	29

Absence re sick leave.

	Days
December 8th and 28th	2

1927-28.

Absence from duty.

	Days
Dates: April 1, 9 and 26th....	3
May 11th	½
July 12th and 18th to 28th	11
November 5th	1
December 1st (½) and 27th	1½
February 27th to 29th.	3
Total.....	20

1927-28.

Absence re sick leave.

	Days
December 1st (½) and 27th.	1½

1928-29.

Absence from duty.

	Days
Dates: April 17th	1
June 7th and 18th, 20th to 30th	12
July 1st to 31st.....	25
August 1st to 31st....	26
September 1st to 30th..	24
November 2nd	1
December 3rd to 8th..	6
Total.....	95

Absence re sick leave.

	Days
June 20th to 30th.....	10
July 1st to 31st.....	25
August 1st to 31st.....	26
September 1st to 30th.	24
Total.....	85

3. Received full pay in accordance with the regulations.

Re absences shown for fiscal year 1923-24:—

Prior to January 1st, 1924, each day, including Sundays and holidays was charged on sick leave owing to the fact that the regulations allowed sick leave by months; but the statutory leave was counted for working days only. This accounts in the year 1923-24 for the item July 16th to 31st being computed as 14 days statutory leave, whereas the item October 1st to 31st is sick leave and computed as 31 days.

[Mr. Euler.]

MILITARY HOSPITALS—PATIENTS AND STAFF

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. How many patients are there in each of the following:
Christie Street Hospital,
St. Anne de Bellevue Hospital, and
Westminster Hospital, London?
2. How many medical doctors are employed at each of the above hospitals?
3. How many individuals are on the staff of each of above hospitals?
4. How many chaplains have appointments at each hospital?
5. How many are on full time or part time basis at each hospital?
6. What are the denominations represented by chaplains and what is the salary and allowance of each chaplain?
7. What is the total annual cost of each hospital?

Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. Christie Street Hospital, 370; St. Anne de Bellevue Hospital, 398; Westminster, London, 480.

2. Christie Street Hospital, 36; St. Anne de Bellevue, 13; Westminster, 14.

3. Christie Street, 198; St. Anne de Bellevue, 193; Westminster, 202.

4. Christie Street, 1; St. Anne de Bellevue, 2; Westminster, 3.

5. Christie Street, 1 part time; St. Anne de Bellevue, 1 full time, 1 part time; Westminster, 3 part time.

6. Christie Street, 1 Protestant, $1,800 per annum, (part time); St. Anne de Bellevue, 1 Roman Catholic, $1,800 per annum, plus board and quarters, (full time); Westminster, 1 Protestant, $1,200 par annum, (part time); 2 Protestant, each $600 per annum, (part time); 1 Catholic, $600 per annum, (part time).

7. Christie Street, 1923-24, $491,814.54; 1924-25, $421,734.36; 1925-26, $399,808.32; 1926-27, $376,470.32; 1927-28, $384,250.96; St. Anne's, 1923-24, $439,529.29; 1924-25, $417,-136.97; 1925-26, $397,384.42; 1926-27, $382,-460.62; 1927-28, $379,076.93; Westminster, 1923-24, $383,547.61; 1924-25, $378,250.85; 1925-26, $373,977.62; 1926-27, $369,518.70; 1927-28, $362,259.38.

AUDITOR'S GENERAL'S REPORT—ITEM $208.40

Mr. FRASER:

1. What are the details of the payment of $208.40, interest on over-due instalments, mentioned on page XI of the Auditor General's report of 1927-28, Vol. I, bottom of page?

2. Why were these interest payments allowed to be in default?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. $206.10 Grant garage, Montreal; $2.30 Lavut building, Montreal.

2. Because the due dates for the instalments in question fell at a time early in the year when parliament had granted only 1/6 of the supply act, and full payment was not made until a considerably later date.

CAMROSE, ALTA., CUSTOMS OFFICE

Mr. LUCAS:

1. In what year was a customs office opened in Camrose, Alberta?

2. What has been the customs revenue at that point for each year since the opening of the said office?

Mr. EULER:

1. 1st August, 1922.

2.	Import Duty	Excise Taxes	Total
1922-23 (8 mos.)	$ 7,135 32	$ 8,346 21	$15,481 53
1923-24	10,834 20	19,300 81	30,135 01
1924-25	9,526 06	12,192 03	21,718 09
1925-26	19,330 72	17,352 51	36,683 23
1926-27	30,081 60	20,484 38	50,565 98
1927-28	29,102 38	19,810 90	48,913 28
1928-29 (11 mos.)	49,980 43	22,063 23	72,043 66

ALLOWANCE TO PENITENTIARY INMATES

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What has been done or will be done by the government or the Department of Justice, (a) to carry out the terms of a resolution adopted by the house in 1927 to pay an allowance to dependents of inmates of Canada's penal institutions under federal control; (b) to adopt measures to meet the provinces re providing proper institutions with the provinces for those of 16, 17 and 18 years of age?

2. Will anything be done by legislation this session to prevent those of 16, 17 years of age being sent to these federal prisons?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. (a) This matter is under consideration. (b) The meaning of this question is not understood. The government has, however, under consideration the making of provision at this session for the establishment of a special institution for the purpose of segregating young prisoners from hardened criminals.

2. No.

SETTLEMENT IN KINGS COUNTY

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings):

1. Were any farms, machinery or stock purchased by the government or any department thereof for settlement purposes in Kings county, Prince Edward Island, during the year 1928?

2. If so, what are the names of parties from whom purchased, the location, the settler's name, what machinery and stock was supplied to each settler, from whom purchased, and what was the price paid for each item?

Mr. RINFRET:

Department of Immigration and Colonization:

1 and 2. The department did not purchase any farms for settlement purposes in Kings county, Prince Edward Island, during the year 1928. It did purchase live stock, machinery and other equipment for persons settled in Kings county under the 3,000 British family scheme, but all such purchases were made out of loans advanced by the Imperial government to assist settlers in becoming properly established. No expenditures whatever out of Canadian government funds were made in the purchase of such stock and equipment.

IMPERIAL WAR GRAVES COMMISSION

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. What is the total amount expended by Canada through the Imperial War Graves Commission, (a) to March 31, 1928; (b) estimated to March 31, 1929?

2. What amount has been expended on war memorials during the same period?

Mr. RALSTON:

1. (a) $4,037,589.87; (b) $4,611,369.87.

2. By this department to March 31st, 1928; $1,225,150.75, for memorials of the Great war.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—QUEBEC

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Will the management of the national railways soon come to a decision in connection with a passenger station for said railways in the city of Quebec?

2. If so, will said station be in keeping with the importance of Quebec and the government railways?

3. What will be the total cost of the Canadian National Railways station at Toronto, including the approaches and all other expenditures in connection with said station?

Mr. DUNNING:

1. The management of the Canadian National Railways reached a decision to make

use of the Palais station in the city of Quebec for all passenger trains; the Canadian National having a half interest in this property.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. The cost, to the Canadian National, of the Toronto Terminals Railway station at Toronto, including the grade separation work done by the Toronto Terminals Railway, will be $11,808,085. The Canadian National Railways' share of the cost of grade separation and other works which are exclusively C.N.R. will be $1,602,298.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—RECEIPTS, 1928

Mr. MATTHEWS:

1. What is amount of money received by the Department of National Revenue for Canada during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1928, for:

(1) All customs duties and taxes provided by the Customs Act and tariff of Canada with amendments and by the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, and amending acts on, (a) imported spirits; (b) imported wines; (c) imported ale, beer, porter and stout.

(2) All excise and sales taxes levied under the provisions of the Inland Revenue Act with amending acts and the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, with amending acts on, (a) Canadian potable spirits; (b) Canadian non-potable and denatured spirits; (c) Canadian wines; (d) Canadian ale, beer, porter and stout?

2. What is amount of money received by the Department of National Revenue for Canada during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1928, for:

(1) All customs duties and taxes provided by the Customs Act and tariff of Canada with amendments and by the Special War Revenue Act 1915 and amending acts on imported spirits, wines, ale, beer, porter and stout, which were exported from Canada.

(2) All excise and sales taxes levied under the provisions of the Inland Revenue Act with amending acts and the Special War Revenue Act 1915 with amending acts on Canadian potable spirits, Canadian wines and Canadian ale, beer, porter and stout which were exported from Canada?

Mr. EULER:

1. (1) Collections of customs duties and excise taxes on imports of spirits, wines and ale, beer, porter, etc., fiscal year ended March, 1928:—

	Customs Duties	Excise Taxes
Spirits..	$22,965,183	
Wines..	1,757,872	
Ale, beer, porter, etc.	95,029	$ 28,751

(2) Collections of excise duties and excise taxes on spirits, wines and domestic beer, fiscal year ended March, 1928:—

	Excise Duties	Excise Taxes
Potable spirits... ..	$17,104,208	
Non-potable spirits..	1,157,205	
Wines..		$ 170,987
Ale, beer, porter, etc.	234,220	6,320,590
Malt..	4,274,966	

Sales tax collections are not recorded, as applied to separate commodities, and returns are not available of sales taxes collected on beer, spirits and wines.

2. (1 and 2) The department has no record of customs or excise revenues collected on domestic or imported spirits, which were exported from Canada subsequent to customs or excise entry.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—PUBLICATIONS AND DISTRIBUTION

Mr. SPENCER:

1. How many men employed in the Department of Agriculture, publications and distribution branch, Daly building, are receiving a salary of twenty dollars ($20) per week, or less?

2. What are their salaries and duties respectively?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Eleven at present, but the majority are only employed for a short period during the distribution of special publications.

2. All these men are paid $17.10 per week. Their duties consist of filling and sealing envelopes ready for mailing, handling and opening packages of publications received from the printing bureau, and general labouring work. Occasionally they may be required to carry messages.

LOWER DETROIT RIVER CONTRACTS

Mr. GOTT:

1. Is it a fact that the Department of Marine and Fisheries refuses to acknowledge representations that have been made to them, after five years of sealed contracts for light and buoy service in the lower Detroit river; that they still refuse to put up same for tender in re-letting the contract which expires April 1, 1929?

2. Has the department received requests to have same let by tender?

3. Has the department received communications re letting contract from any other than present contractor?

4. Is it a fact that a communication regarding same, dated February 26th, was not answered by the department until March 13th and then only after another communication from the same party under date of March 10th had been received?

5. Has the government an offer from a reputable party, well equipped for the work, to perform the contract at less than the present contract price?

6. What is the present contract price?
7. What is the offer received by the government?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. No.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. The department is not aware of any communication on this subject dated February 26th. A communication dated February 27th was received and a further communication dated March 10th which were answered March 13th.
5. An offer has been received from Captain McQueen and Son, Amherstburg.
6. $9,375 per year.
7. $7,900.

MULGRAVE—POINT TUPPER CAR FERRY

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South):

1. What is the amount of capital invested in the car ferry at Mulgrave-Point Tupper service?
2. What is the cost of terminals at Mulgrave, and also those at Point Tupper?
3. What is the annual cost of operating ferry service between Mulgrave and Point Tupper, including maintenance of pusher grade out of Mulgrave?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. $672,782.37.
2. $513,848.30.
3. $170,627.31.

MAJOR GUSTAVE LANCTOT

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac-Addington):

1. When was Major Gustave Lanctot first appointed to the archives branch, in what capacity and at what salary?
2. What position does he now hold and at what salary?
3. What would his salary be according to the civil service rating?
4. When and by what amounts and for what reasons has his salary been augmented by special votes of parliament?
5. What amounts have been paid to him each year since his appointment to cover travelling and other expenses to various countries visited?
6. What countries were visited by him each year, for how long and for what purposes?
7. Is he at present absent on a foreign mission? If so, where and for what purpose?
8. Did he take with him scores of precious, (a) old documents, (b) engravings, (c) art records, and were these from the archives?
9. What is the description and approximate value of each of the articles referred to in previous question?
10. Where and by whom were these precious articles crated for transportation, when and for what amount and by what company were they insured?
11. Will Mr. Lanctot's salary and travelling expenses be paid by the government during his absence?
12. Has any advance been made to him by the government to cover, (a) travelling expenses, (b) living allowances? If so, what amount?
13. How long is Major Lanctot expected to be absent on this special mission and who is acting as chief French archivist during his absence?
14. How many officials appointed by the government of Canada are employed at, (a) the Paris office of the Canadian archives, (b) the London office of the Canadian archives?
15. If the officials referred to above are properly qualified, why has Major Lanctot been sent on his present mission?
16. Will the Canadian government pay Major Lanctot's salary and also his travelling expenses and living allowance while he is representing the Royal Society of Canada, the Canadian Historical Association and the Canadian Authors' Association at various functions of a private character in Paris?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. October 15th, 1912. Student clerk. $480.
2. Chief French archivist. $5,120.
3. $3,720 to $4,420.
4. April 1st, 1927. $700. Order in council P.C. 10/81, January 16th, 1928. Confirmed by parliament.

Two French employees, one drawing a salary of $4,000 and another a salary of $2,400 were retired from the public service, and their duties were transferred to the chief French archivist.

5. 1914-15, $95.70; 1916-17, $1,001.26; 1921-22; $936.07; 1922-23, $1,987; 1923-24, $1,890.45; 1926-27, $1,826.02; 1927-28, $1,929.35.
6. Berkeley, California. March 24 to May 6, 1915. To copy documents relating to the north west, deposited in the university.

England and France. April 18th to September, 1916. Collecting war material.

England and France. July 29th to September 21st, 1921. In search of historical material.

Rio de Janeiro. August 19th to October 16th, 1922.

Delegate to International Congress of the History of America.

England and France. January 15th to May 4th, 1923. In search of historical material.

England and France. January 28th to April 15th, 1926. In search of historical material.

Paris. February 27th to May 16th, 1928. In connection with the early Franch colonial exhibition.

7. Yes. Paris. Exhibition of historical material relating to the colonies of France during the French regime in Canada.
8. Yes. Original documents, old engravings and prints. Most of them were from the archives, a few gathered from other institutions in Canada.
9. Prints and engravings valued at $4,790. Manuscripts. It is difficult to estimate the value of old records. It can only be deter-

mined by the price obtained at a public sale of manuscript. The collection taken by the chief French archivist would probably realise at a public sale at least $9,025.

10. They were packed in the archives in two special cases made by the Public Works department and were taken personally by Major Lanctot.

11. Yes.

12. Yes. $500 to cover travelling expenses and living allowance.

13. About ten weeks. His duties have been taken over by the Dominion archivist.

14. Paris office. One official in charge of the work in Paris and seventeen other employees mainly copyists. London office. One official in charge, six copyists and one draftsman.

15. Major Lanctot made the collection and a request was made for his services by the French committee in charge of the exposition.

16. No information.

PRODUCTION OF DOMESTIC FUEL

Mr. CANTLEY:

1. Has any contract been entered into between the Minister of Mines or other department of the government and any person or corporation under the provisions of chapter 52, an act to encourage the production of domestic fuel from coal mined in Canada, and, if so, how many such contracts are now in force, with the name of each contractor?

2. How many coke ovens are embraced in such contracts?

3. What was the tonnage of coal mined in Canada and so used in such coke ovens?

4. What was the quantity of coke produced under such conditions in such coke ovens?

5. What was the amount of bonus applied for and what amount has been paid under the provisions of this act up to December 31, 1928?

6. What was the total tonnage of all coke produced in Canada between April 14, 1927 (date of passing of act), to December 31, 1928?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Yes. One contract has been entered into with the Nova Scotia Tramways and Power Company, Limited, of Halifax.

2. The number of ovens covered by this contract amounts in all to eight.

3. As the plant has only recently been completed no authoritative information is yet available.

4. As the plant has only recently been completed no authoritative information is yet available.

5. The bonus applied for is 4% of the total cost of the works. As final cost sheets are not yet available the amount of subsidy to be paid cannot be calculated until such time as these are received. No amount was paid under the provisions of this act up to December 31, 1928.

6. 3,720,794 net tons. (Compiled from reports of Dominion Bureau of Statistics).

AMSEY BIGNEY

Mr. HANSON:

1. Was one Amsey Bigney in the employ of the government, in the capacity of fish warden, during the seasons of 1926, 1927 and 1928?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to reappoint him for the year 1929?

3. Is the government aware that the said Amsey Bigney has been convicted for violating the New Brunswick liquor laws?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Not in 1926, but about two months in each of the years 1927 and 1928.

2. No decision yet reached.

3. The Department of Marine and Fisheries was not aware of such.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS IN OTTAWA

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

What is the total sum paid for rentals of government offices and buildings in the city of Ottawa, for each fiscal year since 1922-23 to 1927-28, inclusive?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1922-1923, $636,091.67; 1923-1924, $656,950.63; 1924-1925, $688,002.85; 1925-1926, $672,632.09; 1926-1927, $678,856.25; 1927-1928, $720,608.79.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS SUPERVISION COMMITTEE

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What are the names of the ministers at present composing the government contracts supervision committee?

2. On what date was an order in council passed appointing them?

3. What is the amount of public purchases dealt with by this committee during each of the past five years by departments?

4. What is the amount of public purchases dealt with by the staff of the government contracts supervision committee during the past five years by departments?

5. What is the status of L. H. Beer on this staff? Does he rank over or under Colonel LaFleche, and to what extent does Colonel LaFleche assume responsibility for the administration of the salvage work of the committee?

Mr. ROBB:

1 and 2. By order in council of 8th August, 1924, the organization, formerly under the committee referred to, was placed under the direction and control of the Minister of Finance.

3 and 4.

	1924-1925	1925-1926	1926-1927	1927-1928	1928-1929
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	$ 195,285 87	$ 750 25	.....	.....	.....
Interior	74,801 81	49,548 41	43,447 95	25,840 85	23,743 62
Soldiers Civil Re-Establishment (now Pensions and National Health)	153,309 03	152,719 31	128,588 50	110,200 42	101,211 14
Post Office	86,925 28	.....	.....	.....	.....
National Defence	3,278 53	513 94	11,712 24	4,960 09	.....
Railways and Canals	2,819,612 74	.....	.....	632 23	.....
Public Works	105,664 07	8,079 10	2,896 45	4,417 82	6,883 45
Agriculture	160,379 02	43,794 83	49,943 65	34,669 00	37,717 99
Mines	45,484 79	16,644 40	11,966 25	7,808 72	2,310 48
Trade and Commerce	26,660 03	32,549 46	33,758 76	18,368 77	127,968 44
Indian Affairs	55,551 62	1,426 12	4,500 84	19,702 70	11,701 85
Chief Electoral Officer	658 00	.....	555 00	.....	.....
Immigration and Colonization	447 50	342 50	157 50	.....	343 50
National Revenue	.....	.....	.....	.....	12,811 95
Marine and Fisheries	.....	745 36	.....	.....	.....
Soldiers Settlement Board	42,317 06	66,746 45	95,644 70	81,703 98	89,391 75
Health	13,656 16	.....	.....	.....	.....
	$3,784,031 51	$373,860 13	$383,171 84	$308,304 58	$414,084 17

5. Salvage officer under the direction of Colonel L. R. LaFlèche.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—SALARIES

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

What was the total amount of salaries of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1913-14 and the fiscal year 1927-28, (a) Ottawa service; (b) outside service, giving the number of persons employed in each instance?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

	1913-14		1927-28	
Ottawa service	816	$1,031,980 97	1,326	$2,609,493 36
Outside Ottawa	709	811,162 63	858	1,389,300 36
Total	1,525	$1,843,143 60	2,186	$3,998,793 72

BLIND PERSONS IN CANADA

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. How many blind persons are resident in Canada?
2. How many males?
3. How many females?
4. How many of each sex are self-supporting?
5. How many are entirely dependent on charity?

Mr. MALCOLM:

1. 4,430*.
2. 2,527*.
3. 1,903*.
4. Information not available.
5. Information not available.

*1921 Census figures.

NOTCH HILL, B.C. POST OFFICE

Mr. STIRLING:

1. What is the name of the person or persons having the contract to deliver His Majesty's mail from the Notch Hill post office, British Columbia, to Celista post office, British Columbia, along the Shuswap lake?
2. What other post offices are served with mail besides Celista, British Columbia, under the same contract?
3. How often is mail delivered to each post office?
4. What is the length of term of this contract?
5. When does this contract expire?
6. At the expiration of said contract will public tenders be called for same?
7. What is the cost, per year, to the government under present contract?

Mr. VENIOT:

1. O. L. Charlton.
2. Eagle Bay; Magna Bay; Anglemont; Sorrento.
3. Magna Bay, semi-weekly; Celista, semi-weekly; Sorrento, semi-weekly; Anglemont, semi-weekly April to November inclusive. Weekly December to March inclusive; Eagle Bay, semi-weekly April to November inclusive. Weekly December to March inclusive.
4. Two years.
5. 31st December, 1930.

6. Under act governing, if cost is reasonable and service has been satisfactorily performed, contract may be renewed.

7. $1,050 per annum.

POSTMASTERS DISMISSED IN HALIFAX

Mr. BLACK (Halifax):

1. How many postmasters have been dismissed in Halifax county since 1926?

2. In how many instances have the location of post offices been changed?

Mr. VENIOT:

1. 10.

2. In each case the appointment of a new postmaster involved a change in the site of the office.

AGRICULTURAL INSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. What amount has been paid out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada to each of the provinces under the provisions of the Agricultural Instruction Act, chapter 5 of the statutes of 1913?

2. When were such payments discontinued, and why?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. See attached.

2. Payments were discontinued as from March 31, 1923, as the period covered by the Agricultural Instruction Act expired on that date and the Act was not renewed.

Agricultural Instruction Act

Payments to several Provinces from 1913-14 to 1922-23 inclusive

—	1913-14	1914-15	1915-16	1916-17	1917-18	1918-19	1919-20	1920-21	1921-22	1922-23	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Prince Edward Island	26,529 85	27,832 81	29,138 28	30,443 75	31,749 22	31,749 22	31,749 22	31,749 22	31,749 22	31,749 22	304,440 01
New Brunswick	44,509 93	49,407 20	54,308 40	59,209 60	64,110 80	64,110 80	64,110 80	64,110 80	64,110 80	64,110 80	592,099 93
Ontario	195,733 32	230,868 82	266,013 64	301,158 45	336,303 26	161,303 26	511,303 26	336,303 26	336,303 26	336,303 26	3,011,593 79
Nova Scotia	54,288 45	61,144 45	68,001 87	74,859 28	81,716 69	81,716 69	81,716 69	81,716 69	81,716 69	81,716 69	749,134 18
Quebec	159,482 40	187,409 16	215,310 70	243,212 23	271,113 76	271,113 76	271,113 76	271,113 76	271,113 76	271,113 76	2,432,097 05
Manitoba	51,730 05	58,075 45	64,421 31	58,767 20	89,113 11	77,113 11	77,113 11	77,113 11	77,113 11	77,113 11	707,672 67
Saskatchewan	54,296 29	61,152 31	68,011 04	74,869 76	40,864 24	81,728 48	122,592 72	40,864 24	122,592 72	81,728 48	748,700 28
British Columbia	47,334 76	52,799 38	58,265 94	63,732 50	63,949 06	74,449 06	69,199 06	69,199 06	69,199 06	69,199 06	637,326 94
Ont. Vet. College, Toronto	15,371 91	.....	.....	15,607 85	.....	14,869 56	.....	14,285 72	12,574 85	72,935 68	145,645 57
Alberta	46,094 95	51,310 41	56,528 82	61,747 22	66,965 62	66,965 62	66,965 62	66,965 62	33,482 81	100,448 43	617,475 12
School of Com. Med. and Vet. Science, Montreal	4,628 09	4,392 15	5,130 44	5,714 28	7,425 15	6,666 67	5,882 35	5,000 00	4,613 58	4,883 72	54,336 43
	700,000 00	784,392 14	885,130 44	989,322 12	1,053,310 91	931,786 23	1,301,746 59	1,058,421 48	1,104,569 85	1,191,302 21	9,999,981 97

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—HALIFAX HOTEL

Mr. QUINN (Halifax):

1. Were tenders called for the building of the Canadian National station and hotel at Halifax, Nova Scotia?
2. If so, who were the tenderers and what were the respective amounts of each tender?
3. What firm was awarded the contract?
4. Were sub-tenders called for plumbing, electric wiring, ventilation, sheet metal work, roofing and cut granite?
5. If so, what firms tendered and what were the respective amounts of tenders?
6. What were the names of the firms awarded the contracts?

Mr. DUNNING:

1. Yes.

2. Tenderers, as follows: Anglin-Norcross Limited, Montreal; E. G. M. Cape & Company, Montreal; Foundation Maritime Limited, Halifax, N.S.; G. A. Fuller Company of Canada Limited, Montreal; Robertson & Janin Building Co. Ltd., Montreal; The James Shearer Co. Limited, Montreal; Dakin Construction Co. Limited, Montreal.

The management do not consider it to be in the interests of the Canadian National Railways, nor in the public interest, to publish the amounts of these tenders. They state that the work was given to the lowest tenderer in each case, which is the policy of the railway in that regard.

3. Foundation Maritime Limited. (This firm was the lowest tenderer).

4. Yes.

5. (a) Plumbing, heating and ventilation: The Garth Company, Montreal; John Colford Limited, Montreal; L. E. Moulton & Co. Limited, Montreal; Hagen & Powers, Halifax and St. John, N.B.; Farquhar Bros. Limited, Halifax, N.S.; Thos. O'Connell, Montreal; James Ballantyne, Montreal.

(b) Electric wiring: Canadian Taverner Company Ltd., Montreal; Canadian Comstock Company Ltd., Montreal.

(c) Sheet metal work roofing and cut granite included in bulk tender of Foundation Maritime Limited.

6. (a) The Garth Company (who was the lowest tenderer).

(b) Canadian Taverner Company Limited (who was the lowest tenderer).

The same explanation as given in note in answer No. 2 applies as to these prices also.

LONG TERM FARM LOAN ACT

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What provinces of the Dominion have expressed their intention to make use of the Long Term Farm Loan Act?
2. Is the staff of the Federal Farm Loan Board as yet organized?
3. In view of the great need of the early administration of this act, when will the Federal Farm Loan Board begin to make loans?

Mr. ROBB:

1. Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec.
2. Headquarters staff in Ottawa is organized and rapid progress is being made in four of the provinces.
3. Forthwith, on the provinces having complied with requirements of the act.

IMPORTS OF HIDES

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton):

1. What was the quantity, rate of duty and amount of duty collected on hides imported into Canada during the calendar year 1928?
2. What was the value of leather and manufactures of leather imported into Canada during the calendar year 1928; also percentage of duty levied and total amount of duty collected on same?

Mr. EULER:

78594—79

REVISED EDITION

Imports of Hides, Leather and Manufactures of Leather, Entered for Consumption in Canada, with Import Duties Collected and Rates of Duty Applied, during the Calendar Year 1928

Classification Item	Unit of quantity	Quantity	Value	Duty collected	Tariff item	Rates of duty			
						Preferential	Intermediate	Treaty rates	General
			$	$ cts.					
Calf skins and kips, raw, whether dry salted or pickled	Cwt.	66,955	2,203,760	.....	599	Free.	Free.	Free.	Free.
Cattle skins, raw, whether dry salted or pickled	Cwt.	450,060	10,593,441	.....	599	Free.	Free.	Free.	Free.
Sheep skins, raw, whether dry salted or pickled	Cwt.	40,767	1,119,512	.....	599	Free.	Free.	Free.	Free.
Other hides, skins and pelts, raw, n.o.p., whether dry salted or pickled	Cwt.	28,346	833,338	.....	599	Free.	Free.	Free.	Free.
Belting leather of all kinds	$	.....	461,488	60,885 05	605	10 %	12½%	12½–10	15 %
Leather, not further finished than tanned,—calf, kid, goat, lamb, and sheep leather	$	.....	208,863	27,627 70	605	10 %	12½%	12½–10	15 %
Leather not further finished than tanned, other, and skins, n.o.p.	$	.....	265,450	35,342 14	605	10 %	12½%	12½–10	15 %
Glove leather, tanned or dressed, coloured or not, imported by glove manufacturers, for use exclusively in their own factories in the manufacture of gloves	$	.....	1,327,574	131,870 75	607	5 %	7½%	.....	10 %
Harness leather	$	.....	20,217	2,996 38	604	12½%	15 %	15–10	15 %
Japanned, patent or enamelled leather, and Morocco leather, and leather in imitation of Morocco leather	$	.....	173,384	41,780 68	608	15 %	22½%	.....	25 %
Skins for Morocco leather, tanned but not further manufactured	$	.....	2,062	270 80	605	10 %	12½%	12½–10	15 %
Sole leather	$	.....	116,791	18,004 30	606	12½%	15 %	.....	17½%
Tanner's scrap leather	$	.....	$ 38,478	$ 5,768 95	605	10%	12½%	12½–10	15%
Leather, dressed, waxed or glazed, or further finished than tanned—Calf, dongola, goat, kid, lamb, and sheep	$	.....	1,922,173	277,370 01	604	12½%	15 %	15–10	15 %
Leather, dressed, waxed or glazed, or further finished than tanned—Cordovan, kangaroo, alligator, and all leather, dressed, waxed or glazed, n.o.p.	$	.....	1,624,342	228,272 23	604	12½%	15 %	15–10	15 %
Chamois skins	$	.....	132,737	17,918 55	604	12½%	15 %	15–10	15 %
Boots and shoes, pegged or wire fastened with unstitched soles, close edged	Pair	32,358	49,591	12,184 65	611	15 %	22½%	.....	25 %
Boots, shoes and slippers with leather uppers, n.o.p., men's (size 5½ and up)	Pair	294,829	996,741	198,461 39	611a	17½%	27½%	.....	30 %
Boots, shoes and slippers with leather uppers, n.o.p., women's (size 2½ and up)	Pair	435,334	1,478,252	428,835 50	611a	17½%	27½%	.....	30 %
Boots, shoes and slippers with leather uppers, n.o.p., children's (all other sizes)	Pair	82,030	78,917	15,815 15	611a	17½%	27½%	.....	30 %
Harness and saddlery, including horse boots	$	.....	260,059	60,406 97	612	17½%	27½%	.....	30 %
Leather belting	$	.....	186,412	39,337 95	609	15 %	20 %	.....	22½%
*Gloves of leather	$	.....	683,083	171,850 28	627	22½%	30 %	.....	35 %
*Mitts and mittens of leather	$	.....	3,458	969 80	627a	15 %	25 %	.....	30 %
*Gloves and mitts of leather	$	.....	288,555	78,593 22	627	22½%	30 %	.....	35 %
All other manufactures of leather and raw hide, n.o.p.	$	.....	877,406	201,796 80	613	15 %	22½%	.....	25 %

*Leather gloves and mitts classified together up to April 1st. Separately classified subsequent to that date.

BIENFAIT, SASK., BRIQUETTING PLANT

Mr. CANTLEY:

1. What is the total amount spent to date by the Department of Mines or any other department of the government in connection with briquetting Lignite or Bituminous coal at Bienfait?

2. When did these experiments begin and how much was paid in each year on account thereof?

3. What was the total quantity of briquetted fuel produced yearly during the course of the experiments?

4. What was the cost of the equipment now being operated in connection with the enterprise?

5. What are the terms and provisions of the arrangement under which the plan is now being operated, who are the present operators and what is their connection with the project by way of investment, lease or other commitments?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1. $535,000—the amount granted by the government of Canada to the Lignite Utilization Board of Canada (created by order in council of August 22, 1918, P.C. 2064).

2. According to the records of the Lignite Utilization Board operations commenced October 1, 1918, and expenditures were as follows:

October 1, 1918—March 31, 1920..	$ 41,679 37
April 1, 1920—March 31, 1921.. ..	517,575 94
April 1, 1921—March 31, 1922.. ..	251,257 96
April 1, 1922—March 31, 1923.. ..	91,218 29
April 1, 1923—March 31, 1924.. ..	105,072 31
April 1, 1924—March 31, 1925.. ..	24,595 77
April 1, 1925—March 31, 1926.. ..	18,598 62
April 1, 1926—March 31, 1927.. ..	9,265 53
April 1, 1927—March 31, 1928.. ..	5,968 56

The above expenditure include grants to the Lignite Utilization Board from the governments of Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

3. As the operations of the board did not pass the experimental stage, no record was kept of the production of briquetted fuel.

4. No information. The plant has been in possession of Western Dominion Collieries, Limited, since September, 1927.

5. The rights of the Lignite Utilization Board in the Bienfait plant were transferred to Western Dominion Collieries, Limited, absolutely, on their having satisfied the board and the governments concerned that they were prepared to forthwith install equipment deemed satisfactory for the manufacture of lignite briquettes. A plant with 200 ton daily capacity has been erected and is now in operation.

LIQUOR LICENSES

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton):

1. What new brewery or distillery licenses were granted in Ontario since January 1, 1928, to March 1, 1929?

[Mr. Euler.]

2. What brewery or distillery licenses were renewed in the province of Ontario since January 1, 1928, to March 1, 1929?

3. Who obtained these licenses and where are their plants located?

Mr. EULER:

1.

The Highland Scotch Distillers, Ltd., Humberstone, Ont.

Tecumseh Brewing Co., Limited, Tecumseh, Ont.

The Hofer Brewing Co., Limited, La Salle, Ont.

2. Distillers

Canadian Industrial Alcohol Co., Belleville, Ont.

Consolidated Distillers, Ltd., Belleville, Ont.

J. E. Seagram & Sons, Limited, Waterloo, Ont.

Lindsay Distilleries, Limited, Lindsay, Ont.

Wiser's Distillery, Limited, Prescott, Ont.

Sarnia Wine & Cognac, Limited, Sarnia, Ont.

Gooderham & Worts, Ltd., Toronto, Ont.

The Highland Scotch Distillers, Ltd., Humberstone, Ont.

Hiram Walker & Sons, Limited, Walkerville, Ont.

Brewers

Quinte Breweries, Limited, Belleville, Ont.

The Bixel Brewing & Malt Co. Ltd., Brantford, Ont.

Fort Frances Brewing Co. Ltd., Fort Frances, Ont.

The Kakabeka Falls Brewing Co., Fort William, Ont.

Rock Brewery, Limited, Preston, Ont.

Sleeman's Spring Bank Brewery, Ltd., Guelph, Ont.

Charles Schwan, Carlsruhe, Ont.

Halliday Breweries, Limited, Guelph, Ont.

Formosa Spring Brewery, Ltd., Formosa, Ont.

The Hamilton Brewing Association, Ltd., Hamilton, Ont.

Grant's Spring Brewing Co. Ltd., Hamilton, Ont.

Kenora Brewing Co. Ltd., Kenora, Ont.

Lake Ontario Brewing Co. Ltd., Portsmouth, Ont.

The Kuntz Brewery, Limited, Waterloo, Ont.

Huether Brewing Co. Ltd., Kitchener, Ont.

John S. Labatt, London, Ont.

Carling Breweries, Limited, London, Ont.

Gold Belt Brewery, Ltd., Timmins, Ont.

The Capital Brewing Co. Ltd., Ottawa, Ont.

The Brading Breweries, Ltd., Ottawa, Ont.

Peterborough Brewing Co. Ltd., Peterborough, Ont.

The Port Arthur Beverage Co. Ltd., Port Arthur, Ont.

Sarnia Brewing Co. Ltd., Sarnia, Ont.
Soo Falls Brewing Co. Ltd., Sault St. Marie, Ont.
Felix Devlin, Estate, Stratford, Ont.
Sudbury Brewing & Malting Co. Ltd., Sudbury, Ont.
Taylor & Bate, St. Catharines, Ont.
The Dominion Brewery Co., Ltd., Toronto, Ont.
The Cosgrave Export Brewery Co. Ltd., Toronto, Ont.
Canada Bud Breweries, Ltd., Toronto, Ont.
The Reinhardt Brewery Co. Ltd., Toronto, Ont.
O'Keefe's Beverages, Limited, Toronto, Ont.
The Copeland Brewing Co. Ltd., Toronto, Ont.
The Cronmiller & White Brewing Co. Ltd., Welland, Ont.
Riverside Brewery Co., Riverside, Ont.
The Walkerville Brewery, Ltd., Walkerville, Ont.
British American Brewing Co. Ltd., Windsor, Ont.
Tecumseh Brewing Co. Ltd., Tecumseh, Ont.
The Hofer Brewing Co. Ltd., La Salle, Ont.

3. Answered by No. 2.

DISTILLERIES IN CANADA

Mr. TUMMON:

1. What was the total amount of licenses or fees paid for the calendar year 1928 by the distilleries of Canada for the privilege of operating?
2. What was the total amount of licenses or fees paid for the calendar year 1928 by the breweries of Canada for the privilege of operating?
3. What was the total amount of licenses or fees paid for the calendar year 1928 by the wineries of Canada for the privilege of operating?
4. What was the total amount received for permits for home-brewing for the calendar year of 1928?
5. What amount of excise was received by the Dominion, from breweries, distilleries and wineries for the calendar year of 1928?
6. What was the total amount of sales tax received from the sale of spirits, malt and malt liquors, and wines for the calendar year of 1928?
7. What was the total amount received in customs duties from the importation of alcohol, spirits and beer and wines for the calendar year of 1928?
8. What was the total amount of excise received on account of tobacco, cigars and cigarettes for the calendar year of 1928?
9. What was the total amount of sales tax received on account of tobacco, cigars and cigarettes for the calendar year of 1928?

Mr. EULER:

Calendar year 1928

1. Licenses or fees collected from distilleries, $6,375.00.

2. Licenses or fees collected from breweries, $4,450.00.

3. Licenses or fees collected from wine manufacturers, $50.00.

4. No fees chargeable for home-brewing permits.

5. Excise duty collected from distilleries, $12,088,704.69; Excise duty collected from breweries, $2,298,464.22; Excise taxes collected on domestic beer, gallonage, $7,715,017.24; Excise taxes collected on wines, gallonage, $175,690.62.

6 and 9. Figures are not available in this department of sales tax revenues as applied to separate commodities.

7. Customs duties collected on imports of alcohol, spirits, beer and wines: Beer, $103,809.38; spirituous liquors, $23,914,571.60; wines, $1,672,666.82; Industrial alcohol, $1,472.80.

8. Excise duty collected on cigars, $568,280.41; Excise duty collected on manufactured tobacco, $4,406,348.28; Excise duty collected on cigarettes, $26,630,724.32; Excise taxes collected on cigars, $322,361.88; Excise duty collected on foreign raw leaf tobacco used in tobacco and cigar manufactures, $7,151,981.60.

POWER EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

How many electrical horse-power were exported to the United States by the various provinces of Canada during the years 1926, 1927 and 1928?

Mr. MALCOLM:

Provinces	1926 H.P. Years	1927 H.P. Years	1928 H.P. Years
P.E.I.	—	—	—
N.S.	—	—	—
N.B.	1,281.8	1,485.9	1,833.8
Que.	54,240.8	59,817.0	60,702.8
Ont.	171,887.3	188,175.0	178,637.7
Man.	—	—	—
Sask.	—	—	—
Alta.	—	—	—
B.C.	2,878.6	320.8	251.8

TONNAGE PASSING THROUGH CANALS

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. What tonnage passes through the following canals: Sault Ste. Marie, Welland, Soulanges and Lachine?
2. How many bushels of wheat were shipped by railway from Fort William to Montreal, during the years 1927 and 1928?
3. How many bushels of said wheat came from, (a) the United States; (b) from Canada?
4. What were the railway returns for the shipment of said United States and Canadian wheat?

Mr. RINFRET:

1.

Freight Tonnage	1927 tons	1928 tons
Sault Ste. Marie—		
Canadian lock	1,470,551	2,007,137
United States lock ..	81,882,489	84,985,117
Total..	83,353,040	86,992,254
Welland..	7,247,459	7,439,617
Lachine..	7,790,560	8,277,252
Soulanges	Not available	7,542,825
St. Lawrence canals—		
Way freight	1,050,297	—
Through freight. ..	6,862,655	—
Total..	7,912,952	—

2. Amount received at harbour commissioners elevators Montreal from Fort William were as follows:

Calendar year 1926—118,599.
Calendar year 1927— 16,625.
Calendar year 1928—Not available.

3. (a) The United States, none; (b) Canada, see No. 2.

4. Not available.

FRANK DUNLOP

Mr. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton North-Victoria):

1. What position, if any, does Frank Dunlop, of New Campbellton, Victoria county, Nova Scotia, hold in the Government service?

2. If employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, does he hold any other position in the Government?

3. Who recommended him?

4. What salary does he receive?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Storm signal agent (part time) at New Campbellton, N.S.

2. Not under the marine branch of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

3. F. L. Kelly, ex-M.P., North Sydney, N.S.

4. $75 per annum.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES—DIRECTOR OF PUBLICITY

Mr. DUFF:

1. Has a director of publicity in the Fisheries department been appointed?

2. If so, what salary does he receive per annum?

3. Was he appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

4. Was the position advertised? If so, how?

5. What are the names of the persons applying for said position?

[Mr. Deslauriers.]

6. Has the person appointed any practical or theoretical knowledge of the fisheries?

7. Has he an assistant?

8. What remuneration per year does his assistant receive?

9. What other expenses are connected with this position?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Yes.

2. $3,420 per annum.

3. Yes.

4. (a) Yes; (b) The position was advertised in the Canada Gazette, and by poster sent to the following on December 4th, to be displayed until the 27th: Members of federal parliament; postmasters at offices where the population exceeds one thousand; universities; libraries; secretaries of the Canadian Legion; employment offices throughout the Dominion; individuals who have requested the commission to notify them of vacant positions in publicity work; Business Newspapers' Association of Canada, Toronto; Association of Canadian Advertisers, Toronto; Canadian Association of Advertising, Toronto; The Canadian Daily Newspapers' Association, Toronto; The Canadian Fisheries Association, Montreal, Prince Rupert and Toronto; Canadian Weekly Newspapers' Association, Renfrew. (The fisheries branch also sent notices to other societies, fisheries and press, and to The Canadian Fisherman).

5. Applications were received from the following: Louis Berube, Montreal, P.Q.; H. M. Boyd, Ottawa; W. J. Callaghan, Ottawa; J. H. Conlon, Halifax, N.S.; H. W. Eades, Vancouver, B.C.; A. E. Fortington, Ottawa; E. C. Gannon, Montreal, P.Q.; F. W. H. Giolma, Victoria, B.C.; S. R. N. Hodgins, Macdonald College, P.Q.; T. H. C. House, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.; T. C. Lapp, Toronto, Ont.; W. H. Lloyd, Kitchener, Ont.; H. C. MacCallum, Calgary, Alta.; W. N. Mills, Springhill, N.S.; G. C. Monture, Ottawa; H. F. S. Paisley, Sydney, N.S.; Lloyd Roberts, McKellar, Ottawa; H. A. Underwood, Ottawa; G. G. Yates, Montreal, P.Q.

Letters of inquiry but no particulars, were received from: M. Goldenberg, Montreal, P.Q.; C. W. Seaboyer, Lunenburg, N.S.

6. The advertisement specified, among other things, that the candidate must have, "at least five years of experience in journalism and a wide knowledge of the fishing industry and of the fisheries of Canada." It did not call for practical experience as a fisherman. Mr. Paisley was the only candidate who had five years of experience in journalism and who had also a knowledge of fisheries. Through his editorial work on New Brunswick and Nova Scotia newspapers he has

gained a knowledge of fisheries problems, especially in the maritime provinces, and he has also had experience in public speaking.

7. An employee of the department is acting as an assistant.

8. His salary is $3,720.

9. Office and travelling expenses as may be found necessary.

ARTHUR MCDONALD

Mr. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton North-Victoria):

1. What position, if any, does Arthur McDonald, of Sydney, Nova Scotia, hold with the government?
2. What was the date of his appointment?
3. What salary does he receive?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Arthur McDonald, Sydney, appointed commissioner to investigate partisanship charges against government employees.

2. 21st February 1927.

3. Not on salary basis but paid $20 per day's work plus travelling and living expenses.

INGRAHAM COREY

Mr. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton North-Victoria):

1. What position, if any, does Ingraham Corey, of New Campbellton, Victoria county, Nova Scotia, hold with the government?
2. Who recommended him?
3. What salary does he receive?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. No information.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

NEW CAMPBELLTON, N.S., WHARF

Mr. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton North-Victoria):

1. What amount of money has been spent on the government wharf in the district of New Campbellton, Victoria county, Nova Scotia, during the years 1923-1928, inclusive?
2. Was the work done by contract or days' pay?
3. If by contract, who was the contractor?
4. What was the amount of his tender?
5. If by day labour, who was the foreman?
6. What rate of wages was paid the foreman?
7. What rate of wages was paid to labourers?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. 1922-1923, $481.92; 1927-1928, $1,392.45.—Total, $1,874.37.

2. Day labour.

3 and 4. Answered by number 2.

5. 1922-1923, Rod C. McLean. 1927-1928, D. J. Dunlop.

6. $4 per day.

7. $2.50 per day.

IMPORTS OF WOOL AND WOOLLEN TOPS

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton):

1. What quantity of wool and woollen tops was imported into Canada in the calendar year 1928, and what was the rate of duty and amount of duty collected on same?
2. What was the value, rate of duty and amount of duty collected on imports of manufactured woollen goods during the calendar year 1928?

Mr. EULER:

Statement of Imports of Wool, and Wool Manufactures Entered for Consumption in Canada, with Rates of Duty and Amount of Duty Collected, Calendar Year 1928.

Item	Unit	Quantity	Value	Duty	Tariff item	Rates of duty			
						Preferential	Intermediate	Treaty rates	General
			$	$ cts.					
Wool, the hair of the camel, alpaca, etc., not further prepared than combed	Lb.	14,271,154	5,797,533	.....	549	Free.	Free.	Free.	Free.
Noils	Lb.	513,364	256,211	.....	549	Free.	Free.	Free.	Free.
Worsted tops	Lb.	7,668,954	5,283,913	.....	549	Free.	Free.	Free.	Free.
Garnetted wool waste in the white for Canadian manufacture	Lb.	96,164	45,150	.....	550c	Free.	Free.	Free.	Free.
*Yarns over 30c. per lb, for the mfr. of woollen goods	Lb.	776,854	771,166	98,615 40	*558	12½%	17½%	17½–10%	20 %
*Yarns, mohair and alpaca	Lb.	143,564	162,136	.....	*560	Free.	Free.	Free.	Free.
*Yarns, woollen, n.o.p	Lb.	46,949	64,367	11,870 70	*557	20%	27½%	27½–10%	30 %
Yarns of wool, etc., not containing silk or artificial silk, n.o.p.	Lb.	121,480	178,243	32,450 55	551	20%	22½%	22½–10%	25 %
Yarns and warps wholly of wool, imported etc., for mfr., n.o.p.	Lb.	1,065,517	834,538	105,129 26	551a	12½%	17½%	17½–10%	20 %
Yarns and warps wholly of wool, etc., imported for weaving, worsted or woollen fabrics (not carpets or floor rugs)	Lb.	1,349,620	1,625,179	4,592 83	551b	Free.	10 %	10 –10%	12½%
Yarns of merino wool not more advanced than singles, dry spun, etc., imported for the mfr. of knitted goods	Lb.	1,224,483	1,638,935	166,306 91	551c	10 %	17½%	17½–10%	20 %
Woven fabrics not over 6 oz. to the sq. yd. imported in the grey for dyeing	Sq. yd.	3,823,407	1,539,020	197,473 26	*563	15 %	22½%	22½–15%	25 %
					554	10 %	17½%	17½–15%	25 %
Woven fabrics, etc., known as lustres, or Italian linings	Yd.	871,055	499,976	57,027 82	*566	20 %	30 %	30 –10%	35 %
					554a	10 %	20 %	20 –10%	25 %
Woven or knitted fabrics, etc., not exceeding 5 ounces to the sq. yd., n.o.p	Yd.	1,105,801	595,264	123,711 16	*566	20 %	30 %	30 –10%	35 %
					554b	22½%	30 %	30 –10%	35 %
Woven or knitted fabrics, etc. n.o.p	Yd.	18,447,974	21,263,908	5,575,393 40	554c	27½%	35 %	35 –15%	35 %
Woven or braided fabrics, not exceeding 12 inches wide, with cut pile or not	$	.....	26,725	7,400 68	554d	27½%	35 %	35 –15%	35 %
								Or 25%	
Woven fabrics with cut pile, etc., n.o.p	Yd.	457,618	885,580	196,058 47	554e	22½%	32½%	32½–10%	35 %
								or 20%	
Carpets	$	.....	3,339,230	995,327 81	572	25 %	30 %	30 –10%	35 %
Clothing	$	.....	2,528,519	696,054 69	555	27½%	35 %	35 –15%	35 %
*Socks and stockings, wool	Doz. pr.	87,478	376,130	89,196 11	*568a	25 %	32½%	32½–10%	35 %
Socks and stockings, wool, valued at more than $1.50 per lb	Doz. pr.	341,40[illegible]	1,537,032	383,731 91	556	27½%	32½%	32½–10%	35 %
Socks and stockings, wool, valued from 90c. to $1.50 lb	Doz. pr.	76,774	252,437	57,634 75	556a	25 %	32½%	32½–10%	35 %
Socks and stockings, wool, n.o.p	Doz. pr.	27,62[illegible]	62,274	11,847 07	556b	20 %	27½%	27½–10%	30 %
*Undershirts and drawers	$	.....	21,751	4,578 08	*568	20 %	30 %	25%	35 %
Underwear, knitted, valued at 90c. per lb. or less	$	.....	4,852	1,296 90	568a	15 %	30 %	25%	35 %
Underwear, knitted, valued at more than 90c	$	.....	426,247	79,101 24	568	20 %	30 %	25%	35 %
*Knitted goods, n.o.p	$	.....	240,142	53,506 97	*568	20 %	30 %	25%	35 %
Household blankets, n.o.p	Pr.	223,059	868,632	193,092 09	553	22½%	30 %	30 –10%	35 %
Felt, pressed, in the web	Lb.	488,739	258,048	58,468 98	552	15 %	22½%	22½–10%	25 %
Wool manufactures, n.o.p	$	.....	1,960,966	551,050 13	555	27½%	35 %	35 –15%	35 %
Coated or impregnated fabrics, wholly or in part wool	$	.....	124,666	37,747 92	555	27½%	35 %	35 –15%	35 %

*Entered in January, February and March, under former tariff items.

GABARUS, N.S., BREAKWATER

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond-Cape Breton West):

1. How much money was expended in 1928 on the breakwater at Gabarus, Cape Breton, Nova Scotia?
2. What portion of this amount was for timber, logs, iron, nails, etc?
3. What portion of this amount covered cost of labour?
4. What disposition was made of material left over?
5. Was the amount expended sufficient to complete the necessary work?
6. Were any additional amounts requested to complete the necessary work?
7. Is the breakwater at Gabarus now in a satisfactory state of repair?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. $803.80.
2. $507.80.
3. $296.
4. 1,050 lineal feet of round logs and some sawn timber was taken to Fourchu and used in beach protection work.
5. Yes.
6. No.
7. Yes.

BOVINE TUBERCULAR TEST IN NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. DUFF:

1. How many cattle, in the province of Nova Scotia, which were subjected to the bovine tubercular test, were declared clear of any infection?
2. How many cattle so declared free of infection were afterwards found, when slaughtered for human food, to be tubercular to a very marked degree?
3. Will the Department of Agriculture or the federal government reimburse purchasers of cattle which were declared by veterinaries free from tubercular and found to be infected when slaughtered, to the full extent of the amount paid by said purchasers?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. During the initial test for tuberculosis of cattle in the Nova Scotia restricted area, 185,896 animals passed a clean test. There was, therefore, no evidence of tuberculosis in these cattle. Some animals may, however, have been too recently infected to react, and occasionally also very badly infected cattle or cattle that have recently been injected with tuberculin may fail to react to the tuberculin test. The percentage of such cases is however very small, and the tuberculin test is recognized by all competent authorities as by far the most efficient means of detecting this disease in cattle.

2. Nine cases have been reported to the Health of Animals branch of cattle, which did not react to the tuberculin test during the test of cattle in the Nova Scotia restricted area, being found to be tuberculous when slaughtered for human food.

3. No. If, however, cattle which fail to react due to causes set forth above in a restricted area are slaughtered under the supervision of a veterinary inspector, and are found to be tuberculous, compensation may be paid at the regular rates.

DAYSPRING, N.S., MUNICIPAL FARM

Mr. DUFF:

1. Were certain cattle at the municipal farm at Dayspring subjected to the bovine tuberculin test?
2. How many cattle of said herd were declared by the veterinary as reactors?
3. What was given as reason by said veterinary for declaring said cattle reactors?
4. Were said cattle slaughtered and where?
5. How many veterinaries were present at said slaughtering and whom did they represent?
6. What were the opinions of said veterinaries?
7. Did any of said veterinaries take away parts of carcasses for laboratorial examination, and, if so, who?
8. What were the results of said examinations?
9. Will full compensation be paid the municipality of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, because of said examination of parts of cattle?
10. If not, why not?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Yes.
2. Three cattle.
3. They reacted to the tuberculin test conducted by him.
4. These reactors were slaughtered on the owner's premises.
5. Two veterinary inspectors, representing the Health of Animals branch, were present when these reactors were slaughtered.
6. Answered by No. 10.
7. The hyperemic glands and portions of spleen from the reactors were taken by veterinary inspectors J. W. Frank and R. B. Catt and forwarded to the Animal Diseases Research Institute, Hull, for examination.

Specimens were handed to Mr. Romkey, the warden of the Poor Farm, for transmission to Dalhousie university for examination.

8. Microscopical examinations of the specimens submitted to the Health of Animals branch laboratory were negative. Small animal inoculations were also made, the results of which are not yet concluded. Microscopical examinations of specimens sent to Dalhousie university were also negative, according to information received.
9. No.
10. The Animal Contagious Diseases Act and regulations established thereunder provide that

cattle that react to the tuberculin test will be considered tuberculous. The compensation awarded for such reactors to the tuberculin test is two-thirds of the value placed on the animals by the veterinary inspector conducting the test. The value that can be placed on animals that react to the tuberculin test is limited by the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CIVIL SERVANTS UNDER $100 PER MONTH

Mr. SPENCER:

1. How many permanent civil servants of the male sex employed in full time occupations, are in receipt of a salary of less than $100 per month?
2. How many of these are with dependents?
3. How many of these are without dependents?
4. How many temporary civil servants of the male sex, employed in full time occupations, are in receipt of a salary of less than $100 per month?
5. How many of these are with dependents?
6. How many of these are without dependents?
7. What would be the cost to the country if the salaries of these civil servants enumerated in questions one and four, above, were increased to the sum of $100 per month?

RURAL MAIL ROUTES

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac-Addington):

1. When and where was the first rural mail route established in Canada?
2. How many rural mail routes have been established in each of the provinces in each year since the inauguration of the system?
3. How many post offices have been closed in each province in each year in consequence of the establishing of rural mail delivery?
4. How many new post offices have been established in each province during each year from 1911 to the end of 1928, and how many (a) postmasters; (b) other officials have been appointed to carry on such extra service?

PUBLIC PRINTING AND STATIONERY

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. How many departments of the government carry on the function of printing, exclusive of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery?
2. What are the names and salaries of the officials of the staff referred to in question number one?
3. What is the approximate original cost of the installation of machinery and equipment used in each department for purposes referred to in question one?
4. What are the amounts paid to outside printing offices not under government service during the year 1926-27 and 1927-28?
5. What are the names of the firms referred to in question number four?

[Mr. Motherwell.]

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. LUCHKOVICH:

1. What was the cost to the treasury of the Department of Justice for the fiscal years 1926-27 and 1927-28?
2. What are the names and respective salaries in each department of: (a) departmental solicitors; (b) departmental assistant solicitors; (c) stenographers and other clerical assistance, for the fiscal years 1926-27 and 1927-28, for the solicitors mentioned in A and B?
3. What are the names and amounts of salaries, fees or payments, made for legal advice or other legal service rendered by members of the legal profession, other than the items included in one and two above, for the fiscal years 1926-27 and 1927-28?

THE I'M ALONE INCIDENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Has the Prime Minister any statement to give to the house with respect to the I'm Alone incident which has been attracting so much attention in the press?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The incident to which my hon. friend refers has been the subject of correspondence between the government of the United States and our government during the past week and is being made a matter of formal representation on the part of our government to the United States government at the present time. I have no further statement to make at the moment.

Mr. BENNETT: Will the correspondence be brought down at an early date?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In due course.

PENSION PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston City): Will the government lay on the table a copy of order in council P.C. 8481 dated January 16, 1928?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): What is it about?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is in regard to the payment of pensions to soldiers already pensioned.

MEDICAL RELIEF FOR INDIANS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): The hon. member for North Timiskaming (Mr. Bradette) directed a question to the government with respect to medical relief for Indians in northern Ontario, and on my behalf he was promised an answer.

The matter was brought to our attention some time ago and we have been in communication with the doctor who visited the band in question. I will content myself by reading to the house his telegram. In reply to our inquiry he wires from Cochrane, after visiting the band:

Newspaper reports of condition greatly exaggerated. Saw few children at post. Only one child very ill. Father decided to keep child home and have advised treatment and given medicine. Conditions are not urgent and as rivers are not open there are very few Indians at post.

VISIT TO WASHINGTON OF MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William): I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm). American press despatches published in the Canadian journals state that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has been visiting Washington and calling on the President and other officials down there. Has the minister a statement to make to the house and to the people of Canada regarding the possibilities of trade agreement negotiations or negotiations of any other nature undertaken during his stay in the American capital.

Hon. JAMES MALCOLM (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I can assure my hon. friend that I enjoyed the pleasure of a stay of two days in Washington, making personal visits and extending the usual courtesies. I called on the president out of courtesy but not for any official purpose.

BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): Now that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) is back with us, I would ask him the question which I put to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) some weeks ago, and that is as to the delay in the appointment of a warden and deputy warden for the British Columbia penitentiary. These offices have been vacant now for almost a year and the matter is beginning to create comment, particularly in view of the fact that the present incumbent, the acting warden, is residing in an hotel in Vancouver and not at the penitentiary.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): The Civil Service Commission has been asked to fill the position.

Mr. McQUARRIE: When were they asked?

Mr. LAPOINTE: A few weeks ago. However, I will refresh my memory and let my hon. friend know.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The house resumed from Friday, March 22, consideration of the motion of Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of ways and means, the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. Hugh Guthrie, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of Mr. Spencer.

Mr. I. D. COTNAM (North Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, I should not care to enter this debate this afternoon but for one particular reason. I feel I owe it as a duty to the constituency which I have the honour to represent in this parliament to lay before this house what I believe to be the views of the people who reside in that constituency. In the first days of March we had delivered to us the usual budget speech by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb). That speech contained nothing remarkable; as a matter of fact, I think it contained less than any other budget speech which the minister has delivered in this house since I have had the honour of being a representative in parliament.

Last year in speaking on the budget I stated that it was milkless, meatless, breadless and butterless; the Prime Minister, in speaking on a certain amendement in this house, stated it was a milk and water concoction, but I should say this is even worse, because there is no milk in it. On March 7 the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), then acting leader of the opposition, delivered a speech in reply to the budget, and I think everyone will agree that he made a most remarkable address which as yet has not been answered by any minister of the crown or any member of this house sitting opposite. Several cabinet ministers have attempted to reply, but I would say that so far they have not answered the speech made that day by the hon. member.

The Minister of Finance tells us that this year he intends to take out of the pockets of the taxpayers of Canada the enormous total of $454,942,000, and he tells us that this is $25,000,000 more than he extracted last year. Apparently he makes that statement with a great deal of satisfaction. Then he tells us

that the customs revenues of Canada for the last fiscal year will amount to $185,000,000, an increase of $28,000,000 over the customs revenues collected during the previous year. That statement comes with very poor grace from a party which, when in opposition, year after year and over the length and breadth of Canada shouted that the tariff of this country was a tax imposed upon the people and that they, if returned to power, would reduce the customs tariff and not collect such an enormous tax from the Canadian people. Then the minister goes on to say that our ordinary expenditures this year are estimated at $355,200,000; capital expenditures are estimated at $24,150,000, so therefore the total expenditures for the coming year will be approximately $385,160,000, or an increase of $22,332,000 over the previous year. Yet in the face of that statement the Minister of Finance and the members of the government try to convince the country that they are actually diminishing the taxation imposed upon the Canadian people. By what process of political alchemy can this government tell us in one breath that they are collecting from the people of Canada $25,000,000 more than they collected in the previous year, and in the next breath tell us they are going to spend almost $23,000,000 more than was spent last year, at the same time claiming that they are reducing taxation? I think that matter was very well dealt with by the hon. member for South Wellington when he showed that while the government are reducing taxes which they imposed because of their extravagances during their entire regime, the total taxation collected from the people of Canada is higher than ever before.

Under the Conservative administration, for the five years from 1918 to 1923, the amount of taxes collected was as follows:

1918..	$260,778,953
1919..	312,946,747
1920..	349,746,335
1921..	436,292,185
1922..	382,271,571

The amount of taxes collected under the Liberal administration for a similar period was as follows:

1925..	$346,834,479
1926..	380,745,506
1927..	398,695,776
1928.. .. .. ..(about)	422,000,000
1929..	454,942,000

So, according to these figures, in the five-year period the Liberal administration collected from the taxpayers of Canada $255,000,000 more than was collected by their predecessors during a similar period of years, notwithstanding the fact that the war was over and they were not confronted with the war expenditures which had to be made by the previous administration. It must be remembered that these taxes, which have been removed to a certain extent by the present administration, were imposed by this government because of their own extravagances, and now that they are reducing the taxes little by little they tell the people they are reducing taxation. The fact remains that the Liberal administration have collected in taxes more than was collected by the Conservative administration, and in spite of that fact the net debt of Canada has been reduced by only $90,000,000.

Mr. RALSTON: Where does my hon. friend get the five years of Conservative administration which he has used for comparison?

Mr. COTNAM: I gave the years; 1918 to 1923.

Mr. RALSTON: And my hon. friend calls that Conservative administration?

Mr. COTNAM: Yes. Yet in the face of these figures the Minister of Finance and the government tell us that they are economizing. We would like them to tell us just exactly where that economizing has been done. The Auditor General's report does not show that economy; the estimates do not show it, and I do not think there is a member of the government who can stand up in his place to-day and give the house one single instance where the government have practised the economy they have preached. It is all very well for the Minister of Finance to tell the people to work and be thrifty, so long as his government can collect from them the taxes with which to carry on the extravagances they are practising to-day. The Minister of Finance says:

> . . . . the administration will refuse to support any extravagance in the spending of the taxpayers' money. To this policy we again solicit the support of hon. members in order that at the end of another year it may again be found that, continuing to live within the public income . . . .

On January 18, 1926, the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) moved the address in reply to the speech from the throne, and in the course of his remarks said:

> May I call attention to the fact, that, the total disbursements for the year prior to the present government coming into power amounted to $418,620,000, and for the year just passed amounted to $339,902,725. I am sure the reduction in the actual cost of carrying on the affairs of this country is a matter of great satisfaction to hon. gentlemen in every quarter of this house. That means a reduction practically from $51 to $37 per head of the population of Canada.

Since the hon. gentleman spoke on that occasion he has become a member of this government; and hon. members rejoice that the expenses of the government have risen from $339,000,000 to $391,000,000 per annum. This expenditure has been saddled upon the tax payers. This additional impost is equal to $5.36 per head, which means an extra contribution of $26 or $27 to be made by the average family living in this country. This expenditure has to be made to meet the extravagance of the government which is in power to-day.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) says that he has reduced taxation. He has reduced the tax on telegrams and transportation; the people who are wealthy enough to occupy compartment or sleeping berths have been given a 10 per cent reduction. But how about the sales tax? This tax affects the great mass of the people of Canada, and it is a burden upon the working people. This government upon coming into office, raised the tax from 3 per cent to 6 per cent. The sales tax could have been removed long ago had the government practised the economy which they are talking about at the present time. Twenty million dollars is remitted by the reduction of 1 per cent in the sales tax, but had the government practised economy that tax would have disappeared at least two years ago when an amendment to the budget speech was moved by the then leader of the opposition (Mr. Guthrie). The government was asked to remove the whole tax, but I suppose the Minister of Finance is holding back that 2 per cent and next year he can hurl out the news that there has been a 50 per cent reduction in the sales tax. Just before the next general election he will be able to tell what he is doing for the poor people in the way of remitting taxes.

The government still manage to retain the excise tax on matches. This article is of prime necessity in every household throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion, but the government still retain that tax which more than any other affects the poor. When the government were in opposition they were always preaching that they were the friends of the poor; in office they have become the friends of the rich and wealthy plutocrats and the big organizations to the detriment of the poor people of this country. They talk about the prosperity of Canada, and we are all delighted with the degree of prosperity there is at the present time. It has been rather interesting to sit on this side of the house and listen to some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, especially to some members of the government—to listen to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) bringing forth the specious argument that the people of Canada are prosperous to-day. One of the arguments used by the minister is the stock argument which has been advanced by every member sitting on the Liberal side of the house. They all go to the bank reports, the reports of the big moneyed interests, the big trusts, the big mergers and the big combines and endeavour to show from the annual statements of those corporations that the people of Canada are wealthy to-day. Unfortunately that picture of general prosperity is not a true picture of what is actually taking place. Every one knows that the farmers are not as prosperous as they should be at the present time, and everyone knows that the wage earners have not been enjoying that general prosperity which is supposed to be abroad throughout the Dominion. So far as the farmers and the wage earners are concerned, that general prosperity is always just around the corner and a little bit away from them. It is a difficult thing for the average individual to understand why the government does not go to the working man and find out whether or not he is prosperous; why they do not go to the farmer and cite his case to show that the farmers are actually prosperous. The former leader of the Liberal party did not pursue the same method in trying to show whether or not the people were prosperous. The late Sir Wilfrid Laurier said that if the people were prosperous it was not necessary to cite statistics; that when the man in the street, the average working man, put his hand in his pocket and when the average housewife went to her pantry or larder they knew by what they found there whether or not they were prosperous.

Under this administration the farmer has never had a square deal. When our American cousins enacted the Fordney tariff, which was aimed against the farmers of this country, this government, in place of giving protection to the Canadian farmer, took that blow lying down. They were absolutely spineless; they never attempted to retaliate in any way or to protect the interests of our farmers. Every one knows that the American duty against Canadian farm products going into the United States is two or three times the Canadian duty against American farm products coming into this country. This government has allowed that situation to exist during its whole tenure of office. That is absolutely unfair to the Canadian farmer and has reacted against his best interests.

Not content with that, this government made a treaty with Australia and by order in council allowed that treaty to be effective

as far as New Zealand was concerned. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) stampeded the country in 1921 when he accused the Conservative party of governing by order in council, but I venture to say that this government has passed more orders in council, than any other government we have ever had. Before that treaty came into force this country was importing butter to the extent of only 197,000 pounds per annum, and we had an exportable surplus of 24,000,000 pounds. But since that treaty came into force millions of pounds of butter have been coming in to compete with Canadian butter, although the Canadian farmer has to produce his butter during the winter months under the most adverse conditions. He has to house his stock and feed them during that time of the year; yet the New Zealand farmer, without having to construct outbuildings, without being put to the expense which the Canadian farmer has to meet, was practically given right of way and permitted to come in and steal the Canadian butter market from the Canadian farmer. The following table shows the importations of butter from New Zealand since this treaty came into force:

Year	Pounds
1926	3,193,382
1927	8,714,985
1928	16,124,641

It is estimated that during the year 1929 the New Zealand dairying interests will sell in Canada in the neighbourhood of 30,000,000 pounds of butter to the detriment of the Canadian farmer. Is it any wonder that our farmers feel exasperated and humiliated owing to the manner in which the government has acted toward them? Is it any wonder that the Canadian farmer is depressed and feels that it is becoming increasingly difficult for him to carry on his operations?

The Minister of Trade and Commerce, speaking in the house the other day, said that this milk was not now being used in just the same way; that it was being put up in different forms and sold as condensed milk, milk powder and so forth. But he neglected to state that whereas in 1926 there were produced in Canada 13,407,000,000 pounds of milk, in 1927 the production had dropped to about 13,000,000,000 pounds. That is, the actual milk production had decreased by almost 500,000,000 pounds in that year. He also forget to mention that at the same time the dairy herds in the Dominion had decreased by 101,000; that the number of swine—and the swine industry is the complement of the dairy industry—had decreased by almost 200,000, while the dairy herds in New Zealand had increased by 50,000 and their swine herds by probably 30,000 or 40,000, showing that the business which should legitimately have come to the mixed farming industry in Canada was being transferred, owing to the policy of the government, to the farmers of New Zealand, and they were obtaining the profits. I often wonder whether the government is working in behalf of the best interests of our own farmers and working people or for the farmers who dwell in lands other than our own.

Prior to entering into the New Zealand arrangement we were exporting pork, bacon, hides, lard, cheese, butter, milk and so forth, to the value of $88,000,000 per annum, and this money was coming into the pockets of the Canadian farmers. Last year our total exports of those products amounted to only $47,000,000. In other words, since the New Zealand arrangement came into force the farmers of this country lost $40,000,000 in connection with by-products of the dairy industry.

Everyone knows what has happened to the woollen industry of this country. According to all the information that is available we should have one of the greatest sheep industries of the world. It is estimated that we should be able in western Canada to support flocks of sheep amounting to about 25,000,000, but at the present time in the three western provinces there are only a couple of hundred thousand sheep. In eastern Canada the situation is somewhat similar; many farmers are supporting only one per cent of the number of sheep which they should have. This is due to the fact that owing to the tariff policy of the government the Canadian farmers have become so disgusted that they are no longer trying to maintain their sheep industry as they did in years gone by. Everyone knows that after the government tampered with the tariff, woollen industry after woollen industry was closed down. I have under my hand a list of the woollen industries that were closed down almost directly after the government tampered with the tariff on woollen goods. The list is as follows:

Name of Mill	Date closed
Canadian Western Wollen Mills, Vancouver	1926
Renfrew Woollen Mills, Renfrew	1927
Gulf Textiles Limited, Isle Verte, Quebec	1924
Amherst Woollen Mills, Amherst, N.S.	1923
Ernestown Woollen Mills, Odessa, Ontario	1927
Hawthorne Mills, Limited, Carleton Place, Ontario	1927
Pembroke Woollen Company, Pembroke, Ontario	1925

Let me say that the Pembroke Woollen Mills were operated and controlled by a former supporter of this administration and that owing to the policy of the government, that mill is in process of being dismantled at the present time.

Name of Mill	Dated closed
Harris and Company, Rockwood, Ontario	1925
Boyd, Caldwell and Company, Appleton, Ontario	1925
Boyd, Caldwell and Company, Lanark, Ontario	1925
Randle Brothers, Meaford, Ontario.	1924

There is a list of about fifty of them, but I am not going to read any more. Is it any wonder, in view of these facts, that the farmers of this country have become disgusted with the sheep raising industry which should be one of their great assets?

What has the government done in this budget or, for that matter, since it came into power, for the wage earners of the Dominion? Last year our imports from and exports to the United States were as follows:

Imports	$825,000,000
Exports	492,500,000

Most of our exports to the United States were raw products, products of the mines, forests and so forth, whereas in the neighbourhood of $400,000,000 worth, or practically one-half of our imports from the United States were made up of articles manufactured in that country from raw products which they had imported from the Dominion of Canada. Furthermore, most of those manufactured articles were such that, under a government which had at heart the true interests of the Canadian workmen and Canadian people generally, they would have been manufactured in this Dominion, in this way increasing the wages for our workingmen and at the same time helping our farmers by creating markets for them.

Let me refer now to the agricultural implement industry. Agriculture, as everyone admits, is really the basic industry of the Dominion. The present government tinkered with the tariff on agricultural implements, promising the farmers that they were going to decrease the price. As a matter of fact, as has been conclusively shown, the cost of agricultural implements in this country is just a little higher to-day than it was before the government tinkered with the tariff. What has happened in the meantime? Our importations of agricultural implements are as follows:

Date	Amount
1925	$ 6,494,986
1926	13,000,000
1927	18,000,000
1928	29,000,000
1929 (estimated)	40,000,000

Had a proper tariff policy been adopted, every one of these agricultural implements should have been manufactured in Canada providing additional work for the Canadian workingman, instead of which many of our workmen have been obliged to sell their homes, leave the Dominion and go to the United States to get the jobs denied them at home because the government has failed to act in their best interests.

The situation is similar in regard to the woollen industry. We are importing to-day $24,000,000 worth of woollen goods while our Canadian mills are operating at only one-half of their capacity and are providing only 30 per cent of the requirements of this country. The government are allowing $24,000,000 worth of woollen goods to come into Canada to the detriment of the Canadian workingman and the sheep industry. This government by a slight change in the tariff could provide that probably one-half of the total amount of woollen goods at present imported would be manufactured in this country, giving work for our workingmen and increased markets for our farmers.

The present administration during this session refused any additional grant towards the construction of a transcontinental highway, and in support of their refusal they brought forward some rather peculiar arguments. Some members went so far as to say that such a highway would cost $200,000,000. I do not know where they got that estimate; I do not know if there ever has been an estimate given of the actual cost of construction of a trans-Canada highway. The fact remains, however, that there is no single piece of work that might be undertaken in Canada to-day that would redound more to the best interests of all the people of this Dominion than the construction of a motor highway across Canada. It would bring the people of eastern and western Canada closer together, and that is what we need in this Dominion. It would bring our young men and our young women in eastern Canada into contact with their fellow-citizens in western Canada, and by making the people of the east familiar with that western land would perhaps tend to prevent the exodus of our young people to the United States. Everyone knows that highway construction throughout the history of the world has always preceded the material advancement of any country.

I think it was the Prime Minister who in an earlier debate this session, when he was trying to show that the New Zealand treaty had not reacted against the farmers of this country, made the statement that the American tourists coming into Canada were drinking so much milk that we were not able to

make as much butter as before. If that is the case, the construction of a national highway across this country might offset to some extent the bad effects of the New Zealand treaty because, according to the Prime Minister's argument, the more tourists that come to this country the more milk will be consumed, although personally I have never been given to understand that the tourists come to this country to drink milk.

The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Dunning) was very much afraid that the construction of a transcontinental highway might interfere with the success of the Canadian National railways. I have a statement here by Sir Henry Thornton, the president of the road, who, speaking at a meeting of the Good Roads Association in Toronto a short time ago, said that he wished that next year we would have two millions of automobiles in Canada instead of one million, because it would be conducive to increasing railway business in this country. He went on to explain that the automobile was the complement of the railway. So the argument of the Minister of Railways does not hold good.

It is not so very long ago that this government, which to-day is afraid to spend money for the construction of a transcontinental highway for the linking up of the peoples of the Dominion, that we might get to know the country in which we live a little better, was prepared, as they announced in the speech from the throne in 1925, to enter into the so-called Petersen contract. I wonder if the members of the government remember that Petersen contract. They were prepared to launch on that expenditure for the purpose of breaking what they said was a shipping combine in the north Atlantic which was breaking the backs of the producers in this country by causing high ocean freight rates, and in that way increasing the cost of living. But the Conservative party in this house exposed the fallacy of that whole argument, and the result was that the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the government of that day has since had the honour of being left at home in his constituency to cogitate on the fickleness of Dame Fortune.

This government is not prepared to do anything for technical education in this country. It is prepared to spend millions and millions of dollars where the expenditure is not called for, but when it comes to expending anything on technical education for the benefit of those who are the least favoured in this country, the government is not prepared to spend the taxpayer's money.

I wonder if this government, which is always talking economy, ever stops to consider the cost of the personnel of the cabinet itself. I think the greatest extravagance in this country at the present time is its own government. The seventeen members of the government are the biggest extravagance which we have in this country at this time. There was a time not so very long ago when this government did not have so many supporters in this house as it has now, and they brought down a speech from the throne in which they said that in order to cut down expenditures they were going to reduce the number of departments, but now, instead of reducing the number of departments, they are going to give us more and more departments, with extra cabinet ministers, and extra cabinet pay. It takes seventeen cabinet ministers to govern this country now, and in a short time we shall have eighteen, for a people of 9,500,000, while the United States, with 120,000,000 people, can be governed through seven cabinet ministers.

Then we have our embassy at Washington. Last year we bought a palatial residence for the Hon. Vincent Massey in Washington at a cost to the taxpayers of this country of $500,000. Whether we need an embassy down there or not is another question, but I would like to make a few observations on what it is costing us to keep the Hon. Vincent Massey down in Washington. According to the Auditor General's report this year, under the heading of Salaries and Wages, the Hon. Vincent Massey gets this title:

Envoy extraordinary—

I do not know whether there is anything extraordinary about the Hon. Vincent Massey. I never saw it anyway:

—and minister plenipotentiary, Hon. Vincent Massey, $12,000, house representation allowance, 2 months at $18,000, 10 months at $10,000, allowance for automobile, $2,000.

Then there is a list of first secretaries, commercial secretaries, chauffeurs, and so forth, with salaries ranging all the way from five to six thousand dollars apiece, and then at the bottom of the account we see this item:

Newspapers and publications, $893.22; postage, $319; rent of offices, $900; rent of rooms at The Mayflower for Hon. V. Massey—

I suppose the Hon. Vincent Massey thought he had come over in the Mayflower and was one of the original four hundred:

—April 1 to June 1, $2,541.69.

That money comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers in this Dominion. That is what we are paying for keeping the Hon. Vincent Massey in Washington, and what we would like to know is what we are getting anyway through having Mr. Massey down there.

The government could not spend any money for building a transcontinental highway; they could not spend any money on technical education to help the sons of the poor man, but when it comes to beautifying the city of Ottawa, they can pull down buildings at a cost of over $3,000,000 in order that you can get a bird's eye view of a little corner of the parliament buildings from the eastern end of the grounds.

Then we have our magnificent tariff board, costing this country $200,000 a year. If the Prime Minister would give the boys a bag of marbles and tell them to go out and play with them and have a good time, they would accomplish just about as much of useful work as this tariff board has done.

Then we have Mr. Newton Wesley Rowell, another extravagance of this government. He travelled across this country with the Customs Inquiry Commission, and he received in fees in a short time, less than a year, $44,060. That looks a good sum to the farmers and workingmen, many of whom are not drawing down more than $2 or $2.25 per day. I notice that the Labour department of this government tells us that the average living wage at the present time should be in the neighbourhood of $85 per month. I want to tell the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) and the government that there are hundreds of thousands of people in Canada who are subsisting on less than $60 a month. I could take the Minister of Labour and the Prime Minister into homes and show them workingmen who are keeping their families and trying to pay their way, and are getting only $2 a day.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have followed this debate with a good deal of care and have read a number of speeches delivered during its course that it was not my privilege to hear. I have also read over several times the budget speech and the budget proposals of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb), but I am not satisfied that he has proposed any substantial remedy for dealing with the problems confronting Canada to-day. Notwithstanding the fact that we have a somewhat relative prosperity, we have still a good many problems to deal with. On the tariff we have very largely a stand-pat policy, the same policy that we have had ever since the introduction of the National Policy.

It seems to me the government decided that because there was likely to be a good surplus this year it would get them by regardless of what criticism might be levelled at them. The budget surplus announced by the Minister of Finance is largely the result of world conditions, as well as the good crop or two that we have had in western Canada, and of course some other factors; it is not particularly the result of any government policy as far as I can see. In the course of his budget speech the minister, after reviewing certain conditions, is reported at page 594 of Hansard as follows:

> These, we believe, are factors which, coupled with good crops, have materially assisted in the expansion of our basic industries.

I think we ought to lay special emphasis on that word "coupled" in relation to his budget proposals. His "coupled with good crops" argument reminds me of the story of the Irishman who entered a tailor's shop with a button and asked to have a pair of pants sewed on to it. I believe that, looking at the budget surplus, the government are fortifying themselves against any criticism by repeating to themselves that passage of Scripture, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." But, after all, if there is to be any change of tariff policy it should be made in times of surpluses. The other day the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) pointed out that the time to make cuts in the tariff, if they were to be made at all in line with the proclaimed policy of the Liberal party, must be when we had surpluses. I think we had a somewhat similar thought expressed by the Prime Minister in days gone by. I remember when he was in Edmonton in 1924, after reviewing the difficulties he had had as Prime Minister, due to the fact that he was practically leading a minority party in the house, he is reported as stating—and I am quoting this from the Edmonton Bulletin of October 11, 1924:

> When asked to form a cabinet he was very diffident concerning the task, as it meant he would have to carry on, not as a government strongly supported, but really as a minority government depending on the support of one of the other parties in the house. Mr. King expressed his appreciation of the loyalty and support accorded to him by the Progressive members of the House of Commons.

That was one difficulty. The other stressed was the difficulty of Dominion finance, due to the fact that the Conservative government which preceded him had been very extravagant and had added tremendously to the national debt. Then we have this passage in the Edmonton Bulletin's report:

> When criticizing the present Liberal government, Mr. King asked his audience to bear in mind the difficulties that had to be faced, and he pointed out that if a Liberal government

had been in power it would have been an easy matter for his administration to have lived up to the promises that were made when he appealed to the country in the last general election.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a budget surplus is not a guarantee of real democratic prosperity throughout the country. We have been told by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) that the car loadings and so on of the railways are an indication of prosperous conditions throughout the country. With regard to budget surpluses, I would point out that for a number of years after the war, when the French government had tremendous difficulty in balancing its budget, it was generally stated that France was not suffering from unemployment to anything like the same extent that Great Britain, Canada and the United States were suffering. This advantage enjoyed by France was attributable, I believe, to the fact that she had not deflated her currency. As to railway carloadings being a criterion of the people's prosperity, I would point out that sixty pounds of wheat moving from any point in western Canada to Fort William or Port Arthur or Vancouver brings the Canadian National or the Canadian Pacific the same revenue regardless of whether it is No. 1 northern or No. 6 northern, or even if it is feed. I know cases where farmers are up against a freight rate of 16 cents a bushel on their grain moving to Fort William or Port Arthur or Vancouver. Their initial pool payment was 11 cents a bushel, yet the threshing bill alone was 13 cents a bushel. I give this illustration to show that buoyant railway earnings cannot be taken as indicating more than 50 per cent of general prosperity throughout the Dominion. I think we shall find this year that the crop in western Canada last year was not all it was reported to be before it was actually harvested. It is possible that it will pay its way, but it will not lead to the development that followed the crop of 1927. I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce also pointed out that the extra carload earnings meant an increase in railway employment; but railway statistics over a period of years do not show that to be the case.

It has been stated generally that when we have a tremendous increase in wheat production we are bound to have an increase in the prosperity of the farmers. I have before me the November, 1928, issue of Current History. It contains an article entitled The Farm Problem Made Clear, and what I am about to quote from this article in my judgment bears out some of the reasons for increased acreage and increased volume of wheat and other production in western Canada:

[Mr. Kennedy.]

Low prices frequently force the farmer toward increased production in order to meet inflexibly high prices, as was pointed out by Dr. E. G. Nourse of the Institute of Economics when he said in his paper before the American Farm Economic Association: "With prices per unit low and fixed obligations high, the utmost effort must be expended toward securing a large output." That is why low and unprofitable prices do not always result in decreased acreage.

So while I am willing to admit that we have a certain amount of relative prosperity, at the same time we have problems in abundance so far as the common people and the farmers of Canada are concerned.

For years one of the remedies proposed by the Liberal party has been the cutting down of the tariff. A few years ago the question of rural credits engaged our attention, and we hope that notwithstanding the very long time it has taken to put the Rural Credits Act into operation, it will be made effective in the near future. But I say again that the Liberal party has made definite pledges to this country. In 1919 it made pledges which have never been repudiated and which have never been thoroughly acted upon. Here is a resolution presented to the National Liberal convention in session in Ottawa August 5, 6 and 7, 1919. It was presented, according to the report, by:

Hon. W. E. Knowles (former member for Moose Jaw in the federal parliament, now of the Saskatchewan government).

Mr. Knowles said:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I will not detain you more than a very few minutes. This resolution is a straight, honest-to-God Liberal resolution; in it we join issue with the privileged classes and those who try to raise our revenues by the indirect method, and out of the poor people.

The rest of his speech is hardly fit to be read in the House of Commons, but if anyone wants to read it privately he will find it at page 164 of the report. However, the resolution itself reads:

Whereas, the national safety demands that the serious financial position of the country should be known and appreciated in order that steps may be taken to cope with the same, and

Whereas, on the 31st March last, according to the statement of the Minister of Finance, the net public debt was $1,584,000,000, or, roughly, $220 for every man, woman and child in the Dominion, involving an annual interest charge of about $115,000,000, and thus imposing an annual burden for interest on debt alone of $15 per head of the population, and

Whereas, the estimated expenditure of the Dominion government for the present fiscal year is over $800,000,000, or, roughly, $100 per head of the population, and

Whereas, the estimated revenue is only $280,000,000, thus creating an estimated deficit of

over $500,000,000—a sum equivalent to $62.50 per head of the population—which sum the finance minister proposes to obtain by borrowing, and

Whereas, national disaster will overtake this country should the present method of financing the country's affairs be continued, and

Whereas, both Great Britain and the United States at present raise more than 80 per cent of their revenue by direct taxation while Canada raises not more than 20 per cent,

Be, and it is hereby resolved:

(1) That the serious nature of the country's financial situation calls for the profoundest consideration of all patriotic citizens, and the exercise of the severest economy by the government;

(2) That increase of revenue must be sought from an equitable and effective imposition and collection of graduated taxes, on business profits and income applicable to all incomes above reasonable exemptions;

And yet, in the face of that declaration, in the last two years we have cut about 20 per cent of personal incomes, about 11 per cent of corporation incomes, and we have reduced the tariff less than 1 per cent in all the years the Liberals have been in power since 1921. I submit that there is one of two things the Liberal party can do: They can repudiate this resolution or implement it, and I think they ought to do either one or the other.

Now last year I made in this house a statement which has been misrepresented and I wish to refer to it again. I wish to refer to an article which appeared in the Montreal Gazette in reference to that statement, and I shall also deal with the reference made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in his budget speech last year to the statement in question. Let me say, when reference is made to this question of a deal, that I used that word deal, and I use it again. I wish to be clear on that point, because the suggestion has been made by some that it should not be used. The statement I made, which will be found at page 955 of Hansard of March 2, 1928, reads:

The parties on that side of the house are trading too much on the fact that we cannot get together with the Conservatives. Let me tell them that, if this sort of thing continues, they will find they are suffering from a delusion. It is not a very big step for the people of the west, and particularly the people of Alberta, to say that if we cannot get tariff reductions in a general way—and it looks as if that were the case—the only thing for us to do is to go and make the very best possible deal with the protectionists and see what they can do for us.

That sentence is clear, as clear as it can be—it referred to the people of the west as saying "make the very best possible deal." And what use has been made of the statement? Here in what the Montreal Gazette says. But before reading this article I may observe that I used an illustration of farmers in the west who are interested in dairying and who simply threw aside, for the time being, any desire they had for free trade in an effort to get protection for their own industry. And that was what was in my mind when I made that statement—that the action of the Liberal government was driving certain farmers to take that attitude of making a deal with the protectionists in order to get, if not equality with other protectionists, the most they could out of it. There is nothing clearer. The Montreal Gazette, on March 5, 1928, says:

Mr. Kennedy's Warning

Mr. D. M. Kennedy, who sits in the House of Commons for Peace River and represents the United Farmers of Alberta, has made a contribution to the budget debate which may or may not be regarded as elevating the tone of that discussion. He is reported to have expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which the government is fulfilling its pledges to the people. It is not very difficult, of course, to find instances of failure in this regard, since the government and its followers, in appealing for the people's votes, exemplified an attitude of all things to all men, and proclaimed a variety of policies on tariff matters according to the understood requirements and sentiments of different sections of the community. No government could carry out all these policies, and it was inevitable that some of the campaign chickens should come home, sooner, or later, to roost in conspicuous places. The government itself has made an ingenious effort to defer the embarrassments attendant upon the homecoming of its political poultry, but Mr. Kennedy, for one, is dissatisfied with the result; wherefore he warns the Prime Minister and his associates that disciplinary measures may be taken.

Mr. Kennedy's protest possesses a certain special interest. He sat for Peace River in the last brief parliament, after the seat had been taken from the Conservative candidate by fraud. Mr. Kennedy had nothing to do with the work of Mr. "Baldy" Robb and the others, nor was it intended that he should be the beneficiary of their activities. But he occupied the seat, and when a petition was presented in behalf of the Conservative candidate, Mr. Collins, the government resisted its acceptance and it was not accepted. Mr. Kennedy stayed, justifying his action on the ground that he had, somewhere or other, lost more votes than had been taken from Mr. Collins. The importance of this episode was revealed in one of the hectic divisions of the session when the government was saved by one vote, including Mr. Kennedy's.

There never was such a division in that session, and I wrote to the editor of the Gazette asking him to inform me to what division he referred. I have not yet received any reply. But notwithstanding the fact of that lie, the Prime Minister uses this article, which is a libel on the Liberal party as well as a misrepresentation of my own attitude, in order to take a slap at me in the budget debate of last year. I will read his statement later. However, the only instance I know of

where there was a really hectic division and where one vote changed the parties in the house, was the division in which I voted against the government and put them out. That was the one division, and I say that the article in the Gazette—whether I was right or wrong in voting as I did does not matter in the meantime—is a lie or misrepresentation. The article goes on:

In these circumstances may be found some reason why the member for Peace River—Mr. Kennedy was reelected at the next election—

Which is another misrepresentation, because I was opposed by both Liberals and Conservatives in that election.

—should speak to the government in plain terms, if he so desires, and he so desired on Friday last. He complained that he and his friends were suffering the disadvantages of both free trade and protection,—

I still claim that.

—while the manufacturers were receiving the benefits of both. He denied that the purpose of the U.F.A. is to bludgeon the government, though an attempt has been made to keep the Liberal party true to its pledges. Indicating the Liberals and Progressives, Mr. Kennedy is reported to have said as follows:

Then the quotation which I have already read appears in full. The article goes on:

Whether the member for Peace River used the word "deal" or the word "bargain"—reports of his remarks differ in this respect—is not very material, the sense being the same.

I had complained of misrepresentation, and I want the Prime Minister to hear this. The Gazette misrepresented the facts, and the Prime Minister, to make a case against me, last year cut a sentence right in two; and in his remarks, before cutting that sentence in two, he utterly misrepresented my statement. I quote from Hansard of March 13, 1928, at page 1299, where the Prime Minister is reported to have said:

He made a statement in this house the other evening to the effect that the most effective way a class group could act might be to see what bargain it could make with a party whose known principles were wholly opposed to its own.

What were his words? He said . . . . "the only thing for us to do is to go and make the very best possible deal with the protectionists and see what they can do for us."

That is the quotation from the sentence:

It is not a very big step for the people of the west, and particularly the people of Alberta, to say that if we cannot get tariff reductions in a general way—and it looks as if that were the case—the only thing for us to do is to go and make the very best possible deal with the protectionists—

That is a complete misrepresentation of that sentence. What I had in mind, and the illustration I used, was that the dairy farmers of the west, because of their dissatisfaction with the action of the government in connection with the Australian treaty, actually took that course; they stated that they were anxious to wipe out the Australian treaty purely on a protectionist basis. There is no question of that, but the Prime Minister made the statement that I said the only thing for a "class group" to do was to turn right around and make a deal with the protectionists.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is the statement to which my hon. friend is referring a statement made by myself in the House of Commons?

Mr. KENNEDY: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Why did not my hon. friend correct the statement at the time, if it was not right? I was merely quoting what he said.

Mr. KENNEDY: It is all very well to ask why I did not get up and correct a statement of that kind when I did not have the actual words before me. In the one case the sentences were all together and in the other case they were cut in two. As a private member of this house I want to say that I have a right to more courteous treatment than that from the Prime Minister. I do not care how hard the Prime Minister or anyone else on any side of the house attacks me with regard to principles or in argument, but I absolutely refuse to have my sentences carved in two, with a half used here and the other half somewhere else in order to make me say something I did not say at all. That is what was done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It looks as though my hon. friend were seeking to make a martyr of himself. What he has read to the house now simply corroborates what I said at the time I spoke. I took his words as they appeared in Hansard; I repeated them in the house when the hon. member was present and all he says now is that he could not have been expected to have known then what he had previously said.

Mr. KENNEDY: The argument advanced by the Prime Minister is a first class illustration of the type of argument used in a particular case. Two men were arguing about theology; one man told the other that by his way of arguing suicide could be justified by the Bible. To support that argument he quoted two sentences: "Judas hanged himself" and "Go thou and do likewise". I will stand by the sentence on the possibility of co-

operation with the Conservatives any way it may be taken, but not when the first part is taken without the second part or the second part without the first.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am quite prepared to have my hon. friend stand by the whole sentence; that is all.

Mr. KENNEDY: Why did not the Prime Minister quote it all?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I quoted what was essential.

Mr. KENNEDY: No, the Prime Minister quoted the part which misrepresented me; that is my claim. Just while we are on this question we may as well settle it; I said I would stand by that statement.

Is it possible for this group to cooperate with the Conservatives? Last year I placed on Hansard figures which showed that there was a difference of only about one per cent in the tariff policies of the two parties, on an average, and that difference is just about the same to-day. I do not know whether or not the Prime Minister wishes to dispute that statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Really I do not know what my hon. friend is after.

Mr. BENNETT: I would say he is after the Prime Minister.

Mr. KENNEDY: Very well; here is the statement I made last year, which will be found at page 201 of Hansard:

During the last election I was informed that some of my Liberal friends were very much peeved at me because I said that there was scarcely any difference between the Liberal and the Conservative tariff policies. I want to repeat that to-day, and so that there may be no misunderstanding, I should like to put on Hansard a statement covering all the years the Conservatives were in power from 1888 to 1897 and from 1913 to 1922. I have given the Conservatives credit in each case for one year after they went out. In the statement I have given the figures regarding the Liberals from 1898 to 1912 and from 1922 to 1926. In both cases I show the average tariff collections against all dutiable imports and against all imports dutiable and free, and taking the whole period during which both parties were in power respectively I find that there is a difference of just .8 per cent in favour of the Liberals. If you take all the years the Conservatives were in power you will find that the collections on dutiable imports averaged 27.4 per cent while in the case of the Liberals, during the whole time they were in power, the collections averaged 26.6 per cent, or a difference of .8 per cent. Taking the figures covering all imports we find, in the case of the Conservatives, an average of 17.2 per cent and in the case of the Liberals, 16.4 per cent.

78594—80½

Then followed the complete statement. I do not think I will read it, but I have worked out the averages on this basis, which I will give the house. During the years the Conservatives were in power their average as against all dutiable imports was 27.4 per cent, while the average of the Liberals was 26.5 per cent; the Conservative average against all imports was 17.2 per cent and the Liberal average 16.4 per cent, or a difference of about one per cent in the applied policy. This is not the so-called "known" but the "applied" policy. At that time I invited criticism of that statement, because I wanted to hear what the other side said about it, but so far as I could see the only answer was this statement handed in by the Prime Minister in which he gave a table showing the reductions in the customs duties on instruments of production in the basic industries of agriculture, mining, lumbering and fishing. Anyone who will look at the pages of Hansard containing that statement will be struck with the relatively large reductions which were made in 1924 and 1926, but were those strictly Liberal budgets or were they the result of Liberal administration? In 1923, in a by-election at Kent, New Brunswick, the Liberals lost one seat to the Conservatives and faced the House of Commons in 1924 with one less than a majority. During that year large reductions were made in the duties on agricultural implements. Then in 1926 we had about one hundred Liberals of a total membership of the house of 245, that was another year when large reductions were made, and I do not think either of these budgets in reality could be called Liberal budgets.

Then let us consider the statement made by the Prime Minister at Edmonton on October 11, 1924 as follows:

When criticizing the present Liberal government Mr. King asked his audience to bear in mind the difficulties that had to be faced, and he pointed out that if a Liberal government had been in power it would have been an easy matter for his administration to have lived up to the promises that were made when he appealed to the country in the last general election.

The argument advanced was that there was not a sufficient majority to carry out these policies, but the point is that the years during which real advances were made in accordance with that policy as laid down by the Liberal convention of 1919 were the years when the Liberal party were in a minority in this house. What has happened since the government came back with a majority, with the help of our Liberal-Progressive friends, who must accept some responsibility? There has been a distinct move away from direct taxation through the

cuts in the income tax, while there has been practically no cut in the customs tariff even this year. That fact stands out so distinctly that it is impossible to examine the budget, having regard to the conditions existing in the House of Commons, without realizing that with a majority of the members of the house belonging to the Liberal party we cannot get away from the old protectionist policy introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald. When I use that argument some of my Liberal friends say to me, "What about the British preference?" The Conservative party should have the same credit for carrying on the British preference after it was introduced as the Liberal party gets for carrying on the old national policy of the Conservatives.

Can we cooperate with the Conservatives? This question of low tariff and free trade is not an idol to worship, any more than is the question of protection. I am not particularly interested in declared or known policies; I want applied policies. Whatever the Conservative policies have been in the past, I am willing to accept the statements which have been made these last two years. If they mean anything at all there is more real equality in the applied policy as defined by the Conservatives than there is in the policy of lowering the tariff less than 1 per cent on an average, and letting it go at that.

Mr. ROBB: I suppose the hon. member has arrived at that percentage by considering the large importations of alcoholic liquor from the United Kingdom.

Mr. BENNETT: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. KENNEDY: Any average you may take is subject to qualification. It is a wonder we did not have some of it last year, and that is why I made that statement in my speech on the address. No reference however was made to it. In a matter of this kind you have to deal with averages, because you are dealing with the whole policy. We are dealing with averages when we consider the income tax and in connection with the Conservative policy; that is the only basis of comparison which can be made.

The following statement, which appears on page 3785 of Hansard of 1925, and which was amplified last year by the member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) was made by the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen in the form of an amendment:

> That a tariff commission should be appointed representative of the three great classes of Canadian industry, agriculture, manufacturing and labour, and be entrusted with the duty of studying Canadian tariff problems, in their every bearing and of making from time to time such recommendations to the government as it deems in the general public interest with the reasons therefor, and with power also, where it finds unfair advantage is being taken of protective duties, of making recommendations to be given effect by the government for removing or reducing tariff schedules or imposing special excise taxes upon product in respect of which such advantage is taken, and that its reports, findings, recommendations and reasons therefor be given to the public.

As I understand the Liberal policy it is about 1 per cent below that of the Conservative, but the manufacturer can take any advantage he likes of the protection given, whether it be 20 per cent, 25 per cent, or 30 per cent. I do not know whether the Conservatives will carry out their declared policy, but they will have to come across with it if I can make them because I believe it would be a good thing to have one party in this house if it did nothing else but keep the one or the other of the major parties to the promises which they may make during election time. If the Conservative party can apply their policy, even though it is 1, 2, 3 or 4 per cent higher than the present tariff, it will be nearer to equality in tariff matters, so far as all the people of this country are concerned, than the policy which has been in effect for the last seven years.

The member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) made a statement last year, and I assume that he was speaking for his party or otherwise my argument does not amount to anything. This statement appears on page 620 of Hansard of 1928, and in part is as follows:

> 4. The stabilization in Canada of the costs of living and the costs of implements of production on such comparatively low bases as will enable our people, in producing and selling our surplus of national products abroad, to compete advantageously with the products of foreign countries in our common markets abroad.
>
> 5. The reduction of the customs tariff or the imposition of higher excise taxes, whenever and wherever necessary, to prevent the immoral use or abuse of the existing tariff, or any unfair advantage being taken of the tariff, as for example by those who would resort to profiteering by exacting unduly high prices for their products from domestic consumers, under the protecting elements of the existing tariff.

I think it was the present leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) who said in Toronto two years ago that the Conservative policy was not a policy of high or low tariff, but a tariff to develop Canada. I submit that a tariff which is used only to protect the market for the home manufacturer, if you have an organization which will prevent ad-

vantage being taken of the home consumer, comes nearer to equality so far as the consumer is concerned, and nearer to being fair than a tariff which is just 1 per cent under the Conservative tariff for the last forty years, and under which the beneficiary is allowed to take any advantage he desires.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we can cooperate with the Conservatives when that policy is applied, as against the policy we have had during the last seven years. During the last elections I told my constituents that so far as I was concerned I had no intention of worrying about Liberal or Conservative parties, but I intended to deal with matters on their merits, and I have tried to follow that policy for the last seven years.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Was the hon. member aware, when he made that statement, that the Conservatives were blaming this government for not raising the tariff, and they moved an amendment to that effect?

Mr. KENNEDY: Speeches have been made on both sides of the house, and if we were to take the statements made over there regarding reductions and compare them with the statements made over here advocating raising the tariff, they would just about counterbalance. What I am interested in is the actual application of the policies.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely you could not cooperate in asking that the tariff be raised?

Mr. KENNEDY: If you can prevent the fellow who gets the raise in tariff from taking advantage of it, that is a different thing entirely. As I have stated, it would come nearer to equality so far as the people of the country are concerned than anything which has been done by the Liberal party, in spite of all its pledges to protect the consumer.

As the balance of my remarks would bear on the amendment and the main motion, and because I have come to a point—

Mr. LAPOINTE: A crucial point.

Mr. KENNEDY: —where I can close my remarks, I will do so as my time has nearly expired.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to discuss the budget which has been discussed almost to the limit of sufficiency, but I only desire to take up the time allotted to me in drawing attention to a resolution which I placed on the order paper about six weeks ago, but which will not be reached owing to the action of the government in appropriating the private members' days for the rest of the session. My resolution was as follows:

> Whereas the affairs of the Manufacturers Finance Corporation were placed in the hands of a liquidator last year;
>
> And whereas a balance sheet was issued only a very short time before the liquidation, showing a very prosperous and satisfactory condition of the finances of the company;
>
> And whereas the interim liquidator has issued a report showing an apparent deficit of over $3,000,000.
>
> Therefore be it resolved, that, in the opinion of this house, it is desirable that the select standing committee on banking and commerce be instructed to investigate the said matter and to report if any means could be adopted for the better protection of the interests of the public.

I am unable to discuss that as a resolution and I have withdrawn it from the order paper in order that I may be able to discuss it now. Under some technicality of the rules I find that I can introduce a motion during the routine proceedings at the beginning of the daily session that this matter be referred to the select standing committee on banking and commerce. As that motion would not be debatable I am taking advantage of the opportunity to explain it now in the hope that hon. members will remember my remarks and support the resolution without any explanation being offered at the time it is introduced. That is the only way in which I can bring it before the committee on banking and commerce. I do not want merely to talk about it; I want to see some action taken in connection with it.

It is not necessary for me to go into the details of this unsavoury mess. It is sufficient, I should think, to make out only a prima facie case for its submission to the committee, and for them to take such action as they may deem wise. The facts as known to us all, as established by the press, will be sufficient justification. This company was formed for the very laudable and legitimate purpose of discounting commercial paper in connection with chattels such as motor cars, pianos, other musical instruments, and so forth. It was specially mentioned in their propaganda to sell their stock, how thoroughly secure the investors were. They were protected by no less than four or five separate provisions. First of all they had the lien on chattel itself, let us say a motor car or piano; secondly, they had the note of the purchaser who was supposed to have paid a substantial sum on it; then they had the note of the garageman who had sold him the car, and further back than that they had the note of the manufacturer. If that was not sufficient

to guarantee the safety of the investment, there was a still greater protection. The whole risk was afterwards insured, the premium being, I think, about one-half of one per cent, by a very stable, strong English insurance company, whose assets were quoted at great length. So, if it was possible to conceive of an investment that was absolutely safe, surely that was the one.

What happened? In the summer it went bankrupt a year ago. About this time or perhaps a little later, they had an annual meeting and they issued a balance sheet. I am sorry I have not a copy of it before me, but it was quoted in the press at the time. That balance sheet was falsified and must have been deliberately falsified, because it represented the company to be in a prosperous and splendid condition. I think one optimistic shareholder said at the time that its condition compared favourably with that of one of the well known banks. At that very moment the company was bankrupt, not bankrupt in the legal sense, but insolvent, inasmuch as it was unable to pay its debts. The liquidator, a man of some note in the financial world and cautious as all liquidators are, announced a probable deficit of $3,000,000 in a comparatively small company of that character.

As recently as less than a year ago a high pressure salesmanship campaign was put on not only in this city, but even in this house, to sell the stock of this company which was then absolutely insolvent. I myself almost fell a victim to it; at any rate I became an object of their attention, but the saving Providence which watches over children, fools and drunkards prevented me from going the whole length of investing in it. Many other people, however, were bitten. It was astonishing to me, after I put the notice on the order paper, to find how widespread the losses were all over Canada and amongst every class of people, from the rich down to the poorest. I have received a number of letters and telephone calls in connection with the matter. A man whom I do not know stopped me in the street one day and bid me Godspeed in bringing the matter up. I understand he had been stuck for some $4,500. This is a typical example from Montreal evidently written by someone who was more familiar with French than with English:

We, the undersigned, submit humbly to your consideration:

1st. We have placed our economies in the Manufacturers Finance Corporation Limited, on urgent solicitations from their agents here in Montreal. They were assuring us that the company was doing good business and was prosperous.

[Mr. Neill.]

2nd. A few months after we had their shares they failed.

We ask earnestly that the said company be ordered by a court or by the government of Canada to pay back the money we put in their hands. etc.

Unfortunately I had to write and tell him that that was quite impossible; that all we could do was to try to prevent a recurrence of the same thing. I have under my hand a postcard sent me anonymously from Vanconver, and this is a typical illustration of their literature. It is headed in big red headlines: "How Much Do You Save?" and it goes on:

Your future—possibly, too, the welfare and happiness of your loved ones—

Note the pathetic appeal!

—depends on your ability to save and make profitable use of your savings. Resolve, this very day, to save systematically, be it ever so little. You'll be surprised how rapidly your savings accumulate and you will bless the day you resolved to start. We have revised an unusual method—

Thank goodness it was unusual!

—which will help you save systematically and earn six per cent on your savings. Our booklet "The Way to Independence" tells you all about it. It contains such useful information that is well worth reading. We will gladly send you a copy on request. Just fill in your name and address below and mail to us. You will be under no obligation whatever.

Then follows the name of the Manufacturers Finance Corporation Limited, a beautiful little picture of the book called "The Way to Independence," and a place for the name of the prospective sucker and his address. The man who sent me this evidently is somewhat cynical because he has put some interjections into it. This is the way he thinks it ought to read:

Mr. HEAPS: Did he think the hon. member was a prospect?

Mr. NEILL: This was sent out in Vancouver to secure prospects. The man thinks it should read not "How much do you Save?" but "How much did you save for McDonald Brothers?" Then he says that instead of saying "You will bless the day you resolved to start," it should read "You will bless the day you resolved to start putting these men in gaol." He says he thinks the beautiful little pamphlet headed "The Way to Independence" would better be called "How to get Rich Quick and how to Keep out of Gaol." He says that instead of "The Way to Independence" it should be "The Way to Three Million Dollars." In the space reserved for the name of the victim he inserts the name "Messrs. McDonald Brothers" and in the

space for the address he puts "care of Senate, and out on bail somewhere." He also writes on the card:

> Actually sold stock when they, the company, were not solvent.
> Mr. Neill, all power to your bringing this matter up in the house. Stay right with it.

I will not go into it further. It compares on a smaller scale with the Home Bank disaster or more properly, perhaps, with what happened in connection with the Great West Permanent Loan Corporation. Hon. members will readily remember the audacity with which the Alexanders defended their position some years ago in the committee. I think they were later convicted on 160 counts of criminality in connection with the case, and they are now in gaol serving a three-year sentence. In less than three years they will be out with the money they robbed their victims of, but their victims will have to go without their money for the rest of their lives, and perhaps their lives will be in danger from lack of the money which would enable them to regain their health.

The main object in getting this before the committee is to endeavour to have some safeguard suggested for the future. I have not much hope that they can do anything for the victims of this particular piece of rascality. No doubt the criminal and civil courts will be available to do anything they can to collect the money from those from whom it should be obtained. I am looking rather to the future. It is a well known fact that we cannot by act of parliament make men wise any more than by act of parliament we can make them virtuous. I do not have much hope that we can do anything for people who are so credulous as to buy Brooklyn bridge or a street car from a total stranger, although I believe that both these things have happened in the last two years. Nor have I much sympathy with that other class which falls so readily a victim to so-called confidence men, because if you examine into these get-rich-quick schemes you will find that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred they are based on the suggestion of cheating somebody else. As has been well said by Charles Dickens, there is a credulity of the knave as well as of the honest man, and the man who examines with the greatest shrewdness a business proposition put up as a sound business investment will very often fall for a suggestion of making easy money illegally, for instance, by tapping a wire and getting the results of a horse race, and then betting on it, before the public know the result. People will fall for that who could not be induced to make an unsound investment. I have not much sympathy with that class of people. But the victims in this case were good, sound business people, some rich, some poor, and people who had no reason to suspect that there was anything wrong with this company. After all, we must take these things at their face value to some extent, or we should never invest at all. Many years ago I saw a world-famous cartoon in Punch. It occupied two pages. On one page was a picture showing a highwayman holding up a regular stage coach. He was on horse back, and with his pistol he was ordering the passengers to stand and deliver. That picture was called "Highway robbery in 1782." On the other page was a picture entitled "Highway robbery in 1882," and it showed a richly upholstered office, in which a fat, oily, unctuous man, labelled "President," was reading out a balance sheet to a shabbily dressed widow with two children hanging on to her skirts. The widow was vainly trying to understand what the man was reading out. As I say, this picture was called "Highway robbery in 1882." Of the two robbers, I really prefer the man with the pistol because at least he took the chance of getting shot, and the still greater chance of ultimately being hanged, but the man who commits the robbery in the manager's or president's room, and can afford to engage lawyers to show him how to do it without bringing himself within the shadow of the law, is not held up to scorn at all, but very likely gets a seat in the House of Lords, in the old country, or a seat in the Senate, in Canada.

It is the ordinary business people and the poor investor that I wish to protect. A thing of this kind is very hard to detect, especially as in this case and in that of the Alexanders the real criminals were those occupying executive positions. I have good reason to believe that some of the directors of this company were inclined to be a little doubtful and sought to make inquiries, but it was easy to deceive them because the men to whom they had to apply for information were those who were guilty of the fraud, and naturally they knew how to cover up their tracks. It is a thoroughly bad thing when a company like this goes to smash because it discredits investment and prevents capital from being available to develop what might be bona fide, although new, industries.

There are two points which I suggest the committee might take into consideration. One would be that no executive officer, no manager or president occupying an executive position and drawing a salary from the company, should be allowed to lend money to himself. That is what wrecked the Alex-

ander outfit; they lent money to each other. I lend the company's money to you on bogus security, and you lend the company's money to me on bogus security. In the case of this other concern, when an examination is made I think it will be found that the trouble was that there was a subsidiary company entirely under the control of one of the principal executive officers; it was really his private company with which nearly all the business was done, and it was done in a way which must inevitably have led to the results which followed. Had he been prohibited by law from lending money to himself directly or indirectly, perhaps it would not have happened.

The other feature which I suggest the committee might consider is this, that promoters of this character, or of any character, should be forbidden to advertise or to feature in their prospectus the names of a member or ex-members of the cabinet or of the House of Commons or Senate of Canada. There is only one reason why their names are put on, and that is to induce people to invest who otherwise would not. People have a great admiration for a certain member of parliament or senator. They know he occupies a high position, and they feel that if he has investigated the company and invested his own money in it, it is good enough for them. Even if the company succeeds, as it sometimes does, at least this practice cheapens our position, and if the company is not successful, which is more than likely to be the case because our names are not needed unless the company's success is at least doubtful—you never see the name of a member of parliament or senator used to boost the shares of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Imperial Oil or International Nickel, because they do not need our names; it is only companies whose success is doubtful that wish to have our names—if the company fails, our action is wholly bad because we allowed our names to be used as an inducement to people, who are less informed on finance than we are supposed to be, to invest their money.

There is also this suspicion. It is inevitably felt that either we got a block of shares at a very low rate or a commisison for the use of our names. Very often the opposite is the fact. Very often the member of parliament or senator loses all the money he puts in, just like the man in the street, but the suggestion is there, and it creates a very unjust suspicion against us all. It is very hard in such circumstances to get the man in the street to believe that we are as innocent as we perhaps really may be, whereas if our names were not allowed to be used, that could not happen.

I only ask that this should go to the committee, and that the committee should look into it and see if it is not possible to devise some safeguards, perhaps something quite remote from anything I have suggested, to check swindles of this character. I hope the house will remember the explanation which I have given now when the motion comes up, as it will, in a few days, and that the house will vote for it to go to the committee without debate, because the motion will not be debatable. I shall draw it widely, so that the committee will have full scope to do as much or as little as it sees fit, and when the motion comes up I shall only ask that it be referred to the committee on banking and commerce.

Mr. FINLAY MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, I fear the time has long gone by when an ordinary member of the house can hope to contribute anything of very much value to the budget debate. Still I regard it as a duty to my constituents to say something on this budget inasmuch as the industry in which I am particularly interested has received no assistance under it.

With regard to the budget itself there is very little to be said. I think it is pretty generally recognized that it is possibly the most innocuous piece of political literature that ever passed for a budget in this parliament. Just why the last speaker (Mr. Neill) saw fit to confine his remarks to a bankrupt concern in dealing with this budget, I do not know; possibly it was the result of an association of ideas. This budget cannot be satisfactory either to the protectionists to the left of the Minister of Finance or to the free traders to his right, but evidently they have both accepted it, possibly because both protectionist and free trader could feel that if he did not get anything, the man sitting at the other end of the chamber did not get anything either. But innocuous as it is, the budget met with the usual chorus of congratulations, both from the supporters of the government in this house and from the Liberal press throughout the country. There is a peculiar feature about this acclaim—the almost identical strain in which all the speeches are couched, and the almost identical phrases employed by the Liberal editors. Two themes run through all the congratulations: First, the great prosperity of the country; second, the great Liberal surplus.

With regard to this vaunted prosperity, there is a considerable difference of opinion.

There is a difference of opinion even among the Liberals themselves. All the supporters of the government whom I have heard acclaiming this prosperity utterly fail to point out exactly where it is to be found. In dealing with this question we find the same old principle of criticism to-day that prevailed yesterday and that I suppose will continue forever; that is, the criticism varies according to the province. The Liberal opposition in Ontario and the Liberal opposition in Nova Scotia deny that there is any prosperity. In Nova Scotia we have a Conservative government—a good government, a government that has been in power for three years and in that time has done more than the preceding Grit governments did in thirty years to develop the resources of the province and to undo the evils created by their predecessors in office. While the Rhodes government claims some little credit for whatever prosperity may exist in the province, the Liberals of Nova Scotia deny that there is any such prosperity. To illustrate the point I am making, I propose to quote two editorials from the leading Grit newspaper in Nova Scotia, the Halifax Morning Chronicle. The first editorial is from the issue of Saturday, March 2, 1929—the day after the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) delivered his budget speech. It is couched in the usual laudatory terms and indicates clearly that is was written before the speech was ever delivered. It is made up of the usual political generalities that every person must employ when getting the obituary ready before the corpse is cold. This is the editorial:

> The sixth budget presented to the House of Commons by the present Minister of Finance was like those which preceded it, a distinctly Liberal budget. It was also a typical Robb budget—in the substance of its contents, in its concise and luminous presentation of facts, in the clear and comprehensive analysis of the national balance sheet, and the evidence it bore of prudent administration and sound financing. Mr. Robb is rivalling the reputation established by his great predecessor in office, Hon. W. S. Fielding, in his management of the public purse to produce recurring surpluses from year to year.
>
> The Minister of Finance in his lucid and businesslike survey of the year's operations was able to tell a glowing story of the rising tide of prosperity, of employment at a high level, of industries busily producing products for home consumption, and for foreign markets, of expanding trade with the world, of buoyant revenues, of a balanced budget, of a large surplus, of continued reduction in the national debt, of a decrease in the annual interest charges, and the prospect of sustained and enterprising development of the great resources of the Dominion which warranted optimism and confidence for the future of the country.

An hon. MEMBER: That is the stuff.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): Yes, it must be very gratifying indeed to the Minister of Finance. But that editorial bears all the earmarks of having been prepared long before the minister introduced his budget. A few days later, on Tuesday, March 19, 1929, the same paper contained an editorial on the question of prosperity claimed by the Rhodes government. The provincial government took credit to itself for having contributed a little towards creating prosperity in Nova Scotia, and the Morning Chronicle promptly took the government to task in these words:

> The attention of the legislature has been drawn to economic conditions in Nova Scotia as they to-day exist. It has been pointed out that the much-talked-of prosperity, in so far as this province is concerned, is confined mainly to those centres where there has been large spending of public moneys, or where certain subventions have been granted to certain industries. In other words it has been stimulated by artificial means.
>
> There is no tendency anywhere to discount these aids, but it is another matter altogether on the strength of these to assert that those engaged in the basic industries and dependent entirely on their own efforts for success are at the flood-tide of prosperity. The country knows this is simply not true. One member stated that fifty per cent of the farms were going behind, twenty-five per cent were standing still, while the remaining twenty-five per cent were making progress because of their better location.

Now I ask seriously, is this country prosperous? Is this statement about the rising tide of prosperity justified? I have listened with interest while hon. members on the opposite side have quoted statistics to show our steady growth of imports and exports; I have listened carefully while they quoted the glowing annual statements of our chartered banks and other financial institutions; I have also noted the impressive figures they presented to the house dealing with car loadings and railway earnings. All this is probably true. The imports and exports may be at a figure hitherto never reached; the bank clearings may be above all previous records; car loadings and all other evidences may be there. And yet I venture to say that seven or eight out of every ten men in this country are poorer to-day than they were twelve months ago. I will illustrate that by an actual happening in my own county. We have there the leading industry in eastern Canada. The Dominion Iron and Steel Company, formed some thirty odd years ago through the assistance of the Liberal government here, has fallen upon evil days on account of the actions of the present government. Up to 1921 and 1922 this industry was able to get along. Since that time this government has been stripping it item by

item of the protection necessary for its maintenance, leaving it open to the competition of our neighbours, with the result that it went into liquidation three years ago. The liquidator at once took steps to employ the most efficient help he could get and eliminated all unnecessary expenses, so that last year this concern operated to 97 per cent of its capacity. Consider this for a moment. That concern was providing employment; it was going for all it was worth, turning out more products than ever before and thus contributing to the railways, to the earnings of the banks, to the exports and imports of the country, and to every one of those indexes quoted by members supporting the government, to show the prosperity of the country. Yet the men employed in that industry, 3,000 strong, are poorer to-day than they were a year ago. Ask these men how the mortgages on their homes stand; ask them whether they have succeeded in paying off those mortgages. Are they able to live better than they did before, to feed and clothe their families any better? The answer is, no. Thirty-three cents an hour is the amount paid for ordinary labour in that concern.

Now, you will never have and never can have prosperity in this country until the great body of the people are prosperous; and the test suggested by my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. Cotnam) this afternoon, in which he quoted from Sir Wilfrid Laurier, is after all the real test of prosperity in Canada. Go among the great middle class, the labouring class, the mercantile class and the professional class, and ask them whether they are prosperous, and seven or eight out of ten will tell you they are not. A few are making money; a few are growing wealthy. But apply the acid test to actual conditions and you will find that the statistical house of cards falls to the ground. So much with regard to prosperity.

The other chord which these eulogists strike is the question of surplus. The Minister of Finance has taken out of the pockets of the people $69,000,000 more than is required to carry on the government of the country. Is any credit due him for that? Not unless he can put his finger on some policy, some piece of legislation and show that it has contributed to the surplus. Let him show that he has contributed thereto by saving, by economising. If he cannot do so he is entitled to about the same credit as is due the tollkeeper at the end of a bridge who takes credit for the traffic that passes over the bridge. With regard to the surplus test, the real point is this: Two things can be done. Either you can take a portion of the surplus to pay off the debt, reducing the interest two or three millions a year, or you can take that $69,000,000 and use it for the development of the resources of the country, creating new wealth greater by many times than the three millions you will save in interest.

I am glad to see my hon. friend from Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) here. I listened with a great deal of interest to his address the other day and I wish to congratulate him upon it. Two or three things he said I must take exception to, but he will not mind that. He referred first of all to the visit of our leader (Mr. Bennett) to the maritime provinces; so did the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot). The hon. member also referred to the gypsum question and to agricultural implements. Now, with regard to the visit of our leader to the maritime provinces, let me say this. During some thirty odd years I have been more or less associated with receptions of different kinds to various leaders of all political parties, Liberals and Conservatives, Republicans and Democrats. With receptions to all political leaders in this country in the last twenty-five years I have had something to do, whether opposed to them politically or not, and I can say this, that no leader of any party, Liberal or Conservative, ever made a more profound impression upon the people of the maritime provinces than did the leader of the opposition in his visit last year. He came to his own; he spoke to his own; they understood what he was saying, and he was offering them something they understood. And from a party standpoint we have been more than pleased with his visit there.

With regard to the question of gypsum, to which my hon. friend referred, there is, as the house is no doubt aware, a very large gypsum industry in the town of Windsor. They ship all the gypsum in a raw state, but I should be very much surprised if the people of Windsor would not very much prefer to have that gypsum converted into the finished article if there were a market for it. The hon. member knows, however, as I know, that there is not a large market in Canada for the finished gypsum; that market is pretty well covered now. Consequently the raw material must be shipped out, and to that there is absolutely no objection on the part of this party. And none was uttered by the leader of the opposition.

I come now to the third point, I must say it struck me at the time as an exceptionally strong argument. The hon. member was dealing then with the duty on agricultural implements and he cited various implements—harrows, manure spreaders and other implements,

farm wagons and so forth. He pointed out the difference between the duty in 1921 and in 1928, and said:

I have figures covering a long list of agricultural implements and comparing the prices of January, 1924, with the prices after the reduction in duty, showing that the reduction actually was reflected in the price of the commodity on which the duty was reduced.

I must say that that statement struck me as an exceptionally strong argument if it were well founded in fact, so strong that I wanted to satisfy myself about it. I did not go to any bureau of statistics—I have heard so many statistics given in this house since I have been here; I have seen member after member get up and make columns of statistics do a skirt dance in order to prove a certain point; so in order to satisfy myself I went to the people who sell these things and got from them their price lists for 1921, 1924 and 1928. I took the items given by my hon. friend, together with some others which he did not include, and according to these price lists the prices were as follows:

	1921	1924	1928
Spring tooth harrows	$ 14 50	$ 15 25	$ 15 50
Disc harrows	45 00	51 50	50 50
Manure spreaders	187 00	216 00	180 00
Farm wagons, trucks	65 50	64 50	59 00
Cream separators	93 50	88 00	92 00
Hay presses	229 00	263 00	272 00
Hay rakes	47 00	51 50	50 50
Ploughs	23 00	22 25	21 50
Reapers	135 50	145 00	138 00
Mowers	83 00	90 50	87 00

It will be noticed from this list that many of these articles cost more in 1928 than they did in 1921, with a few exceptions. Some articles are a little lower, but there is an appreciable reduction in the price of only one machine; that is the manure spreader. In 1921 that machine sold for $187, in 1924 for $216 and in 1928 for $180.

Mr. ILSLEY: What month did my hon. friend take in 1924?

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): I took the price list for the whole year.

Mr. ILSLEY: Does my hon. friend know that the price lists were changed shortly after the beginning of the year as the result of the reduction in duty? That was my argument. Unless my hon. friend's list for 1924 is based on the January prices of that year his figures are not of value.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): I do not think there was much difference in 1924. I refer now to the one article which does show some appreciable reduction; that is, the manure spreader. It would appear that all these reductions in duty have only resulted in lowering the price of that one article.

Now I wish to refer to the matter I mentioned in opening my address; I want to join with my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Cantley) in protesting against the refusal—because that is what it amounts to—of this government to implement the Duncan report with regard to the bonus on steel. That report was made in 1926 and this particular recommendation is found on page 37. To make my point clear I am going to read the recommendation in order to place it on Hansard:

It was pointed out to us that, at its inception, the Nova Scotia steel industry enjoyed national aid in the form of a bounty. This system of bounties prevailed for many years.

We were asked to recommend that a bounty should be again made available. In this connection we have thought it right to give consideration to a point which was emphasized in the course of the evidence, viz.—that a drawback of 99 per cent of the duty is given when imported coal is used for metallurgical purposes, and that this is tantamount to giving a bonus of that amount, since it means that the Dominion is yielding up money which otherwise under its general policy in regard to bituminous coal would accrue to it. While there are, no doubt, other angles from which this concession can be regarded, it does in its operation have the effect of a bonus, and it is difficult to see how the same bonus can be denied to native coal.

Having regard to the bounty system previously applied, and to this aspect of the application of the drawback, we recommend that a bonus should be given in respect of steel when Canadian coal is used in its manufacture, and that the bonus should be calculated on the basis of the present drawback for every ton of coal used in such manufacture.

There we have a clear and definite recommendation. In the preceding paragraphs the report refers to the customs tariff with regard to steel, and there it is made plain that the commission were not dealing with the customs tariff, since that matter was before the tariff board at that time. Just here I should like to point out that in my opinion the tariff board has absolutely nothing to do with the question of a bonus; these are two separate and distinct matters, having to do with entirely different considerations. However, the fact remains that the government have not implemented this recommendation, so what follows? Is there any excuse for that failure? The defence of the government has been left in the hands of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), the representative of Nova Scotia in the present cabinet. I may say to him, having known him for so long and respecting and liking him as I do, that I regret very much that he saw fit to present the defence which he did in this connection. Far better indeed for him to have remained silent

and allowed his friends in Nova Scotia to feel that while he had not succeeded in having that recommendation implemented he was working with that end in view. They would have appreciated the opposition he would have to meet from certain of his colleagues in the cabinet. One of the western statesman in the cabinet, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning), was credited with having made the statement in a western town that the maritime people had only three ambitions; to be born, to get married, and to have a free ride on the Intercolonial.

Mr. RALSTON: Is the hon. member aware that the minister has publicly denied having made that statement?

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): As far as I know he has never denied it in the house. but if he has done so I am prepared to accept his denial. I thought at the time that it was a very foolish statement for any politician to make, particularly a politician having ambitions for further political preferment and requiring the assistance of the maritime provinces to carry them out.

Mr. BENNETT: Do not forget the statement which the Minister of Finance made last year.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): We will come to him in a moment. There is another gentleman representing a western province, the Minister of Mines (Mr. Stewart). He was the author of the coke legislation which was supposed to confer such benefits on the coal industry in the east. He is the gentleman who, after attending some banquet in London, generously threw open the coal market of Canada and invited them to send their coal over here. Those two gentlemen in the cabinet, colleagues of the Minister of National Defence, could be depended upon to oppose any effort to have that recommendation implemented. And last but not least, the genial and gentlemanly Minister of Finance, whose opinion of the maritimes was crystallized in the epithet, "whiners", could be counted upon as being opposed to this measure. We in Nova Scotia realize quite well the opposition the Minister of National Defence would have met with in trying to have this recommendation implemented, but did he attempt it? He did not. We have the statement of the Minister of National Defence, which appears at pages 1032 and 1033 of Hansard. He devoted three columns of Hansard in an attempt to defend the government's want of action in connection with the steel industry.

[Mr. Finlay MacDonald.]

My time will not permit me to read his statement, but I will digest it and put my statement on record and leave it to the opinion of this house whether or not I am doing him an injustice.

From the beginning to the end of his defence of the government's want of action in this connection, the Minister of National Defence did not make one relevant remark. His first statement was that the interests of steel and coal in the maritime provinces were almost inseparable and were absolutely interwoven. It is true that they are allied industries, tied up together pretty well, but they are not interwoven.

Mr. RALSTON: Does the hon. member know that both the coal and steel industries, that is, the receiver and the company, are applying for the same relief? The coal industry is asking that a bonus be paid on coal, and the steel industry is asking that a bonus be paid on steel. Does the hon. member suggest that they are not bound up together?

Mr. BENNETT: The fact that they are asking for the same relief does not mean anything.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): I will deal with that. The minister's statement continues:

> At the present time the coal industry in Nova Scotia is operated by a company under the control of those who own the bonds, and the steel industry is in the hands of and being operated by a receiver.

They are two separate organizations at the present time. Even though his statement be true, what would that have to do with the government implementing this recommendation?

Mr. RALSTON: Does the hon. member know that the coal industry has applied to the tariff board for that?

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): The tariff board has absolutely nothing to do with it.

Mr. RALSTON: The coal industry has so indicated.

Mr. BENNETT: They were sent there.

Mr. RALSTON: It appears in their brief.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GEARY: Take your medicine.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): The bonus question is not before the tariff board. I do not care if three or four companies have put it in their briefs; it should never have been there.

Mr. RALSTON: When the hon. member is running a coal company he will have the opportunity of taking it out.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): That is quite uncalled for, because I am trying to make a serious argument by saying that the bonus would remove a discrimination against our company as compared with other companies in Canada. If the tariff board were honest and sincere they would have said immediately this matter was brought before them; "We will not consider that at all; that has already been ruled upon by a tribunal having equal jurisdiction and power with us."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Mr. BENNETT: An extension was given to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm).

Mr. QUINN: They do not want to hear it.

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps the hon. member has been interrupted to such an extent that he might be given a little more time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Speaker has not the power to extend the hon. gentleman's time.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member can finish it on the main motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the house is unanimously agreed to give the hon. member more time he may proceed.

Mr. HEAPS: I object to any extension of the forty minute rule. If we are going to extend it, let us do away with it altogether.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): I appreciate the courtesy of the Minister of Finance, but I must accept the ruling of Your Honour.

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, will you call it six o'clock?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): If we are going to complete this debate we should continue.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Rosetown): Each year the budget is looked upon as a barometer of the economic welfare of the Dominion. I think we can congratulate ourselves on the buoyancy of our revenue. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) is to be congratulated on the way expenditure has been met by income, leaving a surplus of nearly $70,000,000 to apply towards the reduction of the national debt. But when we compare this with the net debt of the Dominion and the year's total estimated revenue of $454,942,000, and when we take into account the fact that much is made in the budget speech of the tremendous prosperity of the country, it leaves the ordinary man staggering with amazement at the awful extravagance and carefree attitude displayed by Canadians as a people with a debt of nearly $2,300,000,000. Supposing the fiscal year 1928-29 had been a very poor year in trade, one can quite conceive that instead of the boasted optimism, something akin to gloom would have prevailed.

While the revenues of the fiscal year in a measure justify the boast of prosperity for which all governments take credit when they can, we should now at the end of this year analyse the statement of the Minister of Finance, particularly regarding the boasted prosperity. All classes have not shared in the prosperity boasted of, and while urban industries along with those in the carrying trade of the Dominion have been able to show surplus earnings, this has been largely due to the heavy crop of wheat and other cereals from which the farmer was left no better off than he was before. While this condition has been brought about very largely by the low quality of the wheat crop owing to the heavy frosts in August, agriculture is not and cannot be on a permanent basis until it is freed from the burden imposed upon it for the sake of urban industries, particularly in Quebec and Ontario. To speak frankly, the boasted prosperity of the budget is not the prosperity of a commonwealth, but the concentration of wealth by the capitalistic class who constantly seek increasing power from parliament to filch a large part of the worker's earnings by purchase penalties on what he eats and wears. These penalties are imposed and collected without, in many cases, any regard for equity as between the classes, or for businesslike procedure or even for the furnishing of revenue for the administration of affairs.

There is a boast, too, that customs revenues have increased this year by $28,000,000. This to a country of 9,000,000 people should be a shame and not a boast, as it is mostly due to tariff levies on the necessaries of life. We collected this year through tariffs the sum of $185,000,000, or about $21 from every person, or more than $100 from every family. This is a tax that the poor pay as well as the rich. But let us remember that this is the average. The workingman with a family perhaps larger than the average pays the same per capita or accepts a lower standard of living. The situation is even worse than it seems to be by this calculation, because the class who

can best pay the revenue is able to pass on the tariff charges to the worker or to the agriculturist. Only $58,500,000, an infinitesimal amount compared with the boasted prosperity, was collected from income which is based on dividends from capital invested in urban industries and the profits of bankers, loan companies and others who thrive on other people's adversities. There was collected, one might say, from the worker's necessities of life $127,500,000 more than was collected from the incomes of the rich. These figures should have been reversed.

The organized farmers of the Dominion have long sought free entry of all the necessities of life. They have also sought reciprocal trade relationships with the United States because this, to a large extent, would create permanency in agriculture and this would in turn tend toward a steadiness of trade and agriculture and a more continuous market at home for manufactured goods. The feeling in this house now seems to be to increase the general tariff for fear the United States would increase theirs. Such action is not and cannot possibly be of assistance in keeping the Canadian market for the Canadian manufacturer, but it gives Canadian manufacturers an advantage in meeting United States manufacturers in markets abroad by enabling them to dump Canadian goods at the expense of the Canadian consumer. That is, they will charge the Canadian consumer a price that will ensure them a profit over the whole of their output whether sold at home or abroad. That is what tariffs are for, and that is how they have worked out in practice in this country in the past. But the United States may put up their tariff wall as high as the heavens, it will not make manufacturing any dearer or any more difficult on this side of the line; all it will do is increase the cost of manufacturing in the United States and make their export trade more difficult than it now is, unless their manufacturers will, as ours have always done, put the burden on the home consumer and dump their goods in foreign countries. The higher a tariff wall is in any country, the harder it is for that country to carry on an export trade, because the cost of production is invariably raised thereby, despite all the pious protests of some of our manufacturers that they do not take advantage of their tariff in setting home prices. In any protected country where labour is well organized, high wages is a feature of protection, but wages never keep pace with the price-fixing power of the protected manufacturer and distributor. I should like to give an instance or two to show how it is done.

[Mr. Evans.]

Our Canadian millers have a duty of 50 cents per barrel on flour. This is just about sufficient to give them a monopoly of the Canadian market. I have in my hand the bulletin of agricultural statistics, published every month by the government.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. EVANS: Before six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was endeavouring to show how full advantage is taken of the tariff and how unjust an advantage is taken when a monopoly can be created by means of it. I was dealing with flour. It enjoys a protection of 50 cents a barrel, and this is just about enough to give to the Canadian millers a monopoly in their home market. For the month of December last the average price of flour, Manitoba patent, in Liverpool was $3.10½; in Winnipeg, $3.99½; or 89 cents cheaper in Liverpool than in Winnipeg. In this comparison I have taken the grade known as Manitoba patent, which is the second highest priced flour sold in Great Britain; sometimes it is the highest. No. 3 northern wheat—the highest priced Canadian wheat, quoted in Liverpool for the month—was $1.46 a bushel; the average price in Winnipeg was $1.08¾; or a difference in favour of the Canadian miller of 37¼ cents per bushel. Allowing 2¼ bushels to the sack of flour—and it will take a little more than that—the Canadian miller has an advantage of 84 cents on wheat and 89 cents on flour; he is therefore reaping an unjust profit of $1.73 per hundred pounds.

But this is not all. It does not matter in what city, town or village in western Canada the farmer markets his wheat, he always sells it on the basis of the freight rate from his home town to Fort William. But let me cite facts. Many times I have dumped my wheat into the hopper of one of the big mills at Saskatoon, and after agreeing on the grade I have had to accept Fort William prices, less the freight rate. Then quite often I have loaded up a six months', and sometimes a twelve months' supply of flour before moving out of the mill. After paying freight on my wheat all the way from Saskatoon to Fort William, I have had to turn around and pay freight on my purchase of flour all the way from Fort William back to Saskatoon. From Saskatoon to Fort William is nine hundred miles. Paying freight both ways, one way on the wheat and the other way on the flour,

I thereby pay the miller's freight rate on his export flour for at least eighteen hundred miles. This is one of the unjust and undue advantages taken under the tariff.

But let me put the Canadian miller to another test. I find for the month of December last, flour in Minneapolis was $1.21 per barrel cheaper than in Winnipeg. I am told that I should not take one month alone to fix the averages between the two cities. So I take the last seven months of 1928, and this is what I find: In June the price was 39 cents per barrel cheaper in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg; in July, 79 cents; in August, $1.11; in September, 96 cents; in October, $1.68; in November, $1.37; in December, $1.21. This surely goes to show the unjust advantage taken by the Canadian miller of the tariff as it stands to-day. It goes to show also the unbusinesslike and unscientific manner in which our tariff is made up.

But this whole budget, like its predecessor, tends to concentrate the wealth of the country in the hands of those who are already wealthy. Take a case in point. The budget provides that leather for the manufacture of gloves, mitts, and so on, is to be subject to a drawback of one-third of the duty paid, which is 15 per cent under the general tariff; whereas gloves and mitts carry respectively under the three schedules duties of 22½ per cent, 30 per cent and 35 per cent. What shall we say of the callousness of the protectionist and of the government that will put leather practically on the free list, but will penalize the workingman by imposing a tariff duty of over one-third the value of the goods he buys manufactured from that raw material? This incident well illustrates the injustice of the tariff as it stands. And what shall we say in this case to the Liberal government who would impair the revenue by placing this raw material on the free list and at the same time robbing the workingman of one-third of his earnings, as on a pair of mitts?

Sir Richard Cartwright once said in this House of Commons that red parlour methods were followed in the fixing of tariffs and that Sir John A. Macdonald would often call the manufacturers together, as he did once at Hamilton, and assess them for the privileges they obtained under the tariff system. Now how much did the government assess the beneficiary in this case, for campaign funds or otherwise, who gets 33⅓ per cent on his raw material while the working man has to pay a 35 per cent duty on his gloves? Is this what my Conservative friends call a national policy? Is this what the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) calls red-blooded Canadianism? Is this what the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) calls a virile, independent Canadianism? And is this, let me ask also, what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) calls a fair tariff, as he did at Etters Beach last summer—"neither too high nor too low?"

Mr. McGIBBON: What do you call it?

Mr. EVANS: I call it absolute robbery. Now the United Farmers of Saskatchewan have repeatedly asked the Minister of Finance for the right to have the tariff advisory board conduct an investigation into the effect of the tariff upon agricultural implements and the ability of that industry to bear the unjust burden placed upon it. The hon. gentleman has not seen his way yet to comply with that request. He says that the tariff advisory board has not had time to advise, especially in cases where whole tariff schedules are concerned. Well, the tariff advisory board has just become a part of the Liberal electoral machine. Protectionists in this house are forever dwelling on the fact that many of our people go to the United States to seek a living. They would do well to turn their attention to the cause, which is the high cost of living. In the case of flour the cost to the manufacturer in Canada is less than in any other part of the world, but flour in the wheat fields to-day is dearer than in any other part of the world, even after it has been transported 5,500 miles. I submit that a fiscal policy that allows such abuses is a serious reflection on the intelligence of our people. It also has a serious moral effect on this whole country. Is it right or is it wrong? The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie) the other day, speaking on the budget, said that he would deal very summarily indeed with anyone who took advantage of the tariff to fix his prices. I have in my hand the report of the proceedings of the third annual convention of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce held at Quebec last June, and C. H. Carlisle is reported to have said:

> No manufacturer who bases his prices on the tariff is fair either to his own particular company, or to that particular branch of industry, or to the Canadian people.

What shall we say to such statements? I have my doubts as to the sincerity of any man who will advocate a tariff for the sake of price-fixing and then say that he refuses to take advantage of it. To me it is simply unmitigated cant. Mr. Carlisle says it is not fair to the Canadian people; yet his company enjoys protection to the value of one-third in duty on the finished article, which is added to the prices of all rubber goods coming from his

factory. He admits taking advantage of the duty to fix prices in Canada at least 7 per cent higher than they are in the United States, which country, according to our protectionist friends, is the very acme of high prices and protection. Mr. Carlisle enjoys free raw material for an article which when finished draws a duty of 35 per cent under the general tariff, and I find here in a manifesto issued by the research department of the United Farmers of Canada that the duty on rubber goods is absolutely so high as to be almost prohibitive, only $29,016 worth being imported. But for every dollar that went into the Dominion treasury in that case $156 went into the pockets of Mr. Carlisle and his company.

I have here a list of industries in Canada of which I will mention nine: Agricultural implements; automobiles; carriages and wagons; boots and shoes; harness and saddlery; rubber footwear; fruit and vegetable canneries; cotton goods, and woollen goods. Now I find that because of the duty we pay $22,581,000 more than the whole of the wages paid in all these nine industries. This surely ought to set the Minister of Finance thinking whether his budget this year is in any way a fair one to place before the country. On carriages and wagons, only $62,774 was imported, but the cost to the consumer was nearly $1,000,000 more. These are only a few incidents that go to show the absolute unfairness of the tariff system as it stands.

A machine which has come into use in western Canada in the last two summers and known as the harvester, commonly called the combine, has been paying a duty of 10 per cent. It is a harvester pure and simple, and the duty on harvesters is, I believe, 6 per cent. I hope the government will see that the proper classification is given this implement. When speaking on the budget last year I said that the tariff was advocated on the ground that it would provide employment for our working men and furnish revenue for administrative purposes. I cited the case of the fanning mills, and I have here a sworn statement from a friend in Regina regarding the statement I made last year that Chatham fanning mills are made in the United States. In this case they are imported free from the United States but the duty is added to the price paid by the farmer. The statement is as follows:

Canada
Province of Saskatchewan
To Wit:

In the matter of a certain shipment of fanning mills into Canada, and
[Mr. Evans.]
In the matter of a statement made by me to John Evans, M.P., which said statement was referred to by the said John Evans in the House of Commons during the session of 1928.

I, Archibald McLellan, of the city of Regina, in the province of Saskatchewan, hotelkeeper, do solemnly declare:

1. That in or about the month of September, A.D. 1919, I was crossing on the ferry boat from Detroit, Michigan to Windsor, Ontario.

2. That on the day on which I was crossing four drays each containing twelve Chatham fanning mills, being deposited six on each side of each load, or a total of forty-eight fanning mills were driven on to the boat near where I was standing at Detroit, Michigan, at about two o'clock in the afternoon.

3. That I was very much interested in the fanning mills as I formerly lived near Kemptville, Ontario and was a farmer, and had on many occasions visited my brother near Petrolia, Ontario, and was well acquainted with the Chatham fanning mill having used same on different occasions.

4. That I had on former occasions visited the factory at Chatham, Ontario, and was of the opinion that these fanning mills were manufactured in Canada.

5. That I therefore took particular notice of these fanning mills as they were deposited in the centre of the boat near the passenger run way and I had my hand on one of the fanning mills and examined it closely and as far as I could see the fanning mill was complete in every detail, and had printed on it the words: "Chatham Fanning Mill."

6. That I examined the mills very closely on account of my interest in the matter and as I was examining them I noticed an old gentleman standing near the fanning mills. I spoke to him and advised him that I had always understood that these fanning mills were built in Canada. He replied to me as follows: "O, no, not for a number of years, because an American firm bought them and they are built now in Detroit." I then asked the said gentleman if they paid any duty on bringing them across. He advised that they paid no duty and I asked him why not. He stated that the article was an unfinished product. I was very much surprised as I inspected the fanning mills thoroughly and from my examination thought that they were complete in every detail. I then asked him in what respect the fanning mill was not complete. He smiled at me and said "There is a zinc screen which they punch in Canada. They bring the raw material over and punch it in Canada." I suppose the cost would be about eight cents.

7. That when we purchased the Chatham fanning mills in the early days it was costing from $38 to $40 but I understand that at the time when I held the said conversation that they had increased considerably in price.

8. That I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of The Canada Evidence Act.

Declared before me at the city of Regina, in the province of Saskatchewan, this 19th day of June, A.D. 1928.

(Sgd.) Archibald McLellan.

(Sgd.) Jas. F. Bryant.
A notary public in and for the province of Saskatchewan.
(Seal)

What shall we say to this system which allows a practice of this kind? I repeat that our protectionist tariff system as it stands today is absolutely dishonourable and dishonest with respect to the working man and the farmer. A higher tariff is advocated in order to provide work for our people, when our supposed manufacturers can go across to the United States and have these machines built there and brought into the country free of duty, while the amount of the duty is included in the price paid by the farmers purchasing them.

There are many companies in Canada today which do not need tariff protection at all. I have in my hand a clipping from the Ottawa Citizen of November 24 last, stating that Dominion Cottons are to split their shares again and that they are running to 90 per cent of their capacity. They have the power of price-fixing in connection with all their goods as it is, but our friends in the House of Commons are daily advocating a higher protective duty on those articles of clothing needed by our working people. I mention this fact because this company made very high profits, particularly during the war.

The Minister of Finance told us that the tariff advisory board had not had time in which to advise the government. According to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) the tariff advisory board also has a number of advisers, so it seems that these advisers to the tariff board have not advised the board to advise the Minister of Finance to advise the government to put some of these articles on the free list. This is the question I want to ask: Did the tariff advisory board advise the Minister of Finance to place plate glass on the free list for the sake of manufacturers, when used in their factories only, while the finished article carries a duty of 27 per cent and 30 per cent? Mr. Speaker, the entire budget this year was concocted with the manufacturers at the elbow of the minister.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): As usual.

Mr. EVANS: As usual, as my hon. friend says. In view of what we know of the tariff system and how it is maintained, it is only logical to conclude that the tariff advisory board is just a link between the manufacturers and the party managers; no doubt the personnel of the board will be changed if there is a change of government. This will be a little more expeditious than the reform of the senate, which the Prime Minister at a picnic in Saskatchewan last summer said was proceeding at a very satisfactory pace indeed.

When the hon. member for South Wellington was speaking he advocated a higher tariff against the United States and declared that this action should be taken in the interests of the manufacturers even if it did prevent the farmers of Canada from finding a market for about $100,000,000 worth of grain and cattle. The hon. member gave a long list of farm products with a total value of between $95,000,000 and $100,000,000, which would be affected, and said it would be only a temporary embarrassment. Evidently it did not matter to him that thousands of ranchers and farmers would be put out of business. He said we had nothing to fear in this respect; he urged drastic action on the part of the government and said if this government would not act some other government would do so. According to his suggestion, Canada should be hermetically sealed against outside competition for the sake of a class which has relied on the tariff for dividends because of its own incompetence, placing the burden of the tariff on the class which is able to meet outside competition. Because we oppose their greedy desires in this respect this hon. gentleman dubs us hard-shelled, thick-skinned free traders. The only thing of concern to the class for which he speaks is the privilege of fleecing all the consumers of Canada, and he moves an amendment which is nothing but a baited trap to catch unwary agriculturists. He condemns the Australian treaty—as far as that goes I do myself—but he forgets that that treaty was entered into to provide an advantage for the class for whom he speaks; the class who, he says, cannot exist except they become more and more the wards of this nation; the class for whose benefit the consumers of Canada paid $550,000,000 last year because of the $185,000,000 collected for revenue. The hon. gentleman said that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) could settle the question of unemployment with half a dozen strokes of his pen.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Mr. G. S. RENNIE (East Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on the budget and also on the tariff changes which have been brought down, referring especially to the way they affect the city of Hamilton, which I have the honour to represent. A friend of mine asked me the other day just what I thought of the budget, and I told him there was very little in it. He agreed with me and told me that he had come to the conclusion that you could not budge-it; that as it was a government measure

the opposition would be unable to move it. In my opinion it is a simple budget, so simple a child could play with it and not be harmed, because there is nothing in it to explode; nothing in it to tell the people of Canada what the government is going to do. It is like the speech from the throne, which I understand is prepared by the government; but this one was very simple and had practically nothing in it. What was omitted from the budget had as great a significance to Canadians as what was included. Its omissions at once promise a continuance of the conditions which have driven away to a foreign country more than half a million Canadians within the last five years. From this point of view particularly, and for a reason which I shall elaborate upon later, I ask the indulgence of the house while I make some comments on the budget brought down by the Minister of Finance.

I desire to deal with the tariff, not so much with regard to its relation to capital as to its relation to labour and agriculture. It is not sufficient to say that this industry or that industry employs more hands to-day than it did ten years ago. It is not even sufficient to measure the expansion in ordinary terms of growth. We are living in a time when ordinary measures of expansion are futile. We are living in a country which has been invested by bounteous Providence with riches not duplicated in the history of the world. But once we are so administering our affairs that we are driving our sons and daughters to foreign lands where they have the opportunity for the expression of the talents of which we are so proud. It is not the foreign market alone which has been put in jeopardy—that would be lost first, of course—but the home market also is invaded; and nothing is more certain than that pre-eminence in the home market is the ideal which should be aimed at. The only country which fills me with apprehension so far as this question is concerned, is that country in which labour is better paid than in our own and where the standard of living is higher as well—I refer to the United States. Our working people have gone to that country and have found employment in every place where manufacturing is going on. These Canadian artisans are adding to the power and wealth of a foreign nation, while people in this country are suffering through lack of employment. I am sorry the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is not in his seat, because I intended to direct my remarks to him. Has he not been surrounded and pestered on the way to his daily duties by artisans who cry out, "We are not beggars, we only want an opportunity of helping to support ourselves and our families in the country in which we were born?" This is also the case in Montreal and Quebec; in fact it is a condition which exists in every part of Canada. Manufactories will always be found in the United States where men will be required to work; and our men are there instead of here in their own country. No nation can exist which has agriculture alone as an industry; there must be a mixture of industries to bring out the national mind and the national strength and form a national character.

Hon. members opposite sneer at the statement that thousands of our people have left this country to seek employment in the United States. Why has the government of the province of Quebec been taking steps, including the establishing of agencies, to induce these people to come back and resettle in their own province? If their people had not left the country, that government would not be trying to bring them back. Let any man visit the manufacturers in the United States and he will find the Canadian artisan toiling there and doing well, whereas if Canada had a judicious system of taxation they would be working here and doing very well in their own country.

Not only has this country been made a slaughter market by being overwhelmed by the sweepings of the United States, but at times it has been made a sacrifice market by ruinous proposals to suppress certain trades. We all can remember what the salt manufacturers of the United States did when the salt industry first started in Goderich. The salt manufacturers of Syracuse sent in their salesmen with instructions to undersell Canadian salt on the home market and thus crush this infant industry. The shoe trade was dealt with in the same manner by the leather manufacturers of the United States, and twenty-one shoe factories have been closed up in the province of Quebec alone.

In a young country like this, manufacturers are obliged to depend upon credit for the capital they have not themselves, and when such tactics are pursued by the United States manufacturers the Canadian manufacturer cannot escape defeat. He is unable to sell his wares in order to meet his banking arrangements and he becomes insolvent, the factory is closed, his employees are discharged and go to the United States. This is occurring continuously, and once confidence is lost it is not easily restored. The American manufacturers have the great backing of capital behind them, and are thus enabled to obtain an advantage

I cannot emphasize my convictions more clearly than by quoting from an address delivered in these historic chambers fifty-one years ago by that great Canadian, Sir John A. Macdonald. He said:

> The welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a national policy, which, by a judicious readjustiment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion. Such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen, now obliged to go in search of the employment denied them at home; will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade.

That I believe to be the great creed of Canadianism as propounded by Sir John A. Macdonald. His text and his conclusions of March 7, 1878, are as vital to-day to the well-being of Canada as they were then. The vision of that greatest of all Canadians may still guide us, and to excellent purpose.

I represent East Hamilton in this house, and for abundant reasons I consider it a great honour to represent that ambitious city. Hamilton since its birth has been the "Birmingham of Canada", still is the "Birmingham of Canada" and will continue to be the "Birmingham of Canada" so long as its workmen can be paid a just wage for their labour. For the information of the house I wish to mention a few facts regarding Hamilton, before showing how the budget and the tariff will affect that city.

Hamilton has a population of 154,000, with a tributary population of 400,000. I asked some questions in the house in regard to the revenues that were received by the government from the city of Hamilton and I got the following reply:

	Fiscal Year 1927-28
Revenue received from post office	$ 570,158 86
Revenue received from collection of federal income tax	3,944,635 37
Revenue from sales tax	3,490,593 70
Revenue from collection of income tax from corporations	2,669,272 46
Total revenue from customs collections	4,194,037 31
Total revenue from excise tax	3,477,199 62
Total	$18,345,817 32

The bank clearings amount to over $300,000,000. The people of the city of Hamilton are an industrious class, the majority of then toiling with their hands. By reason of its position at the head of lake Ontario it is a large distributing centre. It has good shipping facilities by rail, water and motor transport. Cheap electric power is supplied by two companies, one of which is the Dominion Power Transmission Company which gets its power from De Cew falls. This company was the pioneer company in electric power in the Dominion of Canada and deserves great credit for its pioneer work as well as the work it is doing at the present time, in connection not only with electric development, but also with transportation, having over fifty miles of street railway, with radial lines running to Brantford, Oakville and Beamsville. Hamilton is also supplied with electric power by the Hydro, of which the province of Ontario should be justly proud. These two companies supply power at cheap cost to many manufacturers in the ambitious city of Hamilton, and they also supply light for the city.

Besides the transportation provided by the Dominion Power and Transmision Company the city of Hamilton receives excellent railway transportation service from the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway, which is the connecting railway with the Canadian Pacific railway, the Michigan Central and the New York Central. It is also served by the Canadian National Railways, and everyone knows the importance of this connection. Sir Henry Thornton, realizing the importance of the tonnage and transportation, has deemed it advisable, and properly so, to recommend the building of a new station, to which the city, on the basis of revenue earned, was entitled long ago.

I have stated that Hamilton is a small Birmingham, having 512 industries which give employment to 35,000 of its population, the production value being more than $135,000,000. I will not take up the time of the house in reading over the list. United States capital is invested in manufacturing in Hamilton more than in any other city of Canada, the amount being over $66,000,000, employing 12,000 working people and paying wages amounting to $16,500,000. The production amounts to $61,000,000.

Hamilton is proud that it has the largest agricultural works in the Dominion of Canada, the largest fence works, the largest works for manufacturing washing machines and wringers in the empire, the largest plough works, one of the largest tire plants, the largest saw works, and very large textile factories which require protection. This subject was fully dealt with last year by the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Edwards). It has large cotton manufacturers who recently had a strike amongst their employees. For what reason? Because they did not have proper protection so that they could pay their employees a decent wage. This was dealt with recently by the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr.

Bell). There are also in the city of Hamilton the Canadian Westinghouse, possibly the largest blast furnaces in Canada, and the Steel Company of Canada who also operate a large coke and gas plant. A most up-to-date coke plant is operated by the Hamilton By-products Coke Ovens. These new coke ovens are assuredly up to date because they have been the special study of experts who have been sent by this government to study their methods of making coke and gas. Not only do they supply good coke at a reasonable price but they also supply gas for fuel.

I had the pleasure, at the first session of this parliament, of introducing to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) a deputation from the city of Hamilton, including the mayor of the city, members of the board of control and others, and those interested in the gas and coke plant. They wished to inform the minister that if the government would do some dredging in Hamilton harbour, they would build a dock for the use of the company to get their coal in by water and that the company would allow any boats to use the dock. This dock is almost completed, and consequently the company have kept faith with the government that did the dredging. The Minister of Public Works recognized that Hamilton harbour is one that must receive attention in order that the great industries located in the city may get their supplies in by water. Consequently, after he received the delegation that I had the honour to introduce, he deemed it advisable, and properly so, to bring down in the estimates last year an appropriation to provide proper facilities for Hamilton harbour so that boats can get to the docks which have been built by large plants on the harbour front. The minister, after meeting the delegation from Hamilton representing the city and the By-products Coke Ovens, had the government lend to the Hamilton harbour commission a considerable amount of money to build a warehouse and dock. Consequently the Minister of Public Works, and the government who acted upon his advice, must recognize that the manufacturing interests in Hamilton must not be neglected.

If the 512 industries in the city of Hamilton are to pay their employees a proper wage, so that they may have not only a full dinner pail but a wage that will enable them to live properly and decently, we must have a proper tariff which will afford protection for our skilled labour and prevent it from going to the United States.

Our raw materials are going to the United States to be manufactured and on their return a duty is paid on them. This is not right. If the raw material were kept in this country, the money paid for labour would all go into the pockets of our Canadian people. But the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) will tell us that in many cases there is a drawback. That is true, but the chief drawback is that the government allows our Canadian resources to go to the United States when they should remain in Canada and the wages go into the pockets of the Canadian people.

In the absence of the Prime Minister, I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) if either he or the Prime Minister has ever studied what it costs to rear a family. If he has not, then even though he is a bachelor, I would urge him to make a study of the cost of bringing up a family in this country.

Mr. POULIOT: Why not ask the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett)?

Mr. RENNIE: The cost to the father and mother is enormous, and then there is the further expense for education. What happens after the boys and girls are educated and have to seek employment, whether at manual labour, school teaching, nursing, or in some profession? They find that under existing circumstances in Canada they cannot make a living here; consequently they drift to the United States. That is not right. If we had a proper tariff and proper protection for the industries of this country, our young people would be able to earn a living here and would stay at home, but as it is, they have to leave just at the time when their fathers and mothers are getting up in years and most require financial help, as well as the companionship of their own children; in their old age they are left alone. Moreover, I do not see that the government has done anything definite in the matter of granting them an old age pension.

Now I turn to the great agricultural industry, which also requires protection. The city of Hamilton lies in a great fruit-growing belt, the greatest in the province of Ontario, extending from Hamilton to Niagara Falls, a distance of fifty miles, and towards Brantford, Toronto, Guelph, Simcoe and other places. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, are the farmers in this great agricultural district making good profits from their hard work? I say no; it is all they can do to exist, and many of them are in debt. Why? Because fruits and vegetables are allowed by this government to be dumped into all the provinces of this Dominion. This is

not fair, and so I say that the farmers require protection as well as the labouring class ,and that protection should be afforded them through a reasonable tariff.

I do not see that the hon. Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. King, Kootenay), is doing anything directly to further the interests of the maimed returned soldiers. We all know who won the war; we have been told it often enough. I quite realize that it is a very difficult matter for a pension board to determine that any particular disability a returned soldier is suffering from was caused by the war, but take it from me, if a man has been gassed, and later on develops asthma, bronchitis or tuberculosis, it is my opinion as a doctor that if he was previously normal the war was the cause of his disability. Even if it is not mentioned on his medical history sheet, that is no reason, to my mind, why he should not be granted a pension and receive hospital care. It is my opinion that the pension board draw the line a little too fine. They should be a little more liberal. It would not cost the taxpayers of this country five cents per year to make these poor maimed soldiers happy by giving them the hospital treatment and care they require for the rest of the days they have to live. After the war was over, our returned soldiers wanted to get to their own homes as soon as possible, and when taken before the medical boards and asked if they had any disability, invariably they said, "No", as they were afraid of being detained in hospital. The consequence is that a number of disabled soldiers have never had their disabilities entered on a medical history sheet. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I think the pension board should be more liberal in their findings.

The government is destroying a great many very expensive buildings in the heart of the city of Ottawa. For what purpose? To beautify the city of Ottawa in front of the parliament buildings. This supposed beautification that is taking place is costing millions of dollars. Before indulging in all this extravagance I think the returned soldiers should, first be looked after, for had it not been for the soldiers who held the gap at Ypres, the right hon. the Prime Minister, the hon Minister of Public Works, and other hon. ministers in the government who are encouraging these expenditures would have had to study the German language a long time ago. I mean this: I am not saying it as a joke.

I understand that a commission has been appointed for the purpose of reporting as to the tariff this country requires. Most likely they will hold up their report, like other highly paid so-called servants of the government, until after there is a general election, and unless some proper provision is made for adjusting the tariff in this country before another general election takes place, this report will fall into the hands of the present opposition, which after the next election will be the government of Canada.

I agree with my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) that the discussion of the budget should be held over and other business of the house gone on with until the President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, has considered the tariff situation in that country, and one of my chief reasons for agreeing with my hon. friend was furnished by a depsatch from Washington in that great family journal, the Hamilton Spectator, headed "Increase in Tariff Warmly Criticised. Organ of Wall Street Fears Loss of Trade. Canada's Goodwill would be Wholly Lost to United States." I shall not take the time of the house to read the whole despatch, but anyone who is interested can read it in the Hamilton Spectator of Saturday, March 9th last. According to this article it appears that the United States are very earnestly considering what kind of tariff they shall impose against Canada, and they are doing this advisedly, because they do not want to lose the raw materials which they are now getting from this country. They have always treated us as friends, and they are trying to treat us as friends now. For what reason? In their own interests.

Mr. L. P. BANCROFT (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I was particularly interested in the very able speech delivered during this debate by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Luchkovich). He is the first Canadian of Ukrainian descent to sit in this parliament and he and his people are to be congratulated upon that fact. There are many Canadians of Ukrainian birth or extraction in my constituency, and I had hoped that this speech would contain some message to them of what Canada, through its government, is doing to make them proud of their new home. My hon. friend has a great opportunity, because probably his speeches are translated and printed in the Ukrainian papers. It is regrettable that my hon. friend did not present a true picture of what is being done by the present government. He intimated that the tariff reductions made by the Liberal party were confined to soft soap, false teeth and cocoanuts, whereas he could have told them of the list of tariff reductions, which are matters of record, to be found in Hansard of March 13, 1928, beginning at page

1360. This list, which covers 19 pages of Hansard, shows the reductions made between 1922 and 1928. This is the greatest list of reductions that can be shown for any similar period since confederation. He could have told them that this government inaugurated old age pensions, which have been of immeasurable benefit to many of his people. He could have told them that because some of his people had been placed on poor land when arriving here as immigrants this government amended the Homestead Act so as to allow them to take up a second homestead. He could have told them that this government brought down an amendment to the Naturalization Act, which would have removed much of the difficulty and expense which his people now encounter when seeking naturalization. He could have given many enlightening facts to his people in that portion of his speech which he devoted to nursery rhymes and bedtime stories.

I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to deal for a few minutes with the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) which lays down the Conservative policy on the tariff. This amendment appears on page 758 of Hansard of March 7, 1929, as follows:

> This house regrets that the financial proposals of the government make no provision for reasonably safeguarding and protecting the interests of those "engaged in agricultural pursuits or in industrial" employment in Canada.

In the course of his speech the hon. gentleman said—and I am quoting from page 757 of Hansard:

> ...We must introduce into the tariff of this country, to protect our own people, that element of protection which the Canadian tariff does not now afford.

It looks as though we were going to have a repetition in this country of the United States tariff campaigns of 1920 and 1921 in which the cry was "protect the farmer." Hon. members will recall that deflation in prices during 1920 left the farmers in a serious condition. In the United States this condition was to be remedied by protection on farm products. A great protectionist campaign was waged, and the farmers swallowed it hook, line and sinker. The sinker turned out to be the most effective part of the equipment.

This campaign was followed by the passing of the Emergency Tariff Act, May 1921, and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922. The latter was supposed to be the last word in protection for the farmer. But Mr. Speaker, the condition of the United States farmer grew worse after the passing of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill. Why? When the Fordney-McCumber bill was before the United States senate, Senator Underwood of Alabama said—I quote from page 27 of "Farmers Tariff Studies"—

> Where the fallacy of this argument comes is that under the guise of doing something to help the farmers in some particular item, their support is asked for a bill of which, as a whole, it seems that for every dollar the farmers may derive from the bill, they will pay $100 in taxes for the benefit of somebody else.

What did he refer to in that statement? I have under my hand the following items from the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922:

	%		%
Pig iron	2.2	raised to	41
Bar steel	13	raised to	27
Structural steel	10	raised to	25
Cast iron pipe	10	raised to	20
Wrought pipe	20	raised to	27
Builders hardware & locks	20	raised to	40
Wire	26	raised to	41
Stamped ware	20	raised to	40
Sanitary ware—bath, sinks & lavatories	20	raised to	40
Nails	free	raised to	16
Sewing machines	free	raised to	15 & 30 if over $75 valuation
Gas engines	15	raised to	30
Pumps	15	raised to	30
Windmills	15	raised to	30
Hosiery & knit goods	36.9	raised to	66.6
Cotton thread	15	raised to	35
Aluminum	21	raised to	45
Salt	free	raised to	30.3
Leather gloves	13.7	raised to	50
Window glass	9.6	raised to	28

These are just a few items selected from the bill. It can readily be seen that the campaign of protection for the farmers was just a scheme to get the farmers' support for an increased tariff on manufactured goods. The increased tariff on manufactured goods affected the farmers' cost of production and left him worse off than he was before the passage of the Emergency and Fordney bills. The United States farmer got 42 cents a bushel protection on wheat, 12 cents a pound on butter and so on all along the line. These duties were put on to make the farmers feel that the tariff was framed in their interests. But the farmers of the United States have learned that these high duties on agricultural products were just fakes put there to keep them quiet while the tariff on manufactured goods was being boosted to the limit.

Senator David R. Walsh of Massachusetts reviewed the first year's operation of the Fordney Act, and I have here an editorial from the Manitoba Free Press of February 4th, 1924, which condenses the facts brought out in his speech: increased profits to manufacturers accounted for by higher prices—

increased cost of living—no increase in wages paid to industrial workers—the farmers in sharp distress. I may be permitted, sir, to read the last paragraph of the editorial:

In short, the big manufacturers have benefited a great deal, the wage earners are about where they were before the law was passed, the general public are finding it harder to make ends meet and a large percentage of the farming population are in sharp distress. The high duties on agricultural products have proved a delusion and a snare. Since the passage of the emergency tariff bill in May, 1921, placing a duty of thirty-five cents a bushel on wheat (reduced to thirty cents in the Fordney-McCumber Act and raised to 42 cents in 1923) four hundred thousand farmers in the fifteen wheat-growing states have gone into bankruptcy.

Some might say that 1924 was too soon after the adoption of protection for the farmer for its benefits to be reflected on the farmers condition. During the congressional session of 1926, Senator Arthur Capper of Indiana, speaking before the United States senate on the plight of the American farmer, said that:—

—the first five years of protection for farmers saw more farm foreclosures than the preceding twenty years.

Further evidence of the failure of this policy can be seen in the attempt, during the last three sessions of congress, to pass the McNary-Haugen bill—a bill which attempts to bonus the American farmer by artificial means.

Perhaps the worst condemnation of the policy outlined in the Conservative amendment is found in the fact that this very month, April, 1929, eight years after the United States Emergency Tariff Act and seven years after the passage of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, a special session of congress is being called to consider the plight of the American farmer. The policy adopted in the United States in 1921 and 1922 has practically ruined the agricultural industry in that country.

The amendment is held out as a bait to the Canadian farmer. In the same speech the hon. member for South Wellington advocates an increase in the tariff on agricultural implements and woollen goods, and asks for an element of protection which the Canadian tariff does not now afford. Other prominent members of his party followed, asking for increased tariffs on coal and steel. Since the Winnipeg convention they have advocated increased duties on farm implements, binder twine, automobiles, clothing, boots and shoes, and practically everything that enters into the cost of agricultural production. Then to cap it all the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) in his speech tells the people of Canada that increased tariffs do not mean increased prices.

The Canadian farmer is neither blind nor stupid. He will be able to see through this amendment and the speeches that accompanied it. He will recognize in this policy the same gallows on which the American farmer was hanged. The hon. member for South Wellington used the term "gold brick" several times during his address. Well, the proverbial gold brick was at least attractive on the outside, while his policy has nothing about it to attract anyone. No one can blame the Conservative party for going to the United States for a policy. That is their right. But we can attach a great deal of blame to them for bringing forward a policy that has proven a dismal failure in the country from which they imported it.

Political parties may well turn their attention to agriculture. Agriculture is Canada's basic industry. The estimated agricultural wealth of Canada for 1928 is over eight billions of dollars and the estimated value of agricultural production for the same year is $1,731,805,000. We hear a lot of idle talk about worn out soils, wheat mining, and suggestions that the supremacy of agriculture is just a passing phase in our history. But, sir, soil does not deteriorate if properly farmed; it becomes more productive under scientific tillage. The wheat yields of Canada are increasing. There has been a decided increase in the yield per acre during the past fifteen years. Agriculture is, and will continue to be, the greatest source of wealth production that we have. But, while agriculture is in a much better condition today than 1921, it is well known that the farmers generally are not enjoying the measure of prosperity that is found in other industries. It is because of this fact that I suggest that all political parties should turn their attention to this great industry.

What is wrong with agriculture? In our endeavours to build up industries in Canada, we have ignored our greatest industry. We have pampered and bonused our secondary industries at the expense of our agricultural industry. Agriculture must be considered with all our other industries if we are to have a properly balanced nation. The farmers are justified in demanding that their industry be placed on an equality with other industries.

What is the foundation on which our manufacturing industries have been built up? The right to buy their raw materials in the best markets. No government would interfere with that right. No government would dare to tax the raw materials of the textile in-

dustry, the paper industry, the farm implement industry, the rubber industry, or the automobile industry. The question then arises: Can we afford to give different treatment to the greatest wealth producer of all, the agricultural industry?

What are the raw materials used in agricultural production? Building materials of all kinds, including hardware and cement, household equipment, stable equipment, farm implements, fencing materials, tools, including blacksmith and carpenters' tools, clothing boots and shoes and harness. These are some of the raw matérials used in this industry and they are all taxed from 6 per cent to 35 per cent for the benefit of secondary industries.

The prices of agricultural products are fixed in the world's markets and cannot be increased at will to meet high costs of production. It will be readily seen, therefore, that the agricultural industry is working under a serious handicap when compared with other industries. In my opinion, this is the chief reason why the prosperity that is fairly general through Canada has not reached the home of the farmer. The Fordney-McCumber tariff act failed because it increased the cost of the farmer's raw materials, and gave him little or no benefits in return. The policy laid down by the Conservative party has all the earmarks and brands of the Fordney-McCumber bill. They admit that all is not well with agriculture, and they advocate an increased duty on butter. Butter costs the consumer in Ottawa 48 cents a pound to-day. How much will that price have to be increased to make the farmer prosperous? They want an increased duty on onions. Ontario grown onions are selling for 7½ cents a pound in Ottawa. They advocate an increased duty on fruits. Apples cost us in Manitoba, this winter, $3.85 to $4 a box for table use, and $3 to $3.25 for cooking apples. These boxes contain about 35 pounds of apples. They tell us that the apple growers are being forced out of business at these prices. The question naturally arises: how much must these prices be increased to make the grower prosperous, and what effect will that increase have on consumption?

The Canadian farmer knows more of economics than the farmers of any other country that I know of. He knows that increased tariffs on his products will not solve his problems. He knows that any policy which will be detrimental to the consumer will react against him, for the farmers make up more than half of the consuming public of Canada. He sneers at tariff walls, before which he must sell his products and behind which he must buy his raw materials.

We hear a great deal of talk about saving the home market for Canadians. Saving the home market for Canadians means, if it means anything, an embargo on imports. The farmers must export a large portion of their product; 38·5 per cent of the total exports for 1928 were made up of farm products exported in their raw state. This being true, we must receive imports in payment for these exports; for in international trading over a period of years goods are paid for with goods. If the demands of our Conservative friends for increased restrictions on imports are satisfied, the ability of Canada to export must be seriously curtailed.

Hon. gentlemen demand the exclusion of imports of the goods in which they happen to be interested. If their demands were satisfied, Canada would be reduced to ruin. It is only because the Canadian people refuse to permit embargoes on imports that we can go on selling our products abroad. So much for the amendment.

Now, my hon. friend from Battle River (Mr. Spencer) moved a subamendment which reads:

> That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after "house" and substituting therefor the following:
> "urges upon the government the consideration of an immediate and substantial increase of the British preference as a step towards freer trade relations between Canada and other nations."

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that this subamendment urges upon the government the consideration of these things. Well, the government being in the act of considering them, I suppose the hon. member has all he asks for in the subamendment, because we find in the speech of the Minister of Finance that the government has been considering and is now considering this very matter. At page 594 of Hansard for this year the Minister of Finance said:

> It is gratifying to note the steady development of inter-empire trade. Canada, the pioneer of the British preference, looks on empire trade as the key-stone of its external trade policy and desires in every way to foster closer trading relations throughout the British commonwealth of nations.

Further down on the same page I find the following:

> Many new trade channels within the British commonwealth are being opened and, in addition, the ever-increasing number of countries with which Canada exchanges most-favoured-nation treatment assists Canadian business to establish permanently "made-in-Canada" goods on the markets of the world.

Further on I find the following:

In so far as we have a fiscal problem, our task would appear to be that of readjusting, as necessity arises, our customs tariff schedules to meet new conditions, of removing inequalities where inquiry proves such to exist, of encouraging greater and more economical production of quality products, of assisting in the utilization of domestic resources and, other things being equal, of favouring those countries which favour our products. In applying these principles, availability of supplies, transportation costs, and the proximity of markets are factors which must be considered if all are to benefit and the Dominion prosper.

From this I gather, Mr. Speaker, that the government are considering the matters my hon. friend in his amendment asked them to consider. That fact, coupled with the fact that the subamendment is equivalent to a vote of want of confidence in the government, is sufficient reason why I should oppose the subamendment.

Mr. O. L. BOULANGER (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to take part in this debate, although there are many more experienced, more capable and wiser members of this house than I. It gives me an opportunity to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) on the concise and convincing exposé of the wonderful condition of our country, due to the good administration of the Liberal party. It also gives me an opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon the success of your lectures at the University of Paris, and to thank you for the added glory you have brought this house and this country.

I am also glad of this opportunity to bring before the house a question which is very close to my heart; I refer to the conservation of our population. It is because I am so much interested in this matter I raise my voice in this debate to urge again upon the government as strongly and as solemnly as possible the desirability and advisability of giving a preference to our native sons in connection with the colonization of our vacant lands. Ever since I have been a member of this house I have tried to have this matter discussed. I brought forward a resolution during the short session of 1927 dealing with this question, but it was not reached before prorogation; last year my resolution was reached at five o'clock on a Wednesday afternoon and the house adjourned before anyone had time to give an opinion and before a decision could be reached. However, the idea has travelled; last year it was supported by a petition presented to the agriculture committee, signed by 125,000 people. It was supported by many societies and by a strong section of the press, particularly the farm papers, and recently the idea was supported by the Canadian Council of Agriculture at their annual meeting which took place in Winnipeg on February 25 and 26 last. The resolution passed by that body was as follows:

Whereas statistics clearly prove that the financial rewards obtainable by people engaged in agriculture are on a lower scale than those enjoyed by people in any other useful occupation; and

Whereas, despite this condition the farmers, in common with other classes of our people are taxed to pay part of the passage money spent in bringing more people to engage in farming;

Be it resolved that this council call upon the Dominion government to abandon wholly the present policy of giving assisted passages to agricultural classes; and

Be it further resolved that any inducement that may be offered to immigrants be as freely offered to Canadians living in Canada and to former Canadians now living in the United States.

Just here I would like to direct the attention of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Forke) to what the newspapers have been stating for the last few days. They have pointed out that at present the United States are contemplating turning out of that country hundreds of thousands of Canadians who entered more or less illegally, and I would ask the minister to try to bring some of those Canadian citizens who are to be turned out of the United States back to Canada and settle them on our vacant lands. A short time ago I had the honour of expressing my views in this connection in Toronto, and I am glad to say those views were endorsed by no less a person than the mayor of that great city, Mr. McBride.

This question was discussed last year in the agriculture committee, which conducted an investigation into immigration matters, and the committee made two suggestions which may be considered steps in the right direction. The committee recommended that the homeseekers' transportation rates, which existed before the war, be restored and that assistance be given Canadian youths trained in agriculture. The first suggestion of the committee was put up to the railways, who replied through the Canadian Passenger Association under the pretext that all railways in Canada were concerned, although it is a well-known fact that all railways are included in the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National systems. The reply was as follows:

Specially low fares for homeseekers from eastern to western Canada were inaugurated, as you will probably recollect, many years ago when it was difficult to secure settlers for the

prairie provinces and it was necessary from a national standpoint to encourage the movement in every way possible. At that time there was very little business and commercial travel between the east and west.

Let me interject here that this paragraph from the reply of the railways seems hardly based on facts. These low rates to settlers were in force before the war, when hundreds of thousands of newcomers were pouring in every year in numbers which have not been equalled since, and when activity in western Canada was greater than has been the case since that time. These low rates made the development of the west possible and I know that a multitude of people, some of whom became members of this house, took advantage of those rates to move west where they founded prosperous communities and even towns. The answer of the railways continues:

As the settlement of the western provinces progressed, business and commercial travel gradually developed and the homeseekers' travel from eastern Canada steadily decreased. As the legitimate use of the fare gradually diminished, the railways in order to protect their interest against the advantage being taken of the fare by business and commercial travel gradually raised the charge.

I might remark here that the need of reduced homeseekers' fares has not greatly diminished, if we are to believe Mr. Beatty, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway. When he appeared before the committee on agriculture and colonization last year he stated that there were 35,000,000 acres of good land ready to be taken up within fifteen miles of the railways. The railways' answer continues:

The increase in homeseekers' fares has not been detrimental in so far as settlement of the west is concerned, isasmuch as the exceptionally low harvest help fares authorized each year meet the requirements of the actual land seeker from eastern Canada far better than the homeseekers' excursion fares, which is evidenced by the fact that for a number of years the majority of those in eastern Canada who desired to settle on the land in the west took advantage of these special harvest help fares. This gives them the advantages of working for farmers in the west and earning more than enough to pay their passage fares both ways, and those who decide to settle in the western provinces arrange to move their families at the time of the next harvest excursion, when they have their buildings and home under way and ready to receive them.

The harvesters' excursions may do a little good, but they occur at a season of the year which is not suitable for the establishment of a new home. It is in the spring, not on the approach of fall and winter, when a man wants to do that. But we had the experience last year that harvesters' excursions could be cancelled at a moment's notice in order to try out such experiments as the importation of out-of-work British miners. These men took the place of Canadian harvesters from the east who were available in sufficient number during this last summer to perform the work required to be done in the west. We hope that this experiment will not be repeated for, if we are to judge from the complaints which have been made, it was not a success. But they should be thankful for the free ride although they lacked the necessary experience and training to be successful harvesters. We cannot blame them for that, because it takes generations to make a successful farmer—you cannot make a farmer from a miner. At the beginning of the session the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) stated that although 8,000 of these miners came to Canada, only about 1,600 remained after the harvest. I would like to correct those figures by a statement which the Minister of Immigration was good enough to send to me. According to that statement a little more than 2,000 remained in Canada, but we cannot find out how many remained on the farm. I am inclined to think that many of them spent the winter in the Windsor station in Montreal and in the stations at Winnipeg, Regina, Toronto, and the other big cities of Canada. The Department of Immigration and Colonization may say that the experiment did not cost Canada any money because the scheme did not necessitate any special organization on their part, but they certainly received a lot of bad publicity in England. The railways lost money on the experiment. I am not so much concerned with the losses of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but the losses of the Canadian National Railways were the nation's losses. The railways concluded their answer as follows:

Further, we are of the opinion that present conditions in Canada are such as to make it inadvisable to unduly encourage removal of individuals and families from one province to another. All provinces have vacant land and are anxiously endeavouring to not only hold their present population but to secure new settlers. Certain of the provinces have even felt the drain caused by the harvesters' excursions and have made protest against the arrangement.

That is news to me, as we have had no such protest in the east—not in Quebec, at least. The answer continues.

Our records indicate that from fifteen to twenty per cent of the harvesters who go west each year do not return to the east and that the majority of those who do not return actually settle on the land.

After very careful consideration the railways are strongly of the opinion that it would not be in the general interest to make any reduction in the present so-called "homeseekers' fares."

That is the answer which was made by the railways of Canada. I confess that I cannot see the difference between the removal of individuals and families from one province to another and the removal of individuals and families from one part of the British Empire to another; if it is bad in one case it is just as bad in the other. Of course, I am speaking from the Canadian point of view. If the Department of Immigration and Colonization expected any other answer than the one I have just read from the railways, when they put it up to them, they were very candid and naive indeed. The railways will not do willingly anything which will cost them money or which will not bring them immediate returns. That is why they refuse to install safety devices at railway level crossings in order to protect the public, and why they refuse to dispense with the services of negroes on the trains and to replace them by native Canadians. Such an attitude might be understood on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which is an international business organization although Canadian in appearance. Their only concern is to make money for their international shareholders and bondholders. Patriotism, advancement of the country, improvement of the lot of the Canadian people, conservation of our population are all matters which do not enter unto their calculations. As an illustration, I might mention the fact that no effort has ever been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to develop the mining and colonization areas in the province of Quebec and to connect the city of Montreal with the Abitibi region and the transcontinental railway.

We may be sure that the Canadian Pacific Railway will not reduce its rates for the purpose of aiding the settling of the 35,000,000 acres of good vacant land within fifteen miles of the railway, of which Mr. Beatty spoke, unless it is forced to do so by parliament or the railway commission. But such an attitude is not so easily understandable on the part of the Canadian National Railways, which is the people's system and which is supposed to be operated in the interests of the nation. I submit that the conservation of our population is a matter of great national importance and is one which should engage the attention of the directors of our national railways.

It has been said that a citizen is worth $3,000 to Canada, and at this rate we are losing about $20,000,000 a year by emigration. Of course everyone admits that emigration is not as considerable as it was a few years ago, and that many of our citizens who left us are coming back. But nevertheless, too many farmers and sons of farmers are still leaving the land every year for the manufacturing cities of the United States. From my own county hundreds of such young men go every year. There is no place for them where they were born, and the cost of going to the 35,000,000 acres of good vacant land within fifteen miles of the railways is prohibitive. Emigration will continue and Mr. Beatty's 35,000,000 acres of good land will remain vacant as long as the best settlers in the world, the young Canadian farmers, are discriminated against in the matter of transportation rates. Our young farmers who cannot find land in their environment will emigrate as long as it costs less to go to Fall River, Manchester, Nashua, Biddeford and other American factory towns than to the Canadian vacant lands. These lands will not be properly settled as long as we give to settlers untrained and unaccustomed to our climate and to our conditions an undue preference over the native-born settlers. Very often the settlers whom we import at great cost do not stay. Our conditions are too different from those of their country of origin; we have no employment insurance, no sickness insurance, no maternity allowance, et cetera; life is very lonely in the settlement districts, and the settlers' cottages are not equipped with modern conveniences. Then our European settlers find out that it takes more than a few months' training to make a successful farmer. It is no wonder that they get discouraged and either go back home, flock to the cities or cross the border, and all the money we have spent to bring them here and to establish them has been spent in vain.

If we had spent one quarter of the money we have spent in the last ten years in the importation of European so-called settlers, to encourage settlement by our people, we would have stopped the emigration of thousands of young farmers and there would not be so much good land vacant in the vicinity of railways, because Canadians love the land and they have demonstrated that they can stay on it. If we continue our present policy there will soon be as many Canadians outside Canada as there are inside, and in spite of the expenditure of millions our rural population will remain stationary if it does not decrease.

In my humble opinion there is no advantage in paying people to come to Canada. Our country should be good enough and attractive enough to induce outsiders to make at least the effort of coming here on their own, as it offers to them all the desired

opportunities of improving their lot. But I would be in favour of spending all we can to promote and foster colonization. I would be in favour of a bold, imaginative and vast plan of land settlement wherein the preference would be given to Canadian settlers. I would be in favour of assistance to young Canadian farmers trained in agriculture, in order to set them up in strategical locations where they could be models and examples to others. This plan was advocated by Dr. F. H. Barton, Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture of McGill university who, at my request, was called last year as a witness before the committee on agriculture and colonization. A recommendation in that sense was made by the committee, but in this case, as in the case of the recommendation for lower rates in favour of settlers, the Department of Immigration and Colonization merely put it up to the provinces and we have not heard of it since. I believe that if we make colonization easy, attractive and promising we shall have no difficulty in finding settlers who will remain on the land, we shall keep our own farmers in Canada and we shall attract so many settlers from the United States and Europe that not only will we have to stop paying people to come to Canada but we will have to pay them to keep out, or at least to impose some sort of quota restriction. Such a plan of colonization was outlined before the committee by Mr. C. A. Magrath, and in my humble opinion Canada would do well to study it and put it into operation.

Reduced transportation rates and establishment assistance in favour of bona fide settlers, beginning with our own people, are what will realize Mr. Beatty's dream of settling those 35,000,000 acres of good vacant land within fifteen miles of the railways. That is where we should spend our money. There is no sense, in my humble opinion, in spending millions every year to bring to Canada, in indiscriminate numbers immigrants whom we leave to shift for themselves after they are in the country. And this is the suggestion which, as a modest back bencher, I make bold to offer.

It is all very well to say that easterners should remain east; that farmers should stay in the province where they happen to have been born and that we should settle the cold regions of northern Quebec or Ontario and the rocky slopes of the Matapedia valley or of the Gaspe hinterland. That was said fifty or sixty years ago and the result has been the settlement on the south shore of the St. Lawrence of land which it would have been much better to leave as forest reserve. People were planted on poor, light, rocky soil the fertility of which soon passed; they struggled and worked in a most admirable way; but in spite of their exertion, thrift and ingenuity, many of them had to leave in debt and seek a livelihood in the factories. I submit that Canadian citizens are more useful to the nation in Canada than in the United States. Therefore, I believe that if by reduced rates and assistance a better distribution of population is obtained even at the expense of congested older sections, and our young farmers are prevented from deserting the land, the whole country will stand to gain.

There are two other matters which I would like to mention before I sit down. In the first place I rejoice at the success achieved by the Canadian National Railways, which have shown a surplus of $58,000,000 for the last year and promise even more favourable returns for the years to come. Lest we forget, let me say that this wonderful performance is due just as much to the untiring work, loyalty and devotion to duty of the personnel of the railways from the most humble call boy to the president, as to the general prosperous conditions of our national trade. Our railwaymen deserve the most sincere congratulations and praises of parliament and of the nation.

Might I say in passing that in my humble opinion we, the people of Canada, owe to the Canadian National Railways a duty which perhaps we are sometimes apt to forget. We owe them the duty of supporting and encouraging them. Let us remember that they are our railways; that their success is our success and that their gains are to the advantage of the country. Therefore, why not try to use them more to travel and to ship our goods? Why not make propaganda in their favour? Our railways can give in everything just as good a service as any other system. Let us be proud of them and let us work in their interest. Let us get the "C.N.R." habit. That is the practical way of showing to our railwaymen our appreciation of their wonderful achievement.

Since this debate has started we have heard a lot about trade, trade balance and returns, exchanges, importations and exportations, tariff and financial matters. One would think that Canada is a nation of shopkeepers only. Few members have discussed the situation of agriculture, which is the profession of the majority of Canadians and which is the profession of the people I have the honour to represent in this house. It has been suggested that agriculture has not shared as it should have in our vaunted prosperity,

and I believe that is true. Therefore I wish to join with those who have urged upon the government the necessity of giving better attention, if possible, to the needs of the farmer, especially the eastern farmer who, rightly or wrongly, feels that he has been more or less neglected, perhaps because he is less vocal and less organized than his western confrère. The eastern farmer needs aid to adjust his methods to modern conditions, to improve his produce and to keep his markets.

I have been told by an official of the Quebec Department of Agriculture that three-quarters of the foodstuffs consumed in the large eastern cities come from foreign countries, although these cities, such as Montreal and Quebec, are situated in the middle of the richest farming country. Some say that a seasonal tariff would be a remedy. It is possible, but I rather believe that education and improvement in production and marketing methods would be more effective. In this connection I wish to mention the good service rendered to farmers by the demonstration and illustration stations of the Agriculture department and to congratulate the minister and his deputies, Doctor Grisdale and Doctor Charron, three real friends of the farmers, for their wonderful work in this respect. These stations do not cost much, and the good they do is immense. I have a few in my county, but not enough, and I know whereof I speak; we should have more. They are worth carloads of books of instructions and theories and millions of lectures, because examples are stronger than anything else. In those stations the farmers see the result which can be obtained by the best methods of cultivation. I venture to urge upon the Department of Agriculture the establishment of many more of those stations, in order to render agriculture more successful and more paying. They would teach our farmers to grow what the market demands; they would instruct them in the use of proper fertilizers, and in the classification, grading and preparation of their produce for the market, et-cetera.

I would also ask assistance in favour of young breeders' clubs, one of which is functioning with great success in my county, at St. Michel, and recently obtained a first prize in competition with the whole country. They are the best thing to encourage the improvement of dairy herds and of cattle generally.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by congratulating the government on the very creditable record of achievements which the budget of the hon the Minister of Finance has disclosed. More especially do I wish to congratulate them upon having re-established in the country that happy condition of peace, harmony, understanding and bonne entente between the different parts, classes and people, without which prosperity would have not been possible.

Mr. ECCLES J. GOTT (South Essex): Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that I shall occupy the time of the house I propose to discuss briefly some of the issues that are of major importance to the people in the riding which I have the honour to represent, where I am sorry to say, the plight of the farmer is such and conditions have been aggravated by the inaction of the government to such an extent that it would be hard for me to portray conditions as they actually exist. There are several reasons for that, some of which are unavoidable.

First, the corn borer has ravaged 22,000 acres of our corn land. Second, the hog cholera epidemic of 1928 exterminated some of our finest grades and best hogs. Third, the supplementation of tobacco for corn has brought about chaotic conditions, and the plight of the tobacco grower is so serious that the farmers are greatly discouraged and hundreds of assignments have been made. Fourth, the importation of surplus American farm produce at distress prices, at distress times, has made the growing of early vegetables an unprofitable occupation. Fifth, there was the failure of the government to take cognizance of these conditions and its indifference to requests and demands, its failure to offer assistance when government action was necessary and could have ameliorated conditions. Last, and most important of all, and for which the government will in due time be called upon to answer, conditions are so grave that life-long Liberals in western Ontario are forsaking the party. There is division in the ranks of the Liberal party and strong opposition even to a seasonal tariff on vegetables, to which I shall make more extended reference later.

Before proceeding further with my remarks, I should like to compliment the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Letellier de St. Just), who I am sorry is not in his seat at the moment, on contributing to this debate on March 14th last what to my mind was the finest presentation that has hitherto been made. There was more meat and substance and more actual thought in the preparation of that speech than in forty speeches such as were delivered by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Sanderson). I know something of the pains the hon. member for Compton took in

preparing and translating his speech so that he might deliver it in English. I realize possibly more than many other hon. members who sit with him the many hours he devoted to making the necessary preparation, and I wish to compliment him on the exceptionally fine presentation he made, more particularly as the budget of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) gave him very little to work on.

I was amused when I heard the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) say in the course of his remarks—and I may say that I always get a kick out of his speeches—"We have the Conservative party representing Ontario at loggerheads with the Conservative party representing Nova Scotia." I should like to give a sample of party harmony which actually exists on the government side, between the twin members who occupy adjoining seats in this chamber, the hon. member for North Timiskaming (Mr. Bradette), and the hon. member for East Essex (Mr. Odette), and this would apply to almost any row on the government side of the house. The hon. member for North Timiskaming is officially reported in Hansard of March 11, page 857, as saying: "At the present time the fruit industry is fully protected," and the hon. member for East Essex speaking at Kingsville on March 1st last, is reported as follows in the Border Cities Star, of Windsor, in its issue of March 2nd, under these headlines:

> Action to keep out low-priced United States fruit and vegetables is sure if under-selling proved, says Mr. Odette, Liberal M.P. for East Essex.

The Border Cities Star goes on to say:

> Once Ottawa is shown proof that even a carload of United States fruit and vegetables is brought into Ontario from Detroit at less than Detroit market prices, the federal government, according to Edmund G. Odette, Liberal M.P. for East Essex, will act promptly to enact anti-dumping measures on behalf of the Essex county growers.

There must be some technicality about this, Mr. Speaker, I admit that I do not understand it. The proof is on file; it is on record, and the figures are indisputable.

I quote from the Border Cities Star of March 15 last:

> The following resolution was unanimously passed and will be forwarded to Ottawa:
>
> Resolved, that the Southwestern Ontario Vegetable Growers' Association, in session assembled at Belle River, do hereby strongly urge that the present federal government should immediately enact the necessary legislation to exclude from the Canadian market the following lower priced vegetables and early fruits, such as small berries, and fruits which have been successfully Canadian-grown, also tomatoes, lettuce, early potatoes and cabbage.

I remember quite well the references made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) last session to the situation in the fruit and vegetable industries, following the visit to Ottawa of a large delegation free from political motives, urging the government to restore some means of protection similar to that provided by order in council 1088. I remember the Prime Minister saying that the government could, and he thought would, pass an order in council protecting any particular fruit or vegetable if conditions demanded it. Having this in mind last summer I wired the right hon. the Prime Minister, under date of July 3, as follows:

> Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister, Ottawa, Ontario.
>
> Essex county has wonderful potato crop ready for the market. American surplus finding Canadian market, three hundred cars daily. Strongly advise rendering all assistance possible to farmers moving and marketing. Reduced freight rates, while preventing surplus importation, would assist materially. Wish you could see western Ontario crop, you would render requested assistance immediately.

Signed by myself. To which I received the following reply:

> Please be assured that the representations of your telegram just received will have careful consideration.
>
> W. L. Mackenzie King.

The reply was alluring, and as the Prime Minister himself made it assuring, we had hoped for some results. The crop came on. The total crop yield for the Dominion for 1928 was estimated at 90,975,000 bushels from 599,775 acres, or 17 per cent increase over 1927. Yet the American potato was permitted to come in, and sold, to commence with, at from 65 to 75 cents per peck, or about three dollars per bushel. Again the United States farmer and shipper gets the cream, and our farmers plough under thousands of acres for fertilizer. Potatoes are selling in western Ontario to-day in some places for 40 cents per bag of ninety pounds.

Mr. Frank Smith, a member of the New Brunswick legislature, was in Ottawa, I am informed, during the month of February, urging on the government the adoption of a seasonal tariff on potatoes. He proposed that the tariff be in effect for April, May and June. Potatoes are the chief crop in many parts of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. The market for maritime potatoes is in the United States, Cuba, Ontario and Quebec. The United States tariff is almost prohibitive, yet the United States potato growers capture the early potato market of Ontario and Quebec. It is to conserve the early Ontario and Quebec potato market for the maritime provinces that the seasonal tariff is being urged.

If the proposed tariff was effective for April, May and June, it would not be of much use to the growers of Essex county and south-western Ontario. It is seldom we commence shipping potatoes before July 10, and if the tariff was off July 1 the American potatoes could be brought in and spoil the early market for our crop. To be of any benefit to us, the tariff should be on at least until August 1. That would give our growers two, and perhaps three, weeks to ship at a fair price.

The Amherstburg Echo, the leading weekly Liberal paper in western Ontario, had the following editorial in its issue of August 17 last:

Colchester south and other south Essex municipalities, which by reason of their fine soil produce early vegetables in large quantities, are shockingly hard hit this season and producers are losing heavily on such commodities as potatoes, cabbages, beans, tomatoes and cucumbers. The situation is so serious governmental investigation and action should not be delayed.

Here may I interject, Mr. Speaker, that in Essex county we have competition, first, from the surplus of the Virginia cabbage market, second, the surplus of the Mississippi tomato market, then the surplus of the Michigan potato market, and the surplus of the Louisiana cucumber market, the tail-end of their season meeting the first end of our production season. To continue the editorial:

The loss in Colchester south alone will run well up to fifty thousand dollars. Allowing such a ruinous situation to arise shows that the Dominion government had either not been well advised by its agents in Essex county or has been asleep at the switch. The Echo is not in politics, but it would be a traitor to its constituency if it failed to call attention to the disaster which has befallen so many of our people by reason of the government's removal of a dumping clause in the act where a fixed, fair market value for certain fruits and vegetables was put on by a former government. Just where government supporters in western Ontario were when this regulation was cancelled is a fair question to ask. They do not appear to have been on the job, or at least they did not succeed in having the clause retained or a better one substituted in its place. And as supporters of the government in power, they are the men who the people expect are looking after the interests of their constituents in this and in other regards. The Canadian Horticultural Council at its annual meeting adopted a resolution urging upon the Minister of National Revenue the advisability of establishing a list of fair values for fruits and vegetables, applicable at the port of entry, not the point of shipment, giving our farmers the same method of protection as motor car manufacturers have against the dumping on Canada of a flood of used cars from the United States. This seems a sensible request. Its adoption would have saved the vegetable and fruit growers of Ontario from being ruined. Who ever heard of a used car bought at, say, forty dollars in Detroit, being allowed to come through the Canadian customs without appraisal at a fair market value? Yet our Colchester south and other south Essex produce growers are allowed to be slaughtered by a flood of undervalued American farm products grown under conditions of low labour costs, while not a representative of the government stood up in parliament to plead their cause and protest against the injustice. Ordinary business sense would seem to have dictated a different policy, not to mention the question of political expediency. In the meantime acres of choice foodstuffs are being ploughed under in south Essex because their sales value will not pay for the harvesting.

Now the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) being in his seat, I hope, if he did not pay any attention to this editorial at the time of its publication, he will at least read it to-morrow in Hansard.

At the great Liberal rally in Kingsville on March 1—divided though it may have been—in the riding which I have the honour to represent, one of the speakers proposed that the Ontario government be called upon to follow the example recently set by the government of British Columbia and assure protection for early fruits and vegetables by imposing an inspection tax sufficient to set up a barrier against the dumping of imported products. More harmony in the Liberal ranks! The hon. member for east Essex objects to the proposal, and according to the Border Cities Star of March 2, says that protection for fruit and vegetable growers of Canada is a matter for the Dominion government to deal with, that the government does not intend to shirk its responsibility; and that the tariff to-day is exactly the same as it was when the Liberal government went into office—there has been no reduction. I like straightforwardness in public men. The last statement is misleading. The hon. gentleman knows, and if he does not, the people whom he represents know, that the rescinding of order in council No. 1088, passed by the Conservative government on July 10, 1926, removed the measure of protection, the nature of which had been sought by the fruit and vegetable growers of western Ontario for the past fifty years. I cannot take time to explain in detail order in council No. 1088 which the hon. Minister of Finance told a delegation on Friday, April 27, 1928, had not been cancelled. For the edification of the hon. member for East Essex I would ask him to refer to Hansard of 1928 at page 2486. The order was cancelled on March 19, 1928, the cancellation becoming effective on that date.

May I ask the government if the tariff advisory board has made any recommendation regarding protection, seasonal or otherwise, for Canadian fruit and vegetable growers? If so, what was the substance of the recommend-

ation? Why has it not been implemented? Let me add, if they have made no recommendation I charge them with dereliction of duty.

I have taken up the challenge that the provincial government should provide relief for the growers through an inspection tax. What action will the Dominion government take if British Columbia proceeds according to newspaper reports? I hope they will not interfere. As apparently there is no relief forthcoming from the Dominion authorities, I wrote the Hon. S. F. Tolmie, Premier of British Columbia, and a former esteemed member of this house. I quote from my letter to him of March 7, 1929:

> The growers of Essex south are weary of waiting for action from the Mackenzie King government, who have put every possible obstacle in the path of the farmer, and I am of the opinion, from press reports only, that if it can be successfully operated in British Columbia, Ontario should be permitted to benefit through the plan emanating from your province.
>
> If this can be worked out from a provincial angle, south Essex will forget that we have a King government in Ottawa. I will, if it is possible, request our provincial government, either through legislation or regulation (according to your advice), to act on it at once.
>
> Western Ontario Liberals should have supported our proposals in the house last session, but because they failed is no reason why we should not pursue more intensely our convictions in this matter.

The only reason, Mr. Speaker, that has been advanced in this house for failure to implement legislation that will be beneficial to the vegetable growers is the fear that the consumers will be compelled to pay fabulous prices for their products. Let me say to the government that I have never favoured permitting the farmer to exploit the consumer. I have never suggested to this government nor have I suggested to any individual that the farmer should be permitted to exploit the consumer. But have hon. gentlemen ever considered the lamentable position the consumer would be in should the early vegetable industry be ruined? Here is a principle on which we should agree. In order to sell a few baskets of early tomatoes at $2 a basket the grower plants a large acreage. Following the sale of these few baskets a week or two later he ships hundreds of baskets at prices within the reach of the working man. A week later tons and tons of the primest fruit, at a margin which it would not pay him to handle were it not for the first prices he obtained, are put on the market. The point is this: the grower must get the rich man's price for a limited number of baskets in order to reach the humblest table. The strawberry industry in Essex county and western Ontario should provide one with a fine example of what may happen to all other products. For instance, while strawberries were once a gift of nature to be found on the poorest man's table, in the spring in the form of choicest fruit and in the winter months in preserves, they have in Essex county, Canada's most southern county, become now a luxury available only to moneyed people. The reason is obvious. The condition is due to cold storage shipping from the south and the low duties on an inferior, tasteless quality, and if it comes to pass that the consumer is one day obliged to depend upon American growers he will be accepting the table cleanings as long as he lives. The Canadian producer and the Canadian produce bring down the price to the consumer; they force down the prices of American fruit and vegetables. But in the interim the shrewed American producer, assisted by our laws and regulations, skims the cream of the Canadian market and leaves the Canadian producer and consumer with nothing but the leavings.

May I again be permitted to refer to the Postmaster General's speech. I desire to congratulate the hon. gentleman on being the Dominion's leading optimist. At page 926 of Hansard, speaking with regard to immigration and emigration, he says:

> What is the record?

And answering his own question he states:

> We find that since the termination of the war 270,666 settlers left the United States—American subjects, American born— and came across into Canada to settle, being to-day permanent citizens of this country.

I do not need to remind the house or the country of the real situation during the same period—and I select no special period but take that referred to by the hon. gentleman. What is the true situation in that same period? Almost that number with their dependents, of the Canadian expeditionary forces who served in the Great war are to-day residents of the United States. The Bureau of Statistics at Washington shows that for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1928, 73,154 persons, making 42 per cent of the total immigration into the United States, came from Canada. The report for the previous fiscal year showed that 41 per cent of the total immigration into the United States came from Canada; in other words, 81,506 Canadians left this Dominion in search of employment in a foreign country. What is the contrast? Our soldier boys, broken in pocket, in health and in spirit were forced by the fiscal policy of this government to seek employment in a foreign country, leaving behind many loved

ones and the land from which inspiration for service arose, leaving behind the good old union jack, the beaver and the maple leaf, and what they imply, to become citizens of another country until such time as an economic problem can be solved which is beyond the reach of this government, and when they can return and obtain employment in the land they love so well. Oh, yes, the minister says that we obtained 270,666 settlers from the United States; and he asks, why were not both sides of the medal shown? The fact of the matter is—and both sides of the medal are shown, using the minister's own argument —that we traded our soldier boys, the cream and the flower of the land, for the Americans, through whose entry others will be forced to seek employment in Uncle Sam's domain.

I have not time to discuss immigration or emigration, for I want to deal with the question of tobacco; but let me remind the government that a baseball player with only a bat, a ball and the regular playing equipment, is as useless to the game if he has not the intelligence with which to make proper application, as a government, with all the legislation ever provided, is to a country if the courage is lacking to make the proper application for the safeguarding of our rights and institutions at all times and under all circumstances and conditions. May I suggest to the minister that his argument is as sound as that of the faithful old mother who was convinced that her son never indulged in the consumption of intoxicating liquors because he drank so much water in the morning.

The county of Essex was formerly divided into two constituencies, north and south Essex; now it is divided into three, west, east and south. Taking the two old ridings as a basis of computation, South Essex has increased in population in the last ten years by 2,300, while North Essex has increased 40,000. The reason is that industries have been established in North Essex. Subsidiaries of American plants have established themselves, not for the love of Canada, or Canadians, but because our tariff policy makes it advantageous for them to build here rather than to supply from the American plants and pay the duty. The result is far-reaching. It builds up Canadian industry, gives employment to Canadian workmen, and provides a larger and better market for our farmers. Far better it is, I submit, for the farmer of Essex county to furnish the people of Windsor and district with produce than for the Michigan farmer to supply that demand. Tariff and protection bring capital investment, industry, employment, wages and competition. Competition brings prices within the reach of the working man. Protection brings industry and one industry brings another. A protective tariff develops home industries and these industries promote others, giving employment and wages, and making for contentment in the home. A policy of protection, and one of fairness to all classes, is one which will be conducive to Dominion-wide prosperity in the home, in the factory and in our basic industry, farming. It is the only solution for our war and railway debts and the conserving of the youth of our Dominion.

The government should endeavour to reduce our national debt, and I suggest to the Minister of Finance that the Ontario scheme of debt reduction is worth looking into and studying. The government should endeavour to reduce our national expenditures by economy in the respective departments of state, and instead of adding 1,500 employees to the service should reduce the staff to that extent. Government in Canada costs too much per capita, and much as one might favour reduction in representation, I realize that to that end the start must be made from the town and county councils, to the legislatures, and to the House of Commons. A general reduction in representation should meet with unqualified approval, and Essex county to-day is leading the way in this regard in a substantial reduction in their respective councils.

Now I come to the question of tobacco. The late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier gave the tobacco growers their first protection of 10 cents per pound in 1897. Through the effort, personal endeavour, solicitation and recommendation of the late Mahlon K. Cowan, then member of the constituency which I have the honour to represent to-day, a beginning was made. In 1897 we produced 552,000 pounds of tobacco. The following year, with a tariff of 10 cents per pound on tobacco, we produced 5,500,000 pounds, or approximately ten times as much as the year before. In 1899 a further duty of 18 cents per pound was granted, making 28 cents, and that further increased production to 10,554,000 pounds. In 1918 an additional 12 cents per pound was granted by the Union government, bringing the duty to 40 cents per pound, and that still further increased production to over 20,000,000 pounds in 1920. That duty still stands. In 1928 we produced in Canada 40,956,400 pounds; as to the grades or varieties there are no statistics available. In 1920 we exported about 70,000 pounds of tobacco; in 1928 we exported 6,218,301 pounds, and again

there are no statistics available as to grades. I hope the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture will listen to these figures: In 1928 we imported 17,943,070 pounds of tobacco, and of that total we imported from the United States 16,513,117 pounds, valued at $5,399,505. Again there are no statistics available as to the grades, but my contention is that practically all the tobacco imported from the United States was of the flue-cured variety, the growing of which we are now taking up more extensively.

When we had no duty on tobacco, the tobacco used in Canadian factories was all imported; when the duty was 10 cents per pound only 5 per cent of the tobacco used in Canadian factories was grown in Canada. When the duty was 28 cents per pound on foreign leaf, 30 per cent of the tobacco used in Canadian factories was domestic grown, and since we have had a duty of 40 cents per pound on foreign leaf, 48 per cent of all tobacco consumed in Canada has been domestic grown. I contend that if we increase the duty to 60 cents or 75 cents per pound, in three years 75 per cent of the tobacco used by Canadian manufacturers would be domestic grown, and our production would be greatly increased. In spite of what the tobacco commission have said I think there is a wonderful future for the tobacco industry; the commissioners were not men whose advice I could or would seek.

I have under my hand regulation No. 8, relating to the taxes on tobacco, snuff, cigars and cigarettes, under the revised statutes of the United States, from which I have ascertained that the United States duty against Canadian tobacco is from 45 cents to $1.85 per pound on unstemmed tobacco and from 50 cents to $2.50 on stemmed tobacco. The Canadian duty is only 40 cents and 60 cents per pound. In Canada rebates on duty paid are allowed when imported raw leaf is manufactured for export, and let me tell the Minister of Finance that this encourages Canadian manufacturers to use United States tobacco in our factories. Again, when tobacco comes into Canada it is permitted to lie in bond for two years. When automobiles come into this country the duty must be paid immediately, and I suggest to the minister that duty should be collected on every pound of tobacco coming into Canada, as is the case with other commodities. I think it is an insult to the intelligence of our tobacco growers that this article should be permitted to come into Canada and remain in bond until the Canadian tobacco is pushed off the market or until such time as it is to the advantage of the manufacturer to use imported tobacco.

[Mr. Gott.]

The Minister of Agriculture will recognize this document which I now hold in my hand; it is the report of the Tobacco Inquiry Commission, appointed in 1928. This report is a conglomeration of generalities clustered in radiant form, and with everything considered this commission cost the government more than $5,000. That money was spent with what result? The only result was that the farmers were advised to reduce their tobacco acreage. May I say that the minister and his deputy were exceptionally well received in western Ontario, and I think they came there with very sincere intent; they came realizing that a condition existed there which did not exist in any other part of Canada, and I believe they sincerely wished to be of some help. The situation was diagnosed by the minister and his deputy; when doctors diagnose a case they prescribe a remedy, and in this case the minister's prescription was a tobacco commission. Generally, in the practise of medicine, when one prescription fails another is tried, but the minister did not prescribe anything else. I have here a detailed report of the expenses of this commission. The commissioners received $20 per day each, and in addition the three commissioners received $12 per day as an allowance for living expenses. Then there were the expenses for the secretary, for hiring halls for meetings and so on, but in a word all they did was pass the responsibility and soft-pedal a very grave situation. I suggest to the minister that this investigation was a farce, and I will try to show the minister why I make that statement. The people in Essex county, both Liberal and Conservative, think it was a farce. Perhaps it was not a farce; it may have been a comedy in thirty-two acts, since it took thirty-two days to complete the investigation. The farmers were innocent; they thought this was in their best interests, but why did not this commission examine some of the buyers who sought to crush out the very lives of the growers? The net profits of the Imperial Tobacco Company in 1927 were $4,371,613; I have not seen their annual report for 1928 but I have been informed that their profits are well above the $5,000,000 mark, although I cannot speak authoritatively in this connection. However, I think the commission, if they had desired, could have gone into the enormous profits piled up by this and other companies, which in my opinion would have been more in keeping with the purpose for which they were appointed.

May I say to the minister that conditions existed which should have been but never were brought to light. The minister had the situation in the palm of his hand in 1927

and 1928; he could have made a name for himself in western Ontario then. He could have taken the bull by the horns—and when I say that he will know what I mean, being Minister of Agriculture—and not release one pound of bonded tobacco until every pound of Canadian tobacco of the grades that could have been used at once had been taken up. This would have brought the tobacco moguls to time. The minister had an opportunity to approach the moguls of the combine and throw a bomb into their works which would have shattered the organization for years to come, but he failed to do so.

Now I have some suggestions to make, and I trust that they are sufficiently constructive to be heeded. I place them in two classifications; first, those too late to classify, or rather too late to rectify, and in the second class those which can be heeded.

In the first class, the first point is that the assistance offered, though exceptionally well and sincerely intended, was offered to a dying cooperative when it should have been directed to the organization of a more extensive marketing system. The second point in this group is this: The minister had 5,000 tobacco growers in Essex and Kent counties massed and ready to organize on any fair and reasonable basis, but he dismissed them without action. The third point in this class is that interest waned because the minister was wrongly advised; dissension spread, jealousies arose, proposals and plans disappeared and the growers encountered their second consecutive season of failure in 1928.

Then as to the second class, I have the following suggestions to make, all of which I think can be heeded.

1. Do not waste the people's money want-only for the purpose of shirking responsibility.

2. Revert the expenditure to channels that will be productive of assistance to an industry which is at present struggling to survive the reverses of the past two years.

3. Consult the authorities of the Department of Trade and Commerce and cooperate in such a manner that Canadian tobacco, with the 49 cents a pound preference, can obtain a firm hold in the British markets.

4. Send men to the British Isles and keep them there until they establish, through display or otherwise, Canadian tobacco firmly in the British market.

5. Encourage Canadians to discard their prejudice against Canadian tobacco by means of an educational campaign, and keep Canadian tobaccos, cigars and cigarettes to the fore through cooperation with the Minister of Finance in the reduction of the excise duties on cigars and cigarettes, which duty has increased from $1,889,376.74 in 1912 to $23,569,-641 in 1928.

6. In view of the fact that Norfolk county and other sections of western Ontario are increasing tremendously their acreage of flue-cured, prevent the re-occurrence of the importation of millions of pounds of tobacco from the United States each year. The imports of raw leaf tobacco into Canada from the United States during the year ending December 31, 1928, amounted to 16,513,117 pounds; the import value of which was rated at $5,399,505.

7. In view of the fact that statistics are not available as to the imports into Canada and the exports from Canada of tobacco by grades, and this being important, I suggest that in the future a separate record be kept of same.

8. Eliminate the wholesale and retail smuggling of United States cigarettes, which smuggling is in open contravention and defiance of the law, by making the Canadian excise on cigarettes in proportion to and in conformity with the excise tax levied by the United States government on the production in that country.

Although there are many other suggestions which could be made, my final suggestion is:

9. Do not permit a pound of tobacco to come into Canada without the duty being paid at time of entry, and allow no drawbacks so that manufacturers who have a prejudice against Canadian tobacco may resort to bonded stock at opportune times in preference to Canadian tobacco. Do not permit fruits and vegetables to come into Canada in bond and lie in cold storage cars.

I trust the minister will consider some of the suggestions I have made, and if my services are required, I will help him, his deputy or his staff at any time in the drafting of regulations which will bring new life into an industry which means so much to our section of the country.

On motion of Mr. Heaps the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Robb the house adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Friday, April 5, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice) moved:

That the names of Messieurs Dunning, Glen, Ralston and Stewart (Edmonton West) be respectively substituted for those of Messieurs Gervais, Jacobs, Morin (Bagot) and Denis, and

also that the name of Mr. Malcolm be added on the select standing committee on agriculture and colonization.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the house, shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

MAJOR GUSTAVE LANCTOT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac-Addington): I wish to direct the attention of the Secretary of State (Mr. Rinfret) to Hansard of yesterday, page 1231, where there appears a series of questions put by me which were supposed to be answered. I direct the minister's attention to the last question:

Will the Canadian government pay Major Lanctot's salary and also his travelling expenses and living allowance while he is representing the Royal Society of Canada, the Canadian Historical Association and the Canadian Authors' Association at various functions of a private character in Paris?

The answer to that question is:

No information.

I submit that that is no answer at all. Surely the Secretary of State does not want me or the house to believe that, with respect to a question of that kind, the government are not prepared to say whether or not they are going to pay Major Lanctot's salary. Surely the question is very simple and one which, it seems to me, should be answered. I protest that the answer given is no answer at all, and I have not been accorded the courtesy which a question of this kind calls for.

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I am surprised that my hon. friend should take this stand. The questions were most extensive and in the few days at our disposal we endeavoured to deal with them all. I repeat that we are not aware that Major Lanctot is going to Paris for any other purpose than to represent the archives department at the French exposition.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I rise again, to a question of privilege if you like. I will put the question again to the Secretary of State: Will the Canadian government pay Major Lanctot's salary and also his travelling expenses and living allowance while he is representing the Royal Society of Canada, the Canadian Historical Association and the Canadian Authors' Association at various functions of a private character in Paris? I submit that the Secretary of State can answer, yes or no, whether the government intend to pay Major Lanctot's salary.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. RINFRET: That is not a question but rather an innuendo, and I am not informed that the facts are such as insinuated therein. That is why I replied officially that there was no information that Major Lanctot was going abroad for any other purpose than to represent the archives department at the French exposition.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Again I protest, this time against the word used by the Secretary of State. There is not a particle nor a shadow of an excuse for him to refer to my question as an innuendo. It is a simple question, put as plainly and clearly as possible. If the minister is not prepared to answer or if he does not intend to answer, very well; I can quite understand that, but I want to protest against the minister saying that any words used in that question are intended as an innuendo. The minister has sufficient knowledge of the English language to know that he has no right to use that word as he did use it, and I protest against such use.

Mr. RINFRET: I will admit I have no right to use the word as my hon. friend now uses it, but let me repeat that I have no information that Major Lanctot has gone abroad for any other purpose than to represent the archives branch. If, while in Paris, he chooses to attend one meeting, go to one theatre or visit one museum for a few moments, surely my hon. friend will not protest against that. The main purpose of his trip is to represent the archives branch.

Mr. BENNETT: At the public expense.

Mr. RINFRET: Naturally, since the archives branch is a branch of the public service. Further, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is all out of order.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): May I direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to page 113 of Beauchesne, from which I read as follows:

The purpose of a question is to obtain information and not to supply it to the house. A question may not contain statements of facts unless they be necessary to make the question intelligible and can be authenticated; nor should a question contain arguments, inferences, imputations, epithets or controversial or ironical expressions.

I think the question was out of order.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): On the point of order raised by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), I submit that it is rather late to say the question is out of order, after the government have undertaken to answer it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Out of courtesy.

VISIT TO WASHINGTON OF MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Before the orders of the day are called I desire respectfully to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce which I do not think he adequately dealt with in the answer he gave yesterday. In the Washington Daily Star and in the New York Journal of Commerce, despatches appeared, which have been reprinted in Canada, having to do with his visit to Washington, and in the Philadelphia Public Ledger, a very old and most reputable paper, the staff correspondent directed attention to the visit of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the following words:

> Negotiations are under way for an agreement to leave American tariff rates on Canadian farm products where they are in consideration for Canada's signing the St. Lawrence waterway treaty.
>
> The Canadian Minister of Commerce, James Malcolm, is in Washington on what is described as a purely social visit. He called on President Hoover and on various other American officials. And there is very little doubt his coming to Washington has to do with the feeling in Canada over the projected increase in tariff rates upon the farm products.

If these statements are erroneous, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce to make a clear and unequivocal statement with respect to them, because a few days ago he was very anxious about statements appearing in a Canadian journal, written by a Canadian correspondent. So I suggest that it is highly desirable in the interests of the people of Canada that they should know exactly what if anything has transpired in connection with his visit to Washington.

Hon. JAMES MALCOLM (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I have not had an opportunity to see the article in the Philadelphia Ledger referred to by my hon. friend, but my visit to Washington had nothing to do with any negotiations with regard to tariff or waterways matters. My visit was purely social; I called upon the president out of courtesy, he being the only official of the American government upon whom I called.

Mr. BENNETT: The Canadian ambassador accompanied the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MALCOLM: Surely; he introduced me to the president.

Mr. BENNETT: The photographs indicate that.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

INCREASED REMUNERATION FOR RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS AND OTHER EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. T. THORSON (Winnipeg South Centre): I would like to ask the Postmaster General whether any action has been taken with regard to increased remuneration for employees of the Post Office Department including railway mail clerks, letter carriers, postal clerks and mail porters.

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): In reply to my hon. friend I might say that in regard to mail clerks and porters I repeated to the Civil Service Commission this year the request I made last year, when I recommended that they take up the question of further compensation to these employees of the department. I received a reply from the Civil Service Commisison under date of March 9, 1929, as follows:

> Your recent communication confirming your previous recommendation for higher compensation for the classes postal clerk, letter carrier and mail porter, has been placed before the Board of Civil Service Commissioners.
>
> After full consideration of the subject matter in your letter the commissioners have decided to confirm their decision of May 2, 1928, which was communicated to the Deputy Postmaster General by letter of the same date, that further increase in the compensation of these classes is not justified.

This letter is signed by W. Foran, secretary. With regard to higher compensation to railway mail clerks, this question was taken up last year by the commission and at that time nothing definite was decided. During the summer vacation I again took the matter up; after consultations here in Ottawa between the executive of the railway mail clerks and the officials of the department a certain agreement with regard to the classification or grading of railway mail clerks was arrived at. That agreement was submitted to the Civil Service Commission for their consideration, and after some considerable discussion the question was finally decided by a system of grading in connection with the railway mail clerks. Under this system the clerks are divided into two classes, class A and class B, being railway mail clerks in charge of runs, railway mail clerks assisting and so on. The commission accepted that grading, but excluded a certain number of railway mail clerks, whom they did not grade. There are about 1,300 railway mail clerks, and under the system of grading adopted by the Civil Service Commission I think 242 of these clerks were not included. When that was reported to the Post Office Department I took

it up with the Civil Service Commission and asked why these 242 clerks were not graded and why they received no consideration with regard to increased compensation.

In my first letter to the commission I suggested that all railway mail clerks should receive an increase of at least $60 per annum according to their grading, but they gave an increase of forty cents per hundred miles to the higher grade and twenty-five cents to the minor grade instead and in that way granted what was considered by the executive to be sufficient compensation. When the commission refused the minimum increase of $60 per annum which I suggested for the 242 clerks mentioned, I proposed that they at least give those 242 men, who were not included in the new classification, an increase of fifteen cents per hundred miles. The Civil Service Commission refused to consent to that. The railway mail clerks who were affected favourably have accepted the decision of the commission, but they are asking that the 242 left out be considered.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister has referred to certain correspondence and has read in part from communications; will that correspondence be laid upon the table of the house?

Mr. VENIOT: I intended to say that that correspondence would be laid on the table.

Mr. BENNETT: The explanation would have been much better had it not been prearranged between the minister and the hon. gentleman who asked the question.

Mr. VENIOT: Under the rules of this house I was entitled to make the explanation.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The house resumed from Thursday, April 4, consideration of the motion of Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of ways and means, the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. Hugh Guthrie, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of Mr. Spencer.

Mr. A. A. HEAPS (North Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said during the course of this debate with regard to coal, iron, steel, apples, onions, potatoes and tomatoes, but in carrying on the discussion I do not intend to deal particularly with the question of commodities but rather with what I would term the human factor. We are apt to gauge prosperity, if such exists in this Dominion, by the yardstick of how much is being produced in a given period. The mere fact that production has increased is taken as an indication that prosperity is general throughout the length and breadth of this country. When the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) spoke in this house the other day he said that there were some people who were loath to believe that prosperity really existed in the Dominion of Canada. I am one of those persons, and there are many millions of people in the country who are of the same opinion. In his effort last year to prove that we had prosperity in Canada, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) called the bankers, financiers and industrialists to his assistance. He does not bring those gentlemen forward as witnesses this year to prove that there is prosperity in this country, but satisfies himself with the term "we are prosperous." I would like to know who the Minister of Finance believes is the "we." There may be some people who will say that there is a certain prosperity, but it is what I would term a one-sided prosperity. I would like to know if the minister, or those who agree with his statement, would say that the men engaged on the farms, the mechanics and labourers, are prosperous at the present time. I do not think anyone will deny the statement that the banks, financial institutions and railways are prosperous, but the fact that they are prosperous does not mean that the general body of the people are sharing in that prosperity. Most of the shareholders in those institutions live outside of Canada, and if there are any juicy melons to be cut they are the ones who receive the portions. I do not know what portion of the melon the average man or woman in Canada would receive, but all the average workingman, labourer or agriculturist would get out of the melon would be just the pip. The Minister of Labour quoted figures to show that the volume of wages paid to-day to the men employed on the railways was greater than that paid a number of years ago. I feel constrained to reply to that, because of the fact that a statement made by a minister of the crown may, and probably will, receive wide circulation through the various avenues of publicity which a minister commands. He said that the wages paid on our railways in the year 1923 amounted to $253,320,000; in 1927 to $254,386,000; and that for 1928 the estimate was $276,000,000. In other words, there has been an increase in the wages paid during that period of approximately nine per cent. But the minister neglected to point out one fact. The official Year Book shows

that 157,771 were employed on the railroads in 1923, and that that figure had decreased to 144,176 in 1927, or a reduction of 13,595 in the number employed during that five-year period. The question arises in my mind: What has become of those men who are not now required by our railroads? It is quite true that more money is being paid out in the form of wages, but the fact that a comparatively large number of men are receiving a slight increase in wages does not offset the fact that there are a large number of men who are without employment to-day. According to the figures of the minister, the wages paid on the railways in 1923 amounted to an average of $115.50 per month, and this average had increased to $126 per month in 1926. According to the figures submitted by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm), the number of cars of freight loaded in 1923 was 2,851,000, and in 1928 that had increased to 3,696,000; in other words, there had been an increase in the number of cars loaded amounting to 845,000, or approximately 30 per cent. If we take into consideration the fact that a larger type of freight car is being used at the present time, it would not be out of place to say that there has been an increase of approximately 40 per cent in the freight haulage, and yet wages have only gone up nine per cent in the same period.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) was good enough last year to give some advice to the people of Canada. He said the people should work and be thrifty; that was the sure road to success and prosperity. Unfortunately or fortunately, I do not know which, the people of Canada have not heeded altogether the advice given by the Minister of Finance, because, since the budget speech of 1928 the gambling that has been indulged in by the people of Canada has been unparalleled in the history of this Dominion. Consequently I can well understand why he is not offering any advice in his budget speech of 1929. But the minister —I do not know whether it was because they did not accept his advice—has this year gone so far as to tax those people who gamble in stocks and bonds and I heartily agree with his action in that regard.

When, however, the Minister of Finance tells the people that there is a wave of prosperity throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, I feel constrained to take issue with him. One can go from the Pacific coast right to the Atlantic and have great difficulty in finding traces of that prosperity amongst the masses of the people. I know it is quite true that when we consider the figures of banks, railroads and other large institutions, there is prosperity; large dividends are being paid. But that form of prosperity in the way of dividends and the clipping of coupons is not shared by the great masses of the Canadian people.

The hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) (Mr. Plunkett) told us some days ago of conditions in the city from which he comes. The minister himself visited Victoria last year during a by-election and in order perhaps to give a little more prosperity to the people of British Columbia or more particularly of the city of Victoria he had to make them very large promises. One thing I think the government ought to be thankful for was that the Liberal candidate was not elected in Victoria.

The members from Alberta have told us of conditions in their province. In fact, the discussion which took place in the house in regard to the grain act just prior to the Easter adjournment was in itself sufficient indication of conditions amongst the agriculturists in western Canada. The Minister of Finance did Winnipeg the honour of paying it a visit last summer. I do not know whether he found evidences of prosperity amongst the masses of the people there, but I am glad he visited Winnipeg because I heard that during the time he was there he was introduced to the Seven Sisters.

I come now to the province of Ontario. What do we find there? We find amongst industrial workers as well as amongst the farmers the same conditions as we find in western Canada. We have had in the house instance after instance of the conditions that exist there, of the conditions of industrial workers and of the strikes that have taken place. One instance to which I wish to allude at this time is the condition that now prevails in the city of Oshawa. Last year I brought to the attention of the house conditions in that city where the men had been out on strike and where they had had their wages reduced to the extent of approximately 40 per cent. On that occasion I tried to show how little that 35 per cent protection we give to the automobile industry really means to the men employed in that industry. This year, according to statements I have had given to me and letters I have received, I find that wage cuts have been made by the General Motors Corporation; that men have been discharged for no other reason than that they happen to belong to an industrial organization, and that men have been brought in from Germany and other parts of Europe to take the place of men who have worked for that company during the past twenty

years. As I said a moment or two ago, I have received several communications and I am going to read extracts from one or two that have come to me within the past few weeks. This one, which is dated Oshawa, March 13, reads:

> Instances can be proved where Canadian citizens have been let out of their jobs and these imported Germans being put into their places. One reason for this is probably due to the fact that the Germans have agreed to pay back to the company the full amount of their passage money at the rate of $25 per month.

That is an indication that the passage money for these people was paid by the company to bring them from Germany so that they could take the places of men employed at the Oshawa factory of the General Motors Corporation. The writer continues:

> With reference to wage reductions throughout the plant, it is a fact that there have been wage reductions ranging from around 20, to in some cases, 50 per cent. The speed-up in some departments is so bad that men working in the paint department, the stamping plant, the assembly lines, the enamel plant, in fact the whole plant is speeded up to a point where the men are showing signs of physical exhaustion. In spite of the fact that the company agreed not to discriminate against union men, they have persistently followed a policy of intimidation and victimization and have in every instance denied the men any opportunity to clear themselves of such charges that might have been put against them.

I have in my file of correspondence a communication from a man who has worked in the General Motors Corporation for twenty years. He was discharged at a moment's notice and we are powerless in the house to do anything in regard to the whole situation. There is another case of a man who worked there who, when he was told his services were no longer required, was informed that he should go and see Jimmy Simpson who happens to be vice-president of the Trades Union Congress of Canada.

This is the case of a man who worked there for quite a long time and who was told to go and get his discharge slip. This is what he writes in regard to what happened when he went to the office:

> I was given a gold badge for long and satisfactory service, and was told that my services were no longer required.

Another man who had been there for three years was hired again by the company, and when they found that he had been formerly employed by them, his services were also no longer required. In the Oshawa papers and in papers in other parts of the country, you do not find a word being published in regard to conditions at the Oshawa plant.

[Mr. Heaps.]

I come now perhaps a little closer to Ottawa than Oshawa in order to examine some of this so-called prosperity with which members of the house are being continually regaled, and in which I am loath to believe. We are meeting here within a stone's throw of the city of Hull. Speaking in the Quebec legislature not many weeks ago, the provincial member for Hull Mr. A. Guertin had this to say about the prosperity in the city he represented in that legislature:

> The minister did not tell us that barely a month ago the Eddy Company warned the city of Hull that it could barely carry on unless reduction of civic taxation was granted. It formerly employed 2,000 hands, whereas it now has only 1,025, of which difference the abandonment of the match industry only accounts for 500. There are 2,000 unemployed in the city of Hull under the era of perfect prosperity boasted of by the government.

A little further on the same provincial member says:

> Continuing, the member for Hull deplored the many restrictions visited on the Gatineu district, whose inhabitants might no longer hunt game, carry firearms, enjoy freedom in fishing, or other liberty. All that they were offered in exchange was work in the shanties of the International Paper Company at a wage varying between $25 to $40 per month. Contract work was no better and generally ended in overwhelming debt for the man that took it on.

I have no need even to go to the city of Hull. I think of the statement made by the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) in this house only a few minutes ago. When we are boasting of a surplus in the budget this year of approximately $70,000,000, the Postmaster General informs us that some of the lowest paid men in the Dominion of Canada, postal employees, cannot have a slight increase in their pay. Will the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) or any other minister tell me that these postal workers are enjoying some of this so-called prosperity? Yet the government sits there hopeless and powerless to intervene in a simple case of that character. I feel satisfied that if the government were determined to give these postal employees decent and reasonable wages they could somehow or other find ways and means of overcoming the civil service commission.

I will leave this part of the country now, and discuss conditions in Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces. I do not think that any member of this house, no matter on which side he sits, who has seen conditions in the maritimes with his own eyes, will say that there is prosperity in those provinces. I was in the maritime provinces myself just a few months ago, and I saw conditions in cities like Sydney and in towns like Glace Bay

and I want to say to this house that any Canadian who sees for himself the conditions of the masses of the people there is bound to bow his head in shame to think that such conditions can exist in the Dominion of Canada, where we are boasting of our so-called prosperity. When you go into a place like Glace Bay and see young children ill-fed, ill-clothed, going about in the mud in the streets, with the sewage running down a little gully made right in front of the homes of these people, I say we have no right in this house to talk about prosperity until such conditions are remedied. We all have a responsibility in this matter, and I would go a long way myself to see that conditions in the maritime provinces are remedied in a real and proper way.

What are some of the conditions in the maritimes? Last year a committee of the ministerial association of the maritime provinces investigated conditions in the Dominion Iron and Steel works, and on the 5th day of November, 1928, they published their findings. I will read just one or two brief extracts from their report, and then perhaps my good friend the Minister of Labour will understand why I am one of those who are loath to believe that there is prosperity in the Dominion of Canada. The report says:

> The ordinary work day at the D.I.S. Co. plant is ten hours—from 7.00 a.m. to 5.30 p.m., with thirty minutes at noon for lunch. For night duty there is a twelve hour term, with thirty minutes at midnight for lunch. For the continuous operations, consisting of the coke ovens, blast furnaces and open hearth departments, involving approximately 1,000 men, the day term is eleven hours and the night thirteen throughout a seven day week.

That is, the men in this department work an average of eighty-four hours every week, sixty-six hours during the week on day duty, and one hundred and two hours for the week on night duty. A little further on the report says:

> Your committee cannot help feeling that this is a very cautious and moderate statement. We believe that the plight—it can scarcely be called other—of the some 1,000 men in the continuous operations is a scandal and a shame. To be on night duty, under the most favourable working conditions, from eleven to thirteen hours were trying enough, but when we know the necessarily almost intolerable conditions in which these men have to work, heavy manual labour in gas, smoke, heat, and in some cases, exposure to the elements summer and winter, the situation is nothing less than appalling, and their treatment utterly abhorrent to the dictates of humanity.

I will give my last quotation from this rather lengthy report:

> For the year ending June 30, 1928, as gleaned from the published statement of the corporation, there was an operating surplus of $2,200,000, as compared with $1,500,000 for the previous year, a total for the two years of the receivership of $3,700,000. (This before anything was set aside for interest on bonds or depreciation.) Now, of that amount, $2,000,000 has been retained for depreciation, $1,000,000 per year, the balance presumably being available for interest charges on bonds, and so forth.
>
> What suggests itself is this—Should $2,000,000 of the profits of the industry which the men at least had helped to make, be set aside, not for repairs (these were taken care of in course of the operations and charged to them), but for future replacements, while not a cent of this amount has been allowed for the better condition of the human element in the industry? It does cost money, doubtless a great deal, to replace the machinery of steel making. Unfortunately, it costs the industry little or nothing to replace men—there is nearly always a surplus of labour.

These are the wages paid in Sydney in the month of November last: The labourer, who we have just heard works from eleven to thirteen hours a day, receives 33 cents per hour; helpers, 36½ to 38½ cents per hour, and their hours are ten, eleven and thirteen hours per day, according to the shift they happen to be working; handymen, 42½ to 50 cents per hour; mechanics, 52 to 57 cents per hour. Mr. Charles Schwab, of the United States Steel Corporation, said recently before the United States investigating committee that the average wages in the United States for a similar class of labour averaged about 63.08 cents per hour.

It has been pointed out by several of the ministers and others that there has been an enormous increase in production in the Dominion of Canada. That is perfectly true. I do not think anybody will deny that there has been a great increase in all lines of industrial and even agricultural activity, but, of course, that does not mean that the people who have produced those commodities are necessarily any better off than they were previously, and I shall try to prove that in a moment or two. Labour efficiency has increased enormously in the last few years. About three years ago I placed figures on Hansard which showed that over a period of about eight or nine years the individual industrial efficiency had increased by approximately 40 per cent. Professor Michell, of McMaster university, Toronto, has made some rather interesting calculations along the same lines, and he arrives at somewhat similar conclusions to those at which I arrived when I made this study a few years ago. He points out that from 1890 to 1900 the value of production per worker increased 15.5 per cent, or 1.55 per cent per year on the average; from 1900 to 1910, the increase was 58.5 per cent or 5.85 per year; from 1910 to 1920, the increase

was 7.3 per cent, or 0.73 per cent per year; from 1920 to 1927, the increase was 52.8 per cent, or 8.8 per cent per year.

Now, he shows further that from 1920 to 1927, while production had increased by 52.8 per cent, on the average wages increased only 13 per cent. But even those statistics are not complete in themselves and therefore I shall add a little to them. According to our year books I find that the total wages paid in 1917 to men and women employed in industry was $420,094,869; in 1925, $452,958,655; an increase in dollars—not necessarily in purchasing power—of $32,863,786. In that same period the cost of living increased from 100 in 1917 to 116 in 1925. Therefore if we compare the purchasing power in 1925 with that in 1917—and these are the latest figures available in the Canada Year Book—we find there has been actually a reduction in purchasing power to the disadvantage of 1925; and if the purchasing power of the wages were calculated on the 1925 basis real wages would be considerably less than in 1917, the figures, as I make them out, being approximately $34,551,000. In that same period the number of persons employed had decreased from 552,968 to 466,602—a difference of 86,366.

It is quite true, as has been pointed out, that wages may have increased to the individual, but I might give a very simple illustration of how they have been increased. Let us imagine, for instance, a factory employing ten men, paying out ten thousand dollars a year in wages, and producing, say, forty thousand dollars' worth of commodities annually. At the end of one or two years let us assume that two men have been discharged, the remaining eight producing, say, forty-five thousand dollars' worth of commodities, but receiving nine thousand dollars in wages. Then there would be a relative gross reduction in the wages paid, and the general purchasing power would be correspondingly reduced, with the result that the ten people could not purchase the same quantity of commodities as before. This would leave the ten men, in a relatively worse position than at the outset, while those who owned the factory would be getting the benefit of the increased productivity, and the reduction of staff.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word or two in connection with the amendment to the amendment that was moved by my hon. friend from Battle River (Mr. Spencer) and seconded by myself. In this subamendment it is suggested that we give an increased preference to the people of Great Britain. I believe that is a policy that ought to commend itself to practically all the members of this house. The Conservative party have been preaching that doctrine for a number of years. We in this corner of the house, who have so often been accused of unfriendliness towards the mother country, to-day desire to give practical expression of our true friendship for the people of Great Britain by extending to them the benefits of a much increased preference.

There is another and perhaps a more important reason why we should give an increased preference to the people of Great Britain. At the present time both the public men and the press of the United States are expressing their intention of raising the tariff against commodities manufactured or grown in Canada. Well, if the people of the United States are not anxious to deal with us, then at least we can transfer our trade to those who are willing to trade with us. And Canada has no better customer than Great Britain. Indeed, our Conservative friends have been telling us in season and out of season, in this house and throughout the country, that we are buying many hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of goods from the United States in excess of what we are selling to them. For this reason it is claimed we should erect a barrier whereby the adverse balance of trade will be reduced if not entirely wiped out. If that doctrine of the Conservative party holds good in relation to the United States, then certainly it must hold good in relation to Great Britain. We sell to Great Britain far more than she sells to us. That being the case, I think Great Britain would be justified in complaining against this adverse balance of trade with us just as insistently as hon. members of the Conservative party complain about our adverse balance of trade with the United States. Therefore one means of overcoming that difficulty would be to grant an increased preference to Great Britain. In this way we in turn may become one of the best customers of the mother country.

In this connection, however, I wish to make one statement that I regard as of particular importance. It has been freely stated in the press, without any denial by any member of the government, that Canada might enter into a trade arrangement with the United States by bartering away our rights in the St. Lawrence waterway. I hope and trust that statements of such a character are entirely without any foundation. If we are to negotiate with the United States on matters of tariff, then we must confine the negotiations to tariffs. The waterway question should in no way be made a bargaining point between the two governments. If the United States

wants to use water-powers which may be international in their character, that question must be settled on its merits, and no extraneous question must be allowed to interfere in any such negotiations.

If the United States does not want to deal with the Dominion, then we must find other avenues of commerce. I think my colleague who moved the amendment pointed out one of the avenues of trade now undeveloped is Russia. This country to-day is doing practically no business with Russia; whereas Great Britain, in spite of her diplomatic difficulties with the soviet government has still, I am informed, about twenty-three trade agencies doing business on behalf of the Russian people. Now, Canada has not within its confines one single trade representative of Soviet Russia. I cannot understand why our Minister of Trade and Commerce, who seems so anxious to develop our trade in all parts of the world, has allowed the occasion to slip by of adding a Canadian representative to the British trade delegation which is now visiting Russia.

A moment or two ago, Mr. Speaker, I referred to our trading with the United States. As I said, if the United States is not anxious to trade with us I am not anxious that we should trade with them. On the other hand, I view with considerable misgiving our entry into negotiations with the government of the United States for the joint development of the St. Lawrence waterway. Let me give my reasons for this disquietude. Two years ago, speaking at a banquet of the United Press in New York, the then president of the United States, Mr. Coolidge, made the following significant statement:

> The person and property of a citizen are a part of the general domain of the nation, even when abroad.

One well known citizen of the United States, Mr. Vanderlip by name, commenting on that opinion used some rather caustic language in condemning the speech then delivered by the president of the United States. I should hate to think that where there is United States capital in this country the United States government might claim it to be a part of the United States domain. If that were the case then a great part of Canada would be to-day a portion of the domain of the United States. However, I do not believe that to be the true voice of a very large section of the people of the United States. Nevertheless, when the president of the republic uses language so emphatic, and we witness the subsequent actions of that country in places like Nicaragua, Haiti and elsewhere, we in this country ought to be extremely careful before bartering away any of the rights and heritages we may have in this Dominion. I rather prefer the United States of Abraham Lincoln, as represented by him on many occasions, and perhaps I might be allowed to quote a few sentences of his spoken on one famous occasion when he referred to labour in his country. I much prefer the United States of Abraham Lincoln to the United States of ex-President Coolidge, and as my time has about expired I will conclude by quoting this great American:

> Labour is prior to capital and deserves much the higher consideration. Who and what is labour? You are labour, if you work for a living. You till the soil, you mine the coal, you write the books and spin the yarn. You invent cunning machines, you serve and sell across counters and you build the dwellings of men, all the world over.
>
> In America you are the great majority. All that serves labour serves the nation. All that harms labour is treason to America! No line can be drawn between these two. If any man tells you he loves America yet hates labour, he is a liar. If any man tells you he trusts America, yet fears labour, he is a fool. There is no America without labour, and to fleece the one is to rob the other.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): I desire in the few minutes allotted to me to discuss one essential question and to ascertain in what respect the policy of this government is leading, as I think, to permanent disaster in this country. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) smiles, but I am serious. If I had time I would consider in what the recent prosperity of this country, in 1927 and 1928, largely subsisted. I have taken 100 stocks on the Toronto and Montreal stock exchanges during the year 1927, and allowing for all retrogressions in prices I find that there was a net appreciation in 1927 of $743,302,691; and last year, the calendar year—dealing with 128 stocks, because some others had come into the market—I find that the net appreciation, after allowing for all retrogressions in prices, amounted to $1,033,908,892. So that as regards the credit available to individuals who were engaged in the activities of the stock exchange, they had an appreciation in the two years of $1,787,211,583. They enjoyed a very large measure of prosperity, and "they" included many thousands and even tens of thousands of people throughout the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Hon. gentlemen say, and say truly, that the prosperity of this country depends to a large extent upon the wheat crop of the three prairie provinces. But that appreciation was equal to four times the value of the wheat crop in 1928, which was estimated at $426,-

000,000; and it was equivalent to one and six-tenths of the value of the entire field crops in Canada in the year 1928. You will find that so long as activities of that character prevail there will be on the surface a fictitious prosperity which never reaches the homes of the great body of our citizens.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) has stated the policy of this government to be exclusively—I do not think the word exclusively is a misrepresentation—to devote the activities of that department to find markets abroad for Canadian products, and that policy is to be commended in so far as it deals with the surplus of production in this country. To that end, as he has told us on different occasions, we made a treaty with France in September, 1923. But I find that our exports to France have fallen in the fiscal year 1928 to about $5,000,000 less in value than in 1925. We made a treaty with Italy in January, 1924, and yet I find that our exports to Italy in the fiscal year 1928 were $4,000,000 less in value than in 1927. We made a new treaty with Belgium in October, 1924, and in our fiscal year 1928 we had increased our exports to Belgium by $4,000,000 over our exports in 1925; but that was $2,000,000 less than in 1926 and $550,000 less than in 1927. We made a new treaty with Finland in August, 1925, and I am glad to see that we had increased our exports to Finland by $800,000 in 1928. We made a new treaty with Australia and also gave new trade concessions to New Zealand in 1925, and in the fiscal year 1928 our exports to Australia were less than in 1927 by $4,700,000. Our exports to New Zealand in the fiscal year 1928 were $3,700,000 less than in 1925. We made a new treaty with the British West Indies in 1925, and our exports to these islands in the fiscal year 1928 were only $473,000 more than in 1926. I may say by way of comment that I have visited the British West Indies more times than I can remember, and I went through them with some care about fifteen months ago. So that I know something of local conditions; and while I hope to be disappointed, and while recent arrangements made by this government with the West Indies may be commended as a step on our part towards imperial unity and the assisting of dependent colonies of Great Britain, nevertheless—and I think I am a practical business man—I can see no hope during my lifetime at least for this country receiving any return from that trade, any compensation, adequate to cover the expenses of operation of the new ships costing, I believe, $10,000,000, as I predicted two years ago in a discussion with the Minister of Finance, together with a meagre allowance for depreciation and the annual interest on the capital expenditure. Therefore, while we may be commended for extending a hand to these colonies by reason of our imperial sentiments and our desire to promote and assist colonies of that kind, yet in my opinion we cannot hope for any adequate financial return from that undertaking. If we wish to do anything for the West Indies we must assume control of the administration, placing in charge competent men who will see to it that the productivity of those people is rapidly increased and that they assume a higher standard of living than they have ever enjoyed up to the present time.

British Guiana gave our export trade a preference from March 1, 1927, and our exports to that country for the fiscal year 1928 were $124,000 less than in 1927. We made a new convention with Czecho Slovakia in September of 1926, which was extended in January, 1927, and our exports to that country for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1928, were only $962,000 in excess of our exports for the previous year. I do not disparage these efforts, in many cases futile, on the part of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to extend the foreign and external trade of this country, but it must be remembered that the net result of the intensive activities of this government in negotiating these trade treaties and conventions, on the whole, does not show a very great improvment in our export trade to these several countries, although there may have been some minor increases during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1929. Any slight improvement in our export trade to these countries was only attained by granting very liberal tariff rates on their exports to Canada.

I believe that the whole difficulty is that the Minister of Trade and Commerce and his colleagues on the government benches unfortunately are actuated by the mistaken opinion that the scope of their official duties and responsibilities excludes domestic trade and embraces only the foreign or external trade of this country. Since I have been in this house I have seen no evidence that either the Department of Trade and Commerce, the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture have been actuated by any strong desire—and if they have had the desire they have not exerted the corresponding effort—to increase the domestic productivity of this country upon which its real welfare must always depend. The Minister of Trade and Commerce says that we are represented throughout the world by groups

of trade commissioners as intelligent and aggressive as any country could desire. That is very good; I hope they possess these qualities. I am sorry the minister is not in his seat, because I like to look a man in the face when I ask him questions, but what has his department ever accomplished by way of extending the domestic or internal trade of Canada? What means has he taken to further, even in part, the production in Canada of the $1,220,000,000 worth of commodities which were produced abroad and imported for consumption in Canada during the last calendar year? If the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the staff of officials under his direction should devote their intelligence and their energies to promoting the establishment in Canada of industries which would produce commodities to the value of $500,000,000 of that total of $1,220,000,000 imported, which we could readily produce here but which we now bring in from foreign countries for our domestic consumption, chiefly from the United States, in a few years there would be an increase in employment throughout Canada sufficient to maintain an additional population of at least 1,250,000, and in my opinion, soon Canada would be enjoying increasing industrial activity of every sort and description from the Atlantic to the Pacific. As yet, however, sitting in this house for the last three years, I have never seen evidence of any honest effort on the part of the government, the members of the government or the officials under them to meet and solve this pressing problem of our industrial future. And when I say "industry" I do not mean manufacturing only; I refer to industry of the farms, the fields, the mines and the fisheries as well.

I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce has largely abandoned his real vocation, in devoting the high intelligence which we admit he possesses and the energy of the officials of his department to the extension of our external trade which, under existing conditions, is now of less importance to the general well-being and prosperity of Canada than the internal or domestic trade of the country. In fact, one who attempts intelligently to study the economic conditions of Canada cannot but regret to observe an ever-increasing effort on the part of the government and its supporting public press to overemphasize on all occasions the importance of the increasing foreign trade of Canada. Their arguments, it seems to me, are based on the undoubted fallacy that an increase in foreign trade is always indicative of the increasing general prosperity of the whole country. The real truth is that an increasing import trade often implies a deplorable decrease in domestic productivity and a corresponding decrease in domestic employment. I suggest that the principle which should guide the government and a parliament of this country has been long established by the experience of the most prosperous nations, namely, that the domestic or internal trade of a country is more profitable for the country as a whole and should be first considered, continuously conserved and never sacrificed merely to extend the volume of our foreign trade by unnecessarily increasing the quantity and value of our importations from abroad.

The surplus of our production in Canada over and above the domestic demand, and those foreign commodities for the production of which our own soil, climate and other conditions are unsuited, are the legitimate subjects of foreign trade, but a foreign trade which exceeds these reasonable limitations and sacrifices domestic industry to promote foreign industry is conclusive evidence that the country is not utilizing its own industrial resources and productive activities to the best advantage to its own people. It seems to me that no greater economic fallacy can delude the minds of men than that which measures the general prosperity and industrial welfare of the Canadian people solely or even chiefly by the extent of our foreign commerce, without serious regard, at the same time, as to whether those imports which swell the volume of that foreign trade might not be produced profitably in Canada.

It seems to me that the highest statesmanship of this country should seek to ensure the production in Canada of all commodities which can be produced from our own natural resources or from such raw materials as are readily available for the use of our industries, with as little labour as would be required to produce them in foreign countries and transport them to Canada. Our surplus home products could then be carried to foreign markets to pay for our purchases abroad. Commodities such as iron, steel, woollen, and cotton clothes, hardware and utensils of many kinds and descriptions can be produced in Canada with as little labour as elsewhere. They should be produced here, at least to the extent of our increasing domestic demand for such commodities. It is certainly the duty of Canadian statesmanship to promote such domestic production, primarily for domestic consumption and then any surplus which may be available could be sold for foreign consumption.

If Canada were unable to grow grain the volume of our foreign trade would be greatly increased, to the great disadvantage of this

country. There would be first the necessity of importing grain to feed our own people; and secondly, the necessity of producing in and exporting from Canada a surplus of other commodities wherewith to purchase abroad and pay for the grain so imported. It seems to me that the increase in our foreign trade through the selling abroad of our raw materials, produced here by unskilled labour, in exchange for foreign manufactured commodities, produced by skilled labour, is a menace to the continuing prosperity of this country which should receive the attention of the government. The production by cheap domestic labour of low-priced raw materials for use in foreign factories leaves the producing country impoverisred and compels its skilled labour to seek employment in other countries. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I desire to say that by raw materials I mean those which are subject to further refining processes abroad after they are exported and which refining processes could, under favourable conditions, be effected by skilled labour at home. The exportation of raw materials, produced by cheap labour, is characteristic of a stage of civilization which is but a short advance from barbarism. It results in the slow but sure depletion and exhaustion, without adequate compensation, of the natural resources of the country which so devotes all its energies to encouraging such practices, and it also results in a lack of domestic employment for highly skilled labour which must then emigrate to seek a higher standard of living in other countries.

The people of new and only partially developed countries such as ours, which show the largest relative volume of exports and imports, very rarely enjoy such a considerable measure of comfort and prosperity as is enjoyed by those countries which encourage domestic production to meet the demands of the domestic markets. The motto of always buying where you can buy the cheapest and selling where you can sell the dearest can never form the objective of successful statesmanship in a country such as ours. This country is largely undeveloped and it can only retain the natural increase of its population by creating a diversity of domestic employment. It seems to me that the best interests of Canada can only be fully conserved when each and every citizen shall consider not only his individual welfare, but the welfare of the whole body politic.

The question of cheapness cannot be determined by single transactions, as the apparent interest of an individual purchaser is not always identical with the best interests of the community. The general prosperity of the whole country is expanded as its industrial activities are increased and its sphere of production enlarged and diversified, even though higher money prices are paid from time to time for domestic products over and above the prices which prevail in foreign markets. It is a fundamental law, with casual and special exceptions, that although the Canadian farmer may buy his clothing and other textile products for fewer dollars in England, Belgium or France, he can buy them upon the domestic markets in exchange for fewer bushels of grain or vegetables when their manufacture in Canada is encouraged and facilitated. When the Canadian buys or sells upon the domestic market he saves in a large way the costs of transporting his own products to a foreign market, as well as the costs of bringing the foreign products to the Canadian market. The money price paid is not the only material element in the transaction. The net profit is greater if he sells upon the domestic market a smaller quantity of his own products at a better price.

The prime objective of Canadian statesmanship should ever be to provide increasing, diversified and remunerative employment for our Canadian people. There are commodities such as wheat and pulp and paper which require a special exception. We are producing them in large quantities and the prosperity of this country depends to a large extent upon their continued production and sale abroad. But to devote our entire energies to their production, to the exclusion of encouraging and facilitating a vast number of domestic industries for the production of commodities for consumption at home, is, I think, a fallacy, and will only lead, as I said at the outset, to a deplorable retrogression in the industrial life of this country.

For the great majority of Canadians employment at remunerative wages is the prime necessity. Their continued remunerative employment at home is a matter of paramount economic importance to them and to the nation as a whole. The elevators of this country may be full of wheat, but they offer no relief to idle men and women who are compelled to emigrate to foreign countries to seek the employment which they have failed to find in Canada. The people of Canada are becoming convinced that that economic policy is bad for Canada which tends to deprive them of employment in Canada while opening wide our extensive and profitable Canadian markets to commodities produced by foreign workers.

One can go back and ask the question again: Why should we not produce wool on the

farms in Canada and work it up into cloth in the woollen mills in Canada, instead of sending our raw wools to foreign countries to be worked up into cloth and re-imported to clothe our own people?

Why should we mine raw mineral products in Canada and send them to the United States and other foreign countries to be refined and manufactured into metal products, and thence import manufactured metal products of foreign factories into Canada to supply the demand of our domestic Canadian markets as we are doing?

We must all agree that ever-increasing domestic employment is the only preventive against increasing emigration from Canada, and that increasing domestic employment in Canada is the only incentive to desirable immigration into Canada. Our existing fiscal and economic policies compel our sons and daughters, who have intelligence and education, to seek new homes in the United States, while we expend millions upon immigration to induce unskilled and uneducated immigrants from abroad to undertake for low wages the production of raw materials in Canada for export to more prosperous countries.

The people of Canada are persistently asking in their homes, in their public debates, in their social intercourse: "Why should our sons and daughters be obliged to leave Canada for the United States to earn a living there, while we annually send hundreds of millions of money to pay there for the goods which they produce in the United States, and then sell to their fathers and mothers to be consumed at home?"

It is therefore true, I think, that to the extent that we Canadians import from abroad commodities which, under favourable conditions, could be produced in Canada by our own people, to that extent we impair the available domestic industrial employment of our own people and become more and more dependent upon foreign workers. Every million dollars in value of commodities annually imported, which could under favourable conditions be produced in Canada, deprives Canadians of $1,000,000 of annual revenue. Moreover, when we lose our home market for this million dollars' worth of domestic products, we can be compensated only by opening up new foreign markets for $2,000,000 worth of our own products. We can be compensated for our loss of domestic trade only by obtaining a double equivalent in our foreign or external trade. Therefore, if we purchase abroad $100,000,000 worth of products which have been or could be produced at home, we are not compensated by our sales in a foreign market to the extent of $100,000,000 in value of our own products. To be fully compensated, and to afford equal employment to our own people, we must find additional foreign markets for at least $200,000,000 of Canadian products per annum.

The impressive fact is therefore that whenever we import, instead of producing commodities which may readily be produced in this country, Canada is the loser by the change until our additional exports of our domestic products double the value of the new imports; and this loss to Canada will be decreased only by the percentage that the cost of purchasing and importing the foreign commodity is less than the average price in Canada of the domestic product, which is, in fact, a very small percentage indeed, especially when the contribution which the domestic producers make, as sales taxes, business taxes, income taxes and the like to the public treasury of the country for the purpose of carrying on and maintaining the administration of public affairs, is taken into consideration.

The entire value of any commodity produced in Canada is spent in Canada in its production, and yet ever reappears in the form of a new product. The expenditure of that value in its production not only gives employment in this country to its producers, but also serves to maintain all other classes of workmen and traders throughout the country, by furnishing a demand and market for their other diversified productions, especially for all our farm, dairy, and other food products. The foreign producer bears no part of the burden of maintaining municipal, provincial or federal governments in this country. He makes no contributions to the general development of Canada.

On the other hand, while producing in Canada, the Canadian producer spends in Canada, and yet the thing produced retains its entire value and thereby doubles the economic productivity and the increasing potential wealth of the whole country. The production of goods in Canada for consumption in Canada, instead of the importation of the same goods from foreign countries, for consumption in Canada, affords twice the employment in Canada that is given by the production in Canada of goods to be exported from Canada in exchange for foreign commodities which could be produced in this country. Therefore it seems to me that the government is going on an entirely wrong principle; it is adopting an entirely erroneous policy if it has a view to the permanent welfare and development of Canada and its future industrial and commercial prosperity.

I had intended to show in a brief review conditions which prevail in our trade relations between this country and the United States. The United States, with a total population of nearly twelve and one-half times our own, imports less than twice the amount of fully manufactured goods that are annually imported into Canada. In fact, Canada imported in the fiscal year 1928, $720,090,000 of fully manufactured goods, while the United States imported only $1,312,345,000 of fully manufactured goods, in their fiscal year ending June 30, 1928. If the people of Canada imported fully manufactured goods per capita only in the same proportion as the people of the United States, our annual import of such goods would have been reduced from $720,090,000 in 1928, to about $186,880,000; and we would now be manufacturing annually in Canada $533,200,000 worth of goods which we now import from foreign countries; and we would also be maintaining in Canada, in active employment, at least 300,000 more workmen with families, representing over 1,200,000 more people than we now have in Canada.

Canada's imports for consumption during the calendar year 1928, amounted to $1,222,318,000 or $126.56 per head of our estimated population of 9,658,000. The imports for consumption in the United States in the same calendar year amounted to $4,077,451,000, or less than $34 per head of their estimated population of 120,013,000. And yet there are some people in this house and in this government who seem to be so unsophisticated as to believe that the fact that Canada imports $126.50 per head of our population, as compared with the United States imports of $34 per head, is an evidence of Canada's increasing prosperity as compared with that of the United States. That is the whole burden of one or two of the addresses that I have heard from the opposite benches.

Each family of five in Canada, on the average, pays annually about $632.50 to maintain, clothe and feed the families of the workmen and workwomen of foreign countries, while each similar family in the United States pays only $170 for the same purpose, resulting in a proportionate annual saving for the United States of at least $462.50 for each and every family of five resident in that country.

If we merely maintained workmen in foreign countries in the same proportion as do the people of the United States, we would have had $1,021,000,000 more money annually to distribute in Canada last year for the maintenance of an ever-increasing Canadian population, and this sum of $1,021,000,000 is nearly twice the value of all the grain and grain products exported from Canada during the calendar year ending December 31st last.

I have the figures here of Canada's annual production of both primary and secondary products, as given by the statistical branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce, and it is now approximately $3,600,000,000 annually, or nearly $400 per head of our population, and yet of this $400 per head of the annual revenue of all the people of Canada from all their industrial and other activities, we sent abroad during the calendar year 1928, $126 per head to purchase foreign products; or in other words, we sent abroad nearly one-third of the revenue derived from all the productive activities of Canada to assist in maintaining foreign workmen in foreign countries, and, in particular, we sent abroad nearly 23 per cent of our entire revenues from the aggregate productivities of Canada, to support the industries of the United States.

When you look at the importations from the United States, you find that we spent during the calendar year ending December 31, 1928, in the United States the enormous sum of $826,000,000 to purchase United States products, or more than 67 per cent of our entire importations for the calendar year 1928. How can anyone imagine that we can maintain this country in a happy, prosperous and progressive condition when we send to the United States annually $826,000,000, giving employment to the people of that country to that extent? Is it any wonder that our sons and daughters desert us to engage in the industrial activities of the neighbouring republic?

Mr. GEORGES BOUCHARD (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, as I am the only member of this house who had the good fortune to listen to your lectures at the Sorbonne in Paris, and to witness the increasing interest taken in them by an illustrious audience, I wish to join with the country in extending to you my most hearty congratulations. May I express the hope that this series of lectures, which has deserved the highest praise of outstanding men of letters and of statesmen, be printed for the benefit of those interested in Canadian questions on both sides of the ocean? I am sure that the reading of these lectures will bring to the mind of every Canadian the French saying: "Vous avez bien mérité de la Patrie, Monsieur l'Orateur."

My congratulations naturally go to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) for the encouraging budget which he has introduced in the house this year. A net surplus of approximately $70,000,000, and a substantial reduc-

tion of $25,000,000 in taxation, means something in relieving the people of this country, who, shortly after the present administration took office, had the pleasure of seeing deficits turned into surpluses. However disparagingly the hon. members of the opposition may regard it, I do not see that a reduction of 33⅓ per cent in the sales tax, and the removal of taxation on railway tickets and telegrams, together with a lowering of the tariff, could alarm even the very few who are not directly benefited thereby.

While abroad I was proud to proclaim that Canada, which ranks twenty-seventh in population among the nations of the world, stands fifth in its export trade, which amounted in the year 1928 to $648,000,000.

The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in his able speech was free to admit that "Providence has continued to shower upon the country unbounded prosperity." It is with no little gratification that we on this side of the house, as well as the country at large, realize that Providence has made use of the Liberal party as the medium or agency through which the country has been relieved of the depression caused by the policies of our opponents.

During this budget debate we have not had the explosion of pessimism from hon. gentlemen opposite which has marked previous budgets. With muted strings, this year the opposition strikes the doleful note of "blue ruin." Enlightened by their experience in the past, they know that they cannot delude the country to the extent they delude themselves. There is not a note of political anguish of which our friends opposite are not masters. This year they repeat one after the other that to be wretched is the destiny of the Canadian farmer. The opposition know that their "whisper of death" has not prevented the country from rising to a greater national activity. The mournful warning about the closing of automobile and farm implement factories has not been borne out by the facts.

I read, for instance, in the Montreal Gazette of March 24, 1929:

> For the ten months ending October 31, 1928, the cumulative production of automobiles in Canada was 221,188 cars, having a sales value, f.o.b. plant, of $139,909,876, as compared with 169,331 cars valued at $110,736,126 made during the corresponding period of 1927. The increase this year amounted to 31 per cent in number and 26 per cent in value.

I will quote now from Agricultural and Industrial Progress in Canada, in its issue of February, 1929:

> There is no doubt but that to-day Canada is one of the most fortunately situated countries of the world, enjoying a degree of comfort and prosperity paralleled in few other places. The Dominion has completely recovered from all the effects of the war in more rapid manner than most nations involved, and having made up the distance lost during the period of hostilities, is taking yet more lusty strides upon a broader road leading to a greater destiny than she previously visioned.

I read again from the Montreal Gazette of March 18, 1929:

> Purchasing power of the people of Canada increased by half a billion during 1928,—

And so forth. Here is another quotation of March 23, 1929, from the same paper:

> Canada's foreign trade expanding. Volume nearly 85 per cent greater than at outbreak of war.

In regard to the tariff, the government evidently has not departed from its ordinary course. The Minister of Finance in introducing his fifth budget said:

> The policy of this administration is not a high tariff policy; it is a low tariff policy.

In 1924, under similar circumstances, while the tariff was reduced mainly in relief of four of our basic industries, the Minister of Finance said:

> Of these basic industries I would place agriculture in its various branches first; next to agriculture I would put our forests, our minerals and our fisheries.

Mr. Fielding, when introducing his last budget in 1923, said:

> The tariff as it will be when the changes proposed come into effect will be a moderate tariff, and probably as low as the country can afford to have under present conditions.

The speech of the then acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Guthrie) was, on the contrary, a well-qualified high-protection speech. Certainly his speech was heard with much more pleasure than profit. Its manner is no doubt better than the matter. But high as it may stand in oratory, this speech will, I am sure, have no bearing on the economic life of Canada. May I compare it to a seedless orange? —sweet to swallow, but deprived of all reproductive power. In other words, this speech, so brilliant in form, is frail in the understructure, its foundation being on the quicksand of higher protection. I wonder to what extent the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett), with all his broadmindedness and his keen sense of national responsibility, would like to use his colleague's speech as a lifeboat to keep him safely afloat on the endless sea of golden wheat in the western provinces. This speech, echoed in every corner of the house occupied by the Conservative party, has rekindled the zeal of high tariff worshippers.

I propose to deal particularly with the agricultural side of the policy enunciated by the hon. member for South Wellington and by other hon. members opposite, who repeated the keynote of high protection struck by him as the only solution of the problems which confront the farmer.

When we come to consider the tariff issue in Canada we must bear in mind that high protection is a menace to our farming class, and even to our national unity. There is no country in the world where agriculture is so vital to the national well being as it is to Canada's, and therefore I propose to study the effect of the tariff on our farming class. Public prosperity may be compared to a tree. Agriculture is its root; industry and trade are the branches and leaves. If the root is injured, the leaves fall, the branches break off and the tree dies. Therefore we must look first to the welfare of the root of our national prosperity. It will be generally agreed that we can never do too much for the agricultural class. But is high tariff a solution for any of their problems? I think not.

The prosperity of the United States has been cited as an argument in favour of high protection, and though we cannot deny this prosperity, yet the extent to which American farmers have profited by it may be very much questioned. In spite of the fact that nearly all the protection possible has been given to the American farmer, his present situation does not give him much satisfaction. The cry for relief coming from the farming class of the United States and heard over the border does not speak well for the policy advocated by the members of the opposition. This cry shows at least that if high protection has showered prosperity on the United States, the farmers have benefited by it much less than the other classes of the population. They were far from getting their share of the questionable advantages of that policy.

And if high protection does not properly serve the interests of the agriculturist in the United States, a nearly self-supporting country, how can you logically press it in a country like Canada, which needs outside markets for the greatest bulk of its farm products? In this connection I may be permitted to quote from an article in the Journal of Farm Economics for January, 1928, entitled, Which does Agriculture need—Readjustment or Legislation? It is written by Professor G. F. Warren, of Cornell university. He is a recognized authority on economics. But lest it be objected that he is merely a theorist, I may add that he is also a very successful farmer. He writes:

[Mr. Bouchard.]

Statistical evidence indicates that we are in the eighth year of the most serious agricultural depression ever known in the United States. The depression involves primarily the producers of staple foods.

Throughout the whole article I fail to find any argument in favour of high protection. Evidently he does not think that high protection is the medium by which the farmers of the United States can be relieved. The subject of the article is also discussed by three other well-known professors, and apparently they reach the same conclusion as Professor Warren.

Now coming to the situation among the farmers in the United States, I would refer the house to the Congressional Record of the United States for the year 1928, page 7787. Mr. Blease, by unanimous consent of the senate, put on the record certain excerpts from various publications relating to the subject of farm relief and the farm loan system, and in an editorial appearing in the magazine Cooperation, published by the Cooperative League, New York City, on the question of relieving the farmer, the following comment is made:

Last year 2,000,000 people left the farms in the United States. More than half the population of this country is now living in towns and cities of more than 2,500 population. Only about one-fourth of the people are on the farms. The mortgages on the farms, unlike the people, are steadily increasing. The farms are slipping out of the hands of the farmers. The farmers are slipping away from the farms.

Senator Caraway, speaking in the United States Senate, is reported in the Congressional Record of 1928, at page 3614, as saying:

In 1919 the invested capital in agriculture was more than $79,000,000. In 1926 it had shrunk to less than $59,000,000.

And Mr. Greenwood, on May 24, 1928, is reported in the Congressional Record, House of Representatives, at pages 9736-37 as follows:

During the period of depression . . . 171,000 farms were sold at forced sale. It is estimated that almost 1,000,000 people have been forced to leave the farms because of these sales and failure. It has always been emphatically declared by some political economists that high protective tariff schedules spell prosperity. It is time for the farmer to come out of this deceptive delusion. . . . . Suffice it to say that I am not a free trader, neither do I believe in using the taxing power of the federal government as a means of robbery of the many for the benefit of the few. High tariffs cannot raise the price of commodities of which there is an exportable surplus. . . . . The export price controls the domestic price.

Mr. M. Nelson, of Missouri, on March 2, 1928, is reported in the house Congressional Record as follows:

Hoping to secure first hand information, I have just gone through replies to questions submitted to some 500 Missouri farmers.

Let me quote a few typical answers given to the questions:

Why have so many farmers failed in business since 1920?

Some of the answers given are:

Depletion; slump in the farm values and prices in everything produced on the farm; low buying power of the farmer's dollar; high cost of production; protective tariff; because the tariff cannot be made to do as much for the farmer as for the manufacturer.

And in reply to the question, "Would legislation by congress help the farmer?" some of the answers given are:

Repeal or reduce the tariff, thus placing agriculture and all other industries on the same basis.

Gradually take away protection from the so-called "infant industries" which have grown to be powerful and arrogant.

The final question was:

If not legislative action, what then is the greatest need of farmers?

To this question 26 per cent answered, organization, while 24 per cent replied, co-operation.

Whatever the political expediencies of the United States may be, we find that the leading economists of that country are taking a stand against the principle of high protection, particularly for the farmers. The prevailing, not to say unanimous, opinion is that high protection does not benefit the farmers. In a book written in 1924 by Professors G. F. Warren and F. A. Pearson of Cornell university, entitled The Agricultural Situation, we read at page 293 that the protective tariff in the United States protected only the sheep industry, flax growing and certain varieties of wheat. The protective tariff on other matters is said to have conferred no benefit upon the farmers.

One may read in the Journal of Farm Economics, of January, 1925, the views of Professor Hibbard, of the Agricultural college of Wisconsin. At pages 143-44 this authority writes:

What the situation will be a generation hence we do not know, but at present a tariff on butter and cheese is about as effective as Wonter Van Twiller's campaigns against the Swedes by proclamation. The conclusions, mainly adverse, do not mean that the tariff on dairy products should be repealed. They merely mean that not so much is to be hoped from the tariff on dairy products in the way of relief.

Now I wish to quote from the Gazette, a "low tariff newspaper" published in Montreal, certain views with regard to dairy products. Under date Washington, December 29, 1925, there appears an article under the heading, Cattle Tariff is Declared Futile, and a statement is made by:

Dr. Lynn R. Edminster, of the Institute of Economics, Washington, speaking here to-day at a conference on the tariff question called by the People's Reconstruction League.

The article in question reports this gentleman as follows:

Dr. Edminster believed the present duties, if continued, will gradually tend to raise domestic prices, resulting in substitution of other foods for beef, and cutting of profits to producers. He contended that efforts to stimulate the cattle industry through tariff will impose upon industry, as it now does, a burden which comes from support of general policy of protection in which the cattle man concedes much and gets little in return.

When we come to consider the condition of agriculture in the United States and measures taken for its improvement, we might refer to a report of the Business Men's Commission on Agriculture, published jointly by the National Industrial Conference Board and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, 1927. At page 169, on the question of tariff readjustment, the following appears:

The principal effect of the protective tariff upon the American farmer is to restrict the market for those products of which he produces a surplus above domestic needs. The tariff in agriculture, as in other fields, is a double-edged and dangerous weapon.

Let us turn for a moment to France, another self-reliant country, to find out what the rural economists and the farmers there think about that matter. In his book Economie Rurale, Professor E. Jonzier, at page 74, says:

Waves of protection, having spread over a country, rarely bring about any other effect than the imposing of a tariff duty on all commodities and under such conditions there is no longer protection for anybody or anything.

What do the farmers think about protection, even in France, a self-supporting country? The National Congress of Agriculture in France, which met in 1925 and in 1927, was unanimous in recommending the lowering of the tariff on manufactured products, and an increased tariff for agricultural products was sought only in the event of the tariff on industrial products not being lowered. Just here let me quote a sentence from the Journal d'Agriculture pratique of April 16, 1927:

Agriculture and tariff reforms.

The National Agricultural Congress for the study of the customs' Act, organized by the National Federation of Agricultural Associations, was held on April 11, at Paris, in the Salle des Agriculteurs de France, under the chairmanship of Mr. Jules Gauthier, in the presence of a large number of distinguished guests.

Various recommendations follow, among others, the following:

Lower the duty on industrial products. And to the repeated applause of the entire audience, Mr. Garcin was able to assert that this was the desire of all French farmers who do not belong to the Agrarian party and only claim a moderate protection. If this reduction of duties on industrial products was impossible, then, but then only, the French farming community would request a higher protection on its products.

The farmers, he adds further on, request Parliament to work towards restoring tariff equality by a general increase of duties protecting farming products, if the proposal to lower the duty on industrial products cannot be effected.

In the course of a speech delivered on March 17, 1926, the Marquis of Vogue, speaking of an ex-minister of agriculture in France, said:

Mr. Meline had never erected the protection tariff as a tent for slumbering.

Then he went on to say:

We cannot think for a moment of bottling ourselves at home like in a closed urn: selling abroad or rather bartering our products is of the utmost necessity to us.

If a policy of high protection is declared by the best authorities and by the farmers themselves to be unsuitable for self-contained countries such as the United States and France, how much more so is that the case with regard to Canada, which depends so greatly on export markets? Protection for Canadian farm products can be effective only where no exportable surplus exists, and even then a surplus will be soon created to render protection inefficient. As soon as under-production is turned into over-production the prices fall; the alternation of ups and downs in the prices of produce, which would take place every few years, would discourage the farmers.

In order to present these facts I would ask permission of the house to place on Hansard statements showing first the agricultural and animal products which, according to their origin, do not enter into competition with domestic products, and secondly, agricultural and animal products the production of which considerably exceeds the consumption:

Agricultural and Animal Products which, According to their Origin, do not Enter into Competition with Domestic Products.

	Imports For twelve months ending December, 1928
Fruits, fresh	
Apricots, quinces and nectarines	$ 122,611
Bananas	5,253,414
Grapefruit	969,288
Guavas, mangoes, plantains and pomegranates	14,723
Lemons	1,778,485
Limes	1,639
Oranges	10,748,085
Pineapples	469,331
Other fruits, fresh	6,999,027
Total fruits, fresh	$26,356,603
Fruits, dried	
Currants	$ 829,788
Dates	775,699
Figs	351,618
Other fruits, dried	4,352,039
Total fruits, dried	$6,309,144
Fruits, prepared, n.o.p.	
Total fruits, prepared, n.o.p.	$3,744,380
Fruit juices	
Total fruit juices	$199,932
Nuts	
Total nuts; other nuts, not shelled; other nuts, shelled	$5,315,996
Vegetables, fresh	
Potatoes, sweet	$128,907
Grains	
Rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy	$1,432,073
Rice, cleaned	647,460
Total rice	$2,079,533
Other grains	
Sago and tapioca	$123,925
Oils, vegetable for food	
Total oils, vegetable, for food	$1,060,129
Sugar and its products	
Total sugar and its products	$34,466,567
Tea, coffee, cocoa and spices	
Total tea	$12,325,650
Total coffee and chicory	6,825,629
Total spices	1,628,329
Total cocoa and chocolate	4,223,421
Total tea, coffee, cocoa and spices	$25,003,029
Beverages, alcoholic	
Total distilled beverages	$43,898,992
Total wines	3,440,933
Other beverages, alcoholic	507,895
Total beverages, alcoholic	$47,847,820
Gums and resins	
Total gums and resins	$3,283,802
Oils, vegetable, not food	
Total oils, vegetable, not food	$9,923,214
Rubber and its products	
Total rubber and its products	$23,611,543
Bone, iovry and shell products	
Total bone, ivory and shell products	$518,965
Total	$189,973,489

Agricultural and Animal Products, the Production of Which Considerably Exceeds the Consumption.

	Production For year 1928	Imports For twelve months ending Dec. 1928	Exports For twelve months ending Dec. 1928
Grains			
Barley	$ 76,112,000	(n.o.p.) $ 2,648	$ 26,584,465
Oats	210,956,000	1,637,555	10,335,193
Wheat	426,013,000	140,039	433,767,578
Buckwheat	10,128,000	13,873	336,888
Peas, whole	4,786,000	(n.o.p.) 128,968	296,588
Rye	11,491,000	116,882	11,350,170
Other grains	360,295,000	16,554,154	615,804
Total grains	$1,099,781,000	$18,594,119 (Beans, corn and rice included)	$483,286,686
Milled products			
Total milled products		$ 1,217,702	$71,134,868
Vegetable products, n.o.p.			
Hay		$ 106,482	$ 1,285,960
Animals, living			
Total animals, living, less animals for exhibition purposes		$ 3,147,632	$17,098,988
Fishery products			
Total fish, fresh or frozen		$ 909,092	$10,927,370
Total fish, dried, salted, smoked or pickled		$ 942,739	$10,514,680
Total fish, preserved or canned, n.o.p.		$ 1,473,348	$13,517,079
Other fish products		221,127	1,329,107
Total fishery products, n.o.p.		$ 3,546,906	$36,288,236
Furs			
Total furs		$16,744,956	$23,593,997
Meats			
Total meats		$ 5,391,288	$20,244,718
Milk and its products			
Total milk and its products, (1928)	253,736,605	$ 6,580,915	$36,230,617
Seeds			
Total seeds, (1928)	14,983,940	$ 2,167,819	$ 7,955,353

We also have a class of other agricultural or animal products, manufactured or partly manufactured, which is practically of no interest to the farmer:

Fruits, prepared and jellies		
Total fruits, prepared, n.o.p. and jellies	$ 3,744,380	$ 664,031
Prepared foods and bakery products		
Total prepared foods and bakery products	$ 1,547,926	$ 2,609,693
Oil cake and meal		
Total oil cake and meal	$ 334,267	$ 1,059,978
Hides and leather		
Total hides and skins	$14,750,106	$11,530,456
Total leather unmanufactured	6,293,559	10,926,870
Total leather manufactured	4,902,774	1,044,604
Total hides and leather	$25,946,439	$23,501,930
Oils, fats, greases and waxes		
Total oils, fats, greases and waxes	$ 1,896,816	$ 2,533,252

When we are asked to increase the duty on butter, cheese and eggs, we should remember that during the calendar year 1928 we exported 140,000,000 pounds of cheese as against our exports of 100,000,000 pounds of cheese during the previous year, but before discussing the Australian treaty I would like to consider for a few moments the opinions of the farmers themselves. I have in my hand the report of a delegation from the Canadian Council of Agriculture which came to Ottawa on April 2, 1924, from which I will read one sentence:

The need for immediate and substanial reductions in the customs tariff as a measure of relief to the agricultural industry . . . .

Mr. GOTT: What date was that?

Mr. BOUCHARD: April 2, 1924. The following comment was made at the twentieth annual meeting of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, held in Winnipeg on February 25, 1929:

Canadian farmers should be warned insistently against the danger of allowing themselves to be drawn into the vicious circle of protectionism. The farmers of the United States have listened to the specious plea that agriculture is entitled to receive the same protection as is accorded to other industries. Equal protection for all industries is impossible of attainment. It would, in fact, mean that none of them were protected. By an endeavour to share in the alleged benefits of protection the Canadian farmers must inevitably be the losers.

I would like to quote the remarks of two of the leading rural economists of the province of Quebec. In 1927 Professor Bois of the agricultural college at Oka said:

We levy, he says, a tax on goods which we wish to keep out of the country. But why and how are we to protect by means of the tariff a system of agriculture organized especially with a view to exportation?

We sell our butter and cheese to England and on foreign markets: how can we expect that a customs tariff will improve our situation?

The tariff is an excellent measure, inasmuch as it helps to develop the necessary industries which are too weak at the outset to compete with the older and more firmly established foreign industries, however, we must acknowledge that the tariff has also had the effect of allowing artificial industries to establish and maintain themselves in the country: we must also acknowledge that the tariff has had the effect of maintaining the high cost of living.

And so forth.

The tariff, however—

We shall return to this subject later on.

—perhaps may be of some benefit to the vegetable growers or market-gardeners. Here again, we must not exaggerate but remember two things: that in the country, there also exists both an urban and farming class and that the former is equally entitled to be treated as fairly as the latter. Excesses are detrimental to all.

Professor Charles Gagné, of the agricultural college at Sainte-Anne de la Pocatiere said:

To the question: Have our farmers an interest in claiming protection for their products? he answers: On the whole, we do not think so.

He bases his opinion on the two following reasons: A protective tariff, he maintains, can at the most but relieve temporarily the market on some of our farming products.

Everybody is aware, he states, that Canada exports more than it imports of these products; this simply means that the price is fixed abroad and not in this country. Therefore placing a protective duty, on products entering this country and of which we export a surplus can in no way be effective. The Americans or at least their economists realize now that protection is useless for the products of which they export a surplus.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): Mr. Speaker, I feel sure the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Bouchard) will pardon me if I do not follow him in the various recitations which he quoted from different articles in opposition to a tariff for farm protection. His remarks might be effective here but they certainly would not be across the line. The American farmer knows what he wants and he knows what he is after. He wants higher protection, and any argument put forward by the hon. member against that protection would have no effect so far as the United States is concerned.

For many years the annual presentation of the budget was looked forward to in all parts of Canada. The people were anxious to learn to what degree they would be relieved of the burden of taxation, or of other burdensome conditions which might apply with regard to their business or calling. After several years of disappointment that interest has died out and the present budget has practically passed unnoticed throughout the country.

We have heard a lot regarding the prosperity of Canada, and we on this side of the house rejoice in any measure of prosperity which there might be. But this prosperity should be general all over the country, and it is the duty of the government to do everything possible to remedy any condition which oppresses any section of Canada or any class of our people, whatever their calling or trade may be. Thanks to Providence, we have had large crops in most parts of Canada, but in many cases the crops have not been profitable to the farmer and the

chief benefactor has been the transportation company. The mining industry has had a very good year, and the increased valuation of some of our mining stocks, as well as some of our other stocks, has had a great deal to do with the apparent prosperity.

Mr. DUNNING: They have gone down as well.

Mr. ARTHURS: They are still much higher than they were. After a slight set back, our pulp and paper industry is progressing and is giving employment, directly and indirectly, to a large number of people. But these three industries, agriculture, mining and paper, are to a large extent independent and are not controlled by this government or its lack of policy. This would also apply to the tourist trade, which has been growing year by year and is at present one of the most important assets of this country.

The exception to this rule is the agricultural industry, especially the fruit, vegetable and dairy sections. They have been asking in vain for protection in their home market, but owing to the opposition of certain members to the right of the gentlemen opposite, whose support is very necessary to the government, although their appeals have been heard they have passed unheeded. Every year we see more of our factories and workshops closed owing to the lack of fair protection against the products of cheaper labour and the competition of others who, after supplying their own markets, are allowed to bring in or dump their surplus stock upon the Canadian market. No new factories are being built in our smaller towns because it is impossible to get men to invest where our own markets are not assured and where a neighbouring country can and does raise its tariff overnight when we commence to export any article which can be profitably produced there. It is very hard to believe that this country is prosperous when we see the large number of factories in our smaller towns and cities which have been closed. Those factories were once busy, but the workmen who were employed there have mostly followed the industry which is now located outside of Canada. The result has been a loss of population in the towns and cities and the placing of a greater tax burden upon those who have remained.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb), and other speakers on his side of the house, boasted that there had been a surplus and a reduction in the debt, but they did not say that this was owing solely to increased taxation. The government collected more from the people this year than ever before, even during or subsequent to the war, and almost all by taxation. A comparison of some of the figures will be very interesting. According to the Minister of Finance the income from taxation, leaving aside all other sources of ordinary revenue, will be $391,050,000 for 1928-29 as compared with $319,926,013 in 1922, the last year for which the Conservative party was responsible. Taking the year 1921-22 as a basis, we find that during the six-year period before and including 1922 we collected $525,808,963 in war taxes. This does not include customs duties. During the next six years following 1922 we collected $974,-618,136. In other words, during the war and up to and including 1922 we collected on an average $87,634,823 per annum, but after the war, from 1923 to 1928, we collected on an average $162,436,356 per annum. Thus after the war was over and after our expenditures for the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, hospitalization, physical training, war gratuities, and so forth, were practically over, war taxes nearly doubled; they increased on an average $75,000,000 per annum. This means an increase of $8 per capita, or $40 per family per annum, while the minister has been telling parliament year by year that he is reducing taxation by $25,000,000 or $30,000,000.

We also had a sales tax in 1921 and 1922, the average receipts for those two years being $49,818,907. But after the present government came into power this tax was doubled, and during its six fiscal years, 1923 to 1928, the average was $89,534,934, or an increase of over $4 per capita for every man, woman and child in Canada per annum on the sales tax alone.

Let us consider our customs tax, which is the bête noire of our Progressive friends. Our receipts in 1922 amounted to $105,686,645, while our receipts in 1928-29 will be more than $185,000,000. If the argument put forward by our Progressive friends were sound, that for every dollar collected by the government three dollars were collected by the manufacturers, we must be in very bad shape, because no such collection has ever before been made in Canada, even in war time. But the real reason for the increase in the customs is that by the steady withdrawal of the necessary protection but the retention of a duty, our factories have been closed and the goods that were previously made in them are being imported. There has been no reduction but rather, in many cases, an increase in price to the ultimate buyer while our factories are closed and our workers are out of employment.

We all know that the price of agricultural machinery has increased: that the farmer is paying more for his machines than he did under higher protection. But the speech of the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Fansher) shows another feature of our trade troubles. As reported on page 827 of Hansard he was asked:

Mr. Stirling: Is this machine made in Canada at all?

Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain): To the best of my knowledge these machines are not made in Canada. I understand that the Massey-Harris Company have been manufacturing them in the United States and shipping them across the line.

What an object lesson: A great Canadian company, one of the largest in the world, once entirely Canadian, manufacturing in the United States machinery for use in Canada instead of manufacturing it in Canada as it should be. There is no reduction, but rather an increase in price. The real reason for all these troubles is that this government is kept in power by a certain group whose doctrine is free trade and whose slogan is: "Any tax is a good tax if taken from the central provinces of Ontario and Quebec," as 80 to 90 per cent of the taxes are. But the farmers of Ontario or of Quebec who face ruin owing to the importation of vegetables or fruit at dumping prices or the workmen in either of these provinces or elsewhere who find their employment gone, cannot find much consolation in the quotation: "For he that hath to him shall be given: and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath."

The Minister of Finance and other speakers have dwelt upon the reduction of our debt, but with the vastly increased taxation the reduction should have been much more. In 1913 the total receipts of the government of the day amounted in round figures to $168,690,000, and even then the debt was reduced by $25,617,000. In 1928 the total receipts were $429,642,000 and the debt was reduced by $50,984,000. In other words, the receipts for 1928 were $261,000,000 more than they were in 1913. At page 619 of Hansard the minister gives a list of expenditures due to war for this year amounting to $162,911,000. The excess of receipts for last year over those of 1913 would pay that and leave over $68,000,000 to add to the reduction of 1913, so that the reduction last year, even admitting for the sake of argument that, as stated, all the increased expenditure was due to the war, should, on the same basis, have been $93,000,000. But the minister is not correct in stating that there is an increase of $162,911,000 due to the war. He charges to the war the interest on all the increase in the public debt since 1914, and that is unfair. Between 1914 and 1927 very large sums were voted for our railways for betterments and in order to save them from bankruptcy. I have under my hand only the figures from 1920 to 1927 inclusive, but during these years we made cash payments to the railways of $367,791,580 and, in addition, large sums were given as subsidies to railways. The figures are as follows:

Calendar year	Payments in cash from Dominion government (by fiscal years)
1920	$123,590,232
1921	105,623,699
1922	84,932,579
1923	23,710,617
1924	9,934,453
1925	10,000,000
1926	10,000,000

There was nothing in the fiscal year 1927-28. As a matter of fact, none of these payments should be charged to the war. It was absolutely essential that they should have been made in any event, and the increased debt to that extent should not be charged against the war.

Our friends opposite, in boasting about the reduction in debt, should remember that they have received large payments by way of reparations, repayments and so forth, every dollar of which should have been applied directly to the reduction of the debt which was contracted in that regard.

Mr. BENNETT: Or paying reparations.

Mr. ARTHURS: These payments were as follows:

1922	
Reparations	$6,314,500
1923	
Imperial government exchange.	8,199,333
1924	
Imperial government exchange.	632,500
Redemption of bonds	8,305,760
1925	
German reparations	659,311
Payment by Greece	479,526
Payment by Roumania	3,520,636
1926	
German reparations	1,593,503
1927	
German reparations	1,756,704
1928	
German reparations	6,791,479
Housing	9,768,440
Repayment of loan by Belgium.	4,528,336
Repayment of loan by Greece.	195,000

From 1922 up to the present time there has been received by way of reparations and repayments of loans, $52,745,000, every dollar of which should have gone directly towards the reduction of the debt. In addition we have received very large sums by way of repayment of soldier settlement board loans, for which there is no account in the Auditor General's report.

So far as expenditures are concerned, some are warranted and others are not. The payment of about $3,000,000 to reduce maritime freight rates is justified, but if we continue to meet out of the public treasury the deficits on the eastern branches of the Canadian National Railway these deficits are apt not only to occur regularly, but to increase, especially in the case of the newly acquired lines. I am firmly of opinion that these deficits should be a part of the ordinary business administration of the Canadian National Railway, and should not be chargeable directly to the people of Canada.

Our grants to the provinces for old age pensions are necessary, but I still think, as I said at the time the act was passed, that this Dominion should have assumed the whole burden, and in that way we would not have two sets of overhead expenses. It would also have resulted in a uniform law, and the poor and aged could then get a pension, when otherwise entitled, without regard to residence in any particular province.

The payment of $2,190,000 to the Federal District Commission, largely for the improvement of certain small squares in Ottawa, cannot be justified, at least at the present time.

We are all anxious to do what we can to build up Canada and Canadian trade, but there is a vast difference between giving, not loaning, $2,873,000 to Quebec harbour, and spending $1,000,000 to cover deficits of the Canadian government merchant marine. The Canadian government merchant marine is exploring new channels of trade, and has been very successful in that work until other steamship lines have been prepared to supply the service. The sum is small compared with the subsidies which have been granted by the United States under the camouflage of mail subsidies.

The tariff changes proposed in this budget are very slight and will not affect the ordinary man to any considerable extent. This is also true of the proposed war tax reductions, which are all in favour of the wealthy man and the larger corporations.

The small reduction in the tax on railway tickets and the large reduction in the tax on sleeping and parlour car tickets are both direct benefits to those who can best afford to travel. The man on the farm or the workingman may save 3 cents a year on the average, but the brokers, the banks and the large companies will get the greatest benefit from the removal of the tax on telegrams and cable messages.

The sales tax, which should have been abolished long ago because it is paid by the poor man, has been reduced by one cent on the dollar. This reduction is so small that it cannot be passed on to the consumer, and it will benefit only the middleman. This tax should now be entirely abolished, in which case the consumer would receive the benefit of approximately 5 cents on the dollar in the purchase of all articles which are affected by the tax.

Another instance of how this government taxes the poor man and relieves the rich is shown by the tax on the transfer of stock shares. The minister proposes a tax of one cent per share on stocks up to the value of $3. The minister knows as well as I do that there are no $3 stocks on the market of a par value of $3. All these shares that are below $5 or $10 are $1 stocks. The minister knows also that the great majority of these stocks are sold below an average price of 40 cents, but if we take the average at even 50 cents a share, the tax amounts to 2 per cent on each transfer. I might add that many of the best mines we have in Canada had their stock placed on the market in the first place at around 10 cents per share, stock today which is very, very valuable. It is almost impossible to float a company with the stock placed at a very high figure. Every mining company requires capital for its initial operations, and the stock must be issued at a low price. On the other hand, if the tax upon $100 shares, the average price of which would run up to $200, were on the same basis of 2 per cent, the $100 shares would be taxed $2 per share, whereas the minister proposes to collect only 4 cents on each transfer of these shares. The thing is absolutely absurd. The minister is proposing to tax the lower priced stocks from fifty to one hundred times as much of their market value as he taxes the higher priced issues.

A short time ago a friend of mine read to me a parody on a great poem, which I think is quite pertinent. You all remember that verse of Longfellow's Psalm of Life:

> Lives of great men all remind us
> We can make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, leave behind us
> Footprints on the sands of time.

My friend's parody reads:

> All King budgets tell our workers,
> They should work at every chance,
> But each year they wear behind them
> Larger patches on their pants.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

THE BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CANADA

The house in committee on Bill No. 20, respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada—Mr. Edwards (Ottawa)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Power to increase capital.

Mr. DUNNING: Section 1 as amended, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY COMPANY

The house in committee on Bill No. 62, respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company—Mr. Dickie—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Extension of time for completion.

Mr. DUNNING: This bill has been amended.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, it has been amended in committee, and section 1 now reads:

1. The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, hereinafter called "the company", may within five years after the passing of this act complete and put in operation the line of railway which it was authorized to construct by section two of chapter eighty-three of the statutes of 1919, as amended by section one of chapter eighty of the statutes of 1924, namely: —from a point between Port Alberni and Bainbridge on the company's railway from Parksville Junction to Port Alberni, thence in a northwesterly direction, via Great Central lake and the valley of the Ash river, to Comox lake; and, if the said line of railway is not so completed and put in operation within the said period, the powers of construction conferred upon the company by parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said line of railway as then remains uncompleted.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, I gave notice on the order paper of some amendments which I proposed to move either at this stage or at the third reading. The amendments were for the purpose of putting into effect certain suggestions I made on the second reading to render the bill a more workable one, and to provide for a better guarantee of the early completion of the work authorized. My suggestions were couched in temperate language and were made in a spirit of helpful, constructive criticism. At the time I asked the hon. member in charge of the bill (Mr. Dickie) to convey those suggestions to the promoters. To my surprise I found myself the object of immediate attack by hon. gentlemen opposite, as the house may recall. They accused me of an endeavour to prevent the building of this railway.

Mr. BENNETT: The word "attack" is not parliamentary.

Mr. NEILL: Also I was accused of making misrepresentations. Further, I was accused of baiting the corporation for political effect. These charges were made at a time when it was impossible for me to reply to them. But I do not feel called upon to do so now when I have the opportunity. Considering the source from which those charges emanate, I think they are more amusing than important. It was the same hon. gentleman a few years ago who told a committee of this house that I represented four thousand bolsheviks. Perhaps to his mind I did, because his idea of a bolshevik is somebody who differs from him in political opinions. However, I do not propose to be too hard on the hon. member. We must remember it is as natural for human nature to be true to type, as it is natural for water to run down hill. There is a certain form of mentality, Mr. Chairman, which at the first hint of opposition, or even of expression of a divergence of opinion from its own, throws reason to the winds, forgets logic and resorts to personalities rather than argument. That apparently is what happened in this case. I do not propose to reply in kind to the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie). I prefer to preserve the dignity of debate; and besides, no one has yet discovered a method of throwing political mud without dirtying his own hands. I prefer to leave the hon. member in that position, to derive what sordid satisfaction he can from the methods he pursued on that occasion.

But, Mr. Chairman, I will answer the whole of the charges by putting forward a question. Did you ever hear of a member of parliament opposing the bona fide construction of a railroad within his riding when the promoting company was the only company that could reasonably undertake the work, when the railway was much needed for the development of a large area, and when it meant the expenditure of three or four million dollars in his constituency? I think the answer to this question is the answer to the charges to which I have referred.

Now, sir, finding I could get no sympathy from the hon. member who was endorsing the

bill, and who would not even consent to hand on my representations to the promoters —a courtesy I never saw refused in this house before—I took my courage into my own hands and approached them myself. I found them, as I expected, men of broad vision, men of affairs, and entertaining no idea of opposition because I happened to have ideas different to theirs, and certainly not the class of men to allow themselves to be baited by me or anybody else. The result of the little conference we had was that they agreed to introduce and did introduce into the bill in the railway committee certain amendments which gave me nearly all that I suggested on the second reading. They did not give me all I wanted—I never expect to get all I want or deserve for my constituents; we shall not get that until perhaps we reach a happier sphere. However, there is sufficient to justify me in saying that the bill is much improved and that there are better prospects of an early commencement and completion of the work. In other words, it is a reasonably fair compromise and enables me to accept it on behalf of my constituents. I therefore will not move the amendments I had intended submitting. I wish the bill godspeed in the hope that it will result in a reasonably early construction of this railway, which will do a good deal to develop an important part of my riding. This is something we shall all appreciate.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 78, respecting a certain patent of Zebulum Colvin Ketchum.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 79, respecting a certain patent of Jean Baptiste Hurteau.—Mr. Duff.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 83, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Totzke.

Bill No. 84, to incorporate The Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada.—Mr. Young (Saskatoon).

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Finance) for committee of ways and means, the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Guthrie, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of Mr. Spencer.

Mr. ARTHURS: In representing one department of this government as more inefficient than another, I cite the Department of Immigration. I have no desire to attack any particular officials of that department; individually they are hard working men. But without proper direction, and without any settled plan or policy, they are helpless and the results are most deplorable. The people of Canada are aware of this and are demanding some real results from the large expenditure on immigration.

This year's estimates provide, in this connection, for $5,162,900, apportioned as follows: Immigration, $3,462,900; Land Settlement Board, $1,400,000; health branch in connection with immigration, $300,000. This does not include upkeep or rental of offices and buildings or of quarantine, or what may be in the supplementary estimates, nor does it include the very large sums spent annually by the Canadian National Railways and by the Canadian Pacific Railway, amounting to approximately $1,500,000; neither does it refer to the amount expended by certain of our provinces who maintain their own immigration officials. It does not cover the cost to and the labour of various charitable and religious organizations which have operated so successfully in past years.

The Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) claims credit for every immigrant brought over to this country or coming of his own accord. Let us see what the situation is. According to the government report, from 1910 to 1920, which included four war years, our immigration was as follows:

British	687,215
United States	821,490
European	466,738
Total	1,975,443
Average per year	197,544

During the next period, from 1920-21 to 1924-25, our immigration was as follows:

British	273,887
United States	135,750
European	161,648
Total	571,285

Thus it will be seen that during this period approximately one-half the immigrants entering Canada were British. During the following year, 1925-26, the immigration was as follows:

British	37,030
United States	18,778
European	40,256
Total	96,064

In other words, the immigration from European countries was much greater than

the British immigration, for the first time. During the following year, 1926-27, the immigration was as follows:

British	49,784
United States	21,025
European	73,182
Total	143,991

During that year the immigration from European countries was greater than the combined British and United States immigration. Then we take the last year for which we have a record, 1927-28, and we find the following figures:

British	50,872
United States	25,007
European	75,718
Total	151,597

Again the European immigration is equal to the combined British and United States immigration. We must also remember that the immigration to Canada from the United States is not composed entirely of Americans; the great majority of the people coming to this country from the United States are classed as aliens in that country. The United States Labour department returns for 1928 show that of the 25,007 people who left the United States for Canada 14,797 were aliens passing through the United States to this country. Thus we see that although we have spent millions of dollars more each year we are getting less immigrants and a lower proportion of British and United States citizens.

According to the returns of the United States Labour department 673,683 Canadians entered that country as immigrants during the last six years, and our returns show that over the same period we brought into Canada from all countries approximately the same number. The United States returns are for native Canadians, born in this country, fit physically and not criminals, so really we are expending over $5,000,000 a year in immigration in order to substitute for an average of 110,000 good Canadians an equal number of immigrants most of whom do not speak our language or understand our laws. I have nothing to say against any immigrant who comes to Canada to make a home for himself, but no matter how good he may be he cannot be as valuable to this country as one of our own young men, thousands of whom are still leaving our land through lack of employment caused by the neglect of this government. What this country needs is a policy which will tend to have our raw materials manufactured at home; we should keep our home markets for Canadian farm products and natural manufactures, thus giving employment to Canadians in Canada and making room for the proper class of immigrants from other countries, especially from Great Britain.

A few days ago I read a very illuminating editorial in the leading Liberal newspaper of Ontario, the Toronto Globe. This editorial deals with immigration. I am not going to weary the house by reading it all, since it occupies over a column of space, but I would like to read just a couple of short sentences:

> If Hon. Robert Forke's speech in the House of Commons on Friday is to be regarded as a major attempt at placing the immigration situation before the public, it must be considered as an unqualified disappointment. It carried too many alibi earmarks, found too many excuses and obstacles for which no solutions were offered, while it lacked the clear, ringing note in behalf of British immigration which the country has a right to look for, in view of the many professions of recent months that Canada wanted British blood and was prepared to use every effort to get it.

Further on the editorial continues:

> Has the trepidation of government supporters, depending upon the foreign vote for their seats, caused the minister to waver? His own loyalty to the British principle has not been questioned. Something must have happened to cause him to weigh the subject as he did with such evident desire to placate discontented interests.

That editorial appears in the Toronto Globe of March 18, 1929. This government has had over seven years in which to forward the policy which I have enunciated, that of manufacturing our own goods at home, but they have utterly failed in their task and conditions in Canada are worse so far as the working man or the farmer is concerned.

There is a motion on the order paper in the name of the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans), and although we cannot discuss it at present I wish to read it to the house:

> Whereas the Board of Grain Commissioners have failed in the administration of the Canada Grain Act, and particularly the so-called Campbell amendment; and,
>
> Whereas as a consequence there is widespread distrust of this body among the farmers of the western provinces;
>
> Therefore be it resolved that, in the opinion of this house, the members of the present board should be dismissed forthwith and a new board appointed.

If we substitute the words "government of Canada" for the words "Board of Grain Commissioners" and make a few corresponding changes, the resolution then would read as follows:

> Whereas the government of Canada have failed in the administration of Canada; and,

Whereas as a consequence there is widespread distrust of this body among the farmers and working men of the provinces;

Therefore be it resolved that, in the opinion of this house, the members of the present government should be dismissed forthwith and a new government substituted therefor.

I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that this amended resolution would receive the approval of the great majority of the electors of this country.

Mr. THOMAS McMILLAN (South Huron): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the leaders of the Conservative party have once more pinned their faith to a policy of high protection, and in view of the further fact that when my time was called on the evening of March 11 I had just entered into a discussion of the conditions prevailing in Canada during the latter part of 1920, as they related to sugar, I propose to continue my argument at this time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will confine his remarks to the subamendment.

Mr. McMILLAN: I intend to speak on the subamendment. In view of all that has been said, and in view of the fact that they have been preaching their policy of high protection, I propose to show just what effect high protection had upon the price of sugar during the year 1920. At that time the refiners, evidently believing that the price of sugar would continue high for many months, made large purchases of raw sugar with the expectation of further profits. But for once they were mistaken. American sugar took a sudden drop and it began to flow into Canada at greatly reduced prices. The refiners became alarmed, they appealed to the government for assistance, and the members of the cabinet evidently decided that an avalanche of cheaper sugar coming into the homes of the Canadian people must be prevented at all costs. They became alarmed lest perchance some of our boys and girls might get a teaspoonful of cheap sugar and, in Scottish parlance, it might "pushion" them, so they at once invoked the dumping clause of the customs tariff, which had been devised for a very different purpose. Penalties were levied upon several consignments of imported sugar, but still the inflow of sugar continued. The government brought the board of commerce, which they had appointed, into operation. It made the amazing order of entirely prohibiting the importation of American sugar for the time being, and set a price of 21 cents per pound for Canada when sugar was selling at 12 cents per pound in the city of Detroit. Does anyone think that that board of paid civil servants would have made any such order had they not been coached by someone higher up, someone in sympathy with the refineries? But tremendous protests arose, in which even the government press joined, the government itself took fright, suspended the order, attempted to disavow all previous knowledge of it, laid the entire responsibility upon the hapless board of commerce, and set October 20, 1920, as a date for hearing the appeals of those who had appealed against that particular order. What were the facts? If we consult the press reports of that day we will find that—

Mr. BENNETT: It is perfectly obvious that the remarks of the hon. member have nothing to do with the subamendment.

Mr. CAHILL: The remarks of the previous speaker had nothing to do with the subamendment.

Mr. BENNETT: He spoke on the main motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled that where an amendment is moved to a main motion, and then a subamendment is moved, hon. members are entitled to speak on each separate amendment as if it were a distinct motion by itself. In fact, all the authorities say that it is a motion by itself, but they also state that when an hon. member speaks for the second time on one of the amendments he must speak on that very amendment and not refer to any other matter. The main motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) is:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of ways and means.

Mr. Guthrie, seconded by Sir George Perley, moved an amendment thereto. Then Mr. Spencer, seconded by Mr. Irvine, moved an amendment to the amendment as follows:

That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after "house" and substituting therefor the following:

"urges upon the government the consideration of an immediate and substantial increase of the British preference as a step towards freer trade relations between Canada and other nations."

The hon. member spoke upon the amendment. He is now speaking for the second time, upon the subamendment, and his remarks should be confined to that particular subject.

Mr. DUNNING: The phrase "as a step towards freer trade relations" appears in the subamendment, and I would gather from the remarks of the hon. member that he is advocating that freer trade.

Mr. McMILLAN: I assure Your Honour that I will respect your ruling, as I must do, but I desire to make it very plain that the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer) is in the direction of freer trade relations and has a very particular bearing upon the requirements of household life. Sugar is one of the things which is used in every household, and before continuing my argument along this line I will address myself particularly to the subamendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) must obey the ruling of the Chair. The only question which he has discussed since commencing his remarks has been the importation of sugar from the United States. The subamendment deals with the enlargement or the increase of the British preference; he has not discussed that at all. The hon. member is simply playing with a ruling of the Chair, and he should be stopped.

Mr. CANNON: Without discussing the ruling which His Honour has just given, in fairness to all members of the house I would point out that if a strict interpretation of the rules of the house is given it should apply not only now, but later on in this debate when the subamendment is disposed of. I understand that the members who have not spoken already will be allowed to speak on the main motion, the amendment and the subamendment. What position will they be in when the subamendment is disposed of and they are allowed to speak again?

Mr. BENNETT: They must be limited.

Mr. CANNON: If they have not spoken on the main motion and the amendment, what position will they be in when the subamendment has been disposed of?

Mr. BENNETT: They can no longer speak.

Mr. CANNON: Certainly they can speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. Last year I gave a ruling on the question whether an hon. member could speak on the amendment and the subamendment. I ruled that members could speak on each, confining their remarks to the subject matter. My ruling was appealed from and sustained by the house, but I was not satisfied with that. I instructed the Clerk of the house to write to Mr. Webster, Clerk of the House of Commons in England, in order to find out exactly his views on the subject. By leave of the house I might read what he wrote in reply; it will answer the question which is now put. The letter is as follows:

28th March, 1928.

Dear Mr. Beauchesne:

Your letter of the sixteenth March reached me this morning. The decision referred to is certainly in accordance with practice here. After an amendment has been moved and seconded, the question on the amendment is proposed, and any member who speaks after that question has been proposed speaks to it and not to the main question. When the amendment has been disposed of and the main question is again proposed, any member can speak who has not already spoken on the main question, whether he spoke on the amendment or not. The mover and seconder of the amendment having spoken to the main question cannot speak again to it. The same rule applies of course to the case of an amendment to an amendment. The mover and seconder of an amendment are not penalized as compared with other members, because they speak both to the main question and the amendment which they are moving or seconding, in one speech. Briefly if there are three questions, members can make three speeches.

Yours very truly,

T. Lonsdale Webster.

So that every member can speak on each amendment, but it goes without saying that the speech must be relevant to that amendment. Otherwise we would start a new discussion covering the main motion, the amendment and the subamendment.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, you will perhaps recall—your last observation directs attention to it—that on the question of relevancy the speaker's attention must be directed to the subamendment or the amendment under consideration, and it is clear that when a member speaks to the amendment and the main motion in one speech, and he does not reserve his right to speak on the main motion but makes his speech in terms referable alike to the amendment and the main motion, he is exhausting or should at any rate be held to be exhausting his right to speak in the debate. But if he is to speak two or three times he should at least direct his remarks positively to the subject matter of the question then before the house, which question is, in the first instance, the subamendment, in the second, the amendment, and, in the third, the main motion itself. There is no doubt about that in the world.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. gentleman to direct his remarks to the subamendment itself. Of course the question of amendments and main motion is very involved

but if we do not want to make chaos of the whole debate, hon. members must support the Chair in the principle that on each amendment the only question debated is the subject matter of that amendment.

Mr. DUNNING: On the question of relevancy I submit that very broad latitude is permitted by the very terms of the subamendment itself. The language of it is as follows:

—urges upon the government the consideration of an immediate and substantial increase of the British preference as a step towards freer trade relations between Canada and other nations.

Mr. BENNETT: The subject matter is the British preference.

Mr. DUNNING: Surely my hon. friend is at liberty to discuss the nature of the step proposed in the subamendment, what its implications are and what its advantages might be, his speech of course being directed to the subamendment.

Mr. McMILLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the first place I would call your attention to the fact that Canada has now a British preference with the West Indies and Australia, which are both sugar-producing countries. The subamendment reads:

That this house urges upon the government the consideration of an immediate and substantial increase of the British preference as a step towards freer trade relations between Canada and other nations.

I would expect a subamendment such as that to come from my hon. friends across the way, but I am surprised that they would be sponsors of it if they would think seriously for one moment. Do they not think that the members of this government are giving this matter continuous consideration? If I was going to find any fault, I would find fault with the fact that possibly they are considering it too much. But apart from that observation I have no particular objection to the wording of the subamendment. I will, however, oppose it for the following reasons: the substance of the subamendment is now one of the cardinal principles of Liberal policy—the keystone of freer trade, not only with the motherland and the other British dominions but as well, with the world. Canada is the one nation since the war that has led the way in a policy of gradually lowering trade restrictions, thus demonstrating that she realizes she has now become one of the foremost countries in the world, and is willing to encourage international trade with all the world under fair, equitable and generous terms.

Second, the subamendment as introduced is simply a vote of want of confidence in the government. Does anyone believe that these hon. members who have sponsored the subamendment would think of driving this government to the country on an amendment such as this? They know there is no danger of this subamendment being carried, and that is the only reason why they moved it. The fact is that if they thought there was any chance of carrying this subamendment, every member who has sponsored it would be searching every nook and corner of these parliament buildings to try to get a hole big enough to crawl through in order to get himself out of the predicament.

Finally, I stand on Liberal principles, and endorse Liberal policy. My whole being has burned to lend some assistance to the onward march of human progress, and while we might deplore the snail-like pace at which our hon. friends are rumbling towards the promised land, yet when I cooperate with anyone, I pray God that it will be with those who manifest some real possession of principle rather than with the paragons of virtue who are continually parading their professions to the housetops and at every convenient opportunity are ready to place those professions on the public bargain counter, or, as in June, 1926, desert themselves, break the solemn bond of cooperation to which they had pledged their honour along with Liberals to put through the program of the government, and then join up with that shadow cabinet in their effort to put over the most indefensible act of power usurpation ever attempted in this house. When they could not succeed—

Mr. KENNEDY: Would my hon. friend permit a question? Did any member of this group in 1926 enter into a solemn compact or otherwise to whitewash corruption in administration?

Mr. McMILLAN: I might answer the hon. gentleman in this way, that there was a committee appointed to investigate the customs administration, and my hon. friend along with eight other members was on that committee. While they were in committee a certain resolution was proposed to censure the late Minister of Customs, Mr. Boivin. My hon. friend voted against that motion in committee, and yet when it came into the house he voted for a similar motion.

Mr. KENNEDY: That is not so.

Mr. McMILLAN: There was an agreement, and they deserted.

Mr. KENNEDY: Lest there be any misunderstanding, I wish to deny that satement.

Mr. McMILLAN: I well remember the late member for North Huron—

Mr. KENNEDY: I rise to a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman has just stated that when a motion was proposed in the committee in 1926 to censure the then Minister of Customs, I voted against it. There was not a motion proposed in the committee to censure the Minister of Customs that I voted against. There was a motion to report the Minister of Customs to the House of Commons, and I opposed that until the investigation should have been completed.

Mr. McMILLAN: I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I read that motion in the proceedings of the committee to-day, and if it does not convey the meaning that I have placed before this house, I did not read it aright.

Mr. KENNEDY: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMILLAN: Let me continue. As I said, not only my friends opposite, but everyone who claims to support Liberal principles entered into a solemn agreement to try to put over the program which was placed before the house, and I well remember the late respected member for North Huron, Mr. King, coming into my office and telling me that there was such a split among the Progressives, so many of them had deserted, that he wondered what they would do. The moment he asked me I said at once, "Go back and tell them that above everything else you are going to respect yourself, respect the solemn bond to which you have pledged yourself." But that is what these gentlemen did not do.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman is far from the British preference.

Mr. McMILLAN: No, Mr. Speaker. I said a few moments ago that for three reasons I intended to oppose this subamendment, and I am now discussing my third reason. I have said that when I cooperate with anyone, I trust it will be with those who show some real possession of principle and will stick to their solemn bond of cooperation. But when these gentlemen saw that they could not sustain the movement which they had begun to keep that "two-penny ha-penny" outfit in power, the biggest scurry I have ever witnessed in this house in my time was the scurry of these hon. gentlemen to try to get back under the coat-tails of the Liberal party, rather than face their constituents. If those gentlemen were the only real champions of Canadian agriculture we might well cry out Lord help Canadian agriculture.

I do not wish to dispute the ruling of the Chair, but I do feel, so far as remarks which I made on the sugar question are concerned, that it must have been clear to every member of the house that I was about to touch a shoe which pinched very severely the members of the Conservative party and their record in days gone by. Not to carry that any further I will just say that I feel we ought to proceed even more rapidly along the lines of a well-considered tariff reduction. In that respect Canada has led the way in many lines, and she is leading the way to-day, although it may be very gradually, along the very lines which have been proposed in the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer). I really think myself, in face of the fact that Canada has a British preference with the West Indies and Australia, both sugar-producing countries, that my remarks should come within the bounds of this discussion upon the subamendment, but in view of the ruling of the Chair I shall not proceed any further along that line. In view of that ruling, I presume I am not allowed to do as the hon. gentleman who preceded me this afternoon has done. He devoted a great deal of his speech to the record of the financial administration of this government. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, if I shall be in order in considering the financial record of the government any further?

Mr. MANION: Surely; it needs consideration. Go ahead.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. The hon. gentlemen must address himself to the subamendment.

Mr. O. B. PRICE (Westmorland): I am very much honoured to-night by the presence of so many ministers of the administration, and I am particularly glad to see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) in his place. It looks like old times with him back in the house, and I am sure that if the session continues we shall see a little more of the spirit which he used to exhibit in days gone by.

This debate has been rather lengthy, and it is not my intention to take up very much time, but coming as I do from a potato country, I may say that we had hoped for a budget that would give more relief to the labouring classes. In days gone by the great Liberal party always posed as the friend of the masses and not of the classes, but this budget has clearly demonstrated that the present administration have forgotten the policy

which they formerly advocated in favour of the masses and the necessity for looking after their welfare.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) in presenting his budget gave a catalogue of the so-called achievements of this government. To my mind this budget does not safeguard the interests either of agriculture or of industry. If anything has been done along that line, I fail to recognize it.

We imported from the United States last year something like 465,000 bushels of new potatoes, which came into competition with our own crop, and it looks as if this year would be a repetition of last year. Our present market for disposing of our potatoes is very poor. In my constituency, and I think this applies throughout Canada, the potato crop last year was a good one, but it has been very difficult indeed to find a market for it. If there is one thing lacking, it is adequate protection. When our farmers have a large crop, if something could be done by means of the tariff to stabilize the industry and enable the farmers to stand on their own feet, it should be done. I think the railways are to be commended for the special rates that they have put into effect. They acted promptly. In the St. John valley district both the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National have done what they could to relieve the situation; they have reduced the freight rate to a certain extent. Along the Matapedia valley they have also reduced the rate by something like 25 per cent. While it is not really impressive from the standpoint of percentage reduction as compared with what was given in other districts, still I do not think we have very much cause to complain, because the crop in the Matapedia valley has been a very poor quality one, and it has been very difficult indeed for the people to get their potatoes to the market. However, I do feel that a little more protection would be better, and that we should not rest until we are at least "brick for brick", as the saying is, with the Americans. I believe we should take that course in the interests of our own people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is a great need in the country for better export and import traffic through the maritime ports. I think everyone will give credit to the administration for having done something along this line. I believe they have endeavoured to assist the ports of St. John and Halifax, and really have done something to put the National Transcontinental railway to some use. As we all recall, an enormous expenditure was made for the construction of that railway, I think upwards of $173,000,000, and if it can be put to work, if we can nationalize our ports in the maritime provinces and get our shipments through those ports—the administration have already started this movement and I trust they will see that it continues—it will be of tremendous advantage to the maritime provinces in particular and to Canada as a whole, for it will convince us that we must be self-dependent and stand on our own feet in this regard, particularly when we have at our command an excellent railway with a four-tenths per cent grade.

The Farm Loans Act was passed a couple of years ago, and we are anxiously waiting for the board to function. The province of New Brunswick has already enacted such legislation as is necessary in cooperation with the federal administration.

While in the past our ports have been developed and, as I say, to a certain extent encouragement has been given both to Halifax and St. John, the adoption of Halifax as a port of call for the White Star line was a move in the right direction. I believe it was only necessary to call the attention of the White Star management to the fact that they could utilize Halifax as well as Portland to cause them to make the test with the liner Regina. This turned out so satisfactorily that they at once determined to make Halifax a permanent port of call, and to discontinue Portland for this purpose, the latter port having hitherto been utilized by them for Canadian overseas traffic.

It is most regrettable, sir, to notice that recently the Montreal Corn Exchange persuaded the council of the Board of Trade of the city of Montreal to oppose strenuously the application to the Board of Railway Commissioners by the Halifax harbour commission and the maritime board of trade for a reduction of 35.5 cents to 19.34 cents per hundred pounds on grain for export over the all-rail route from Fort William, Port Arthur and Armstrong via the National Transcontinental railway to St. John and Halifax. The resolution passed by the Board of Trade of the city of Montreal was as follows:

Resolved, that the Montreal Corn Exchange Association urge the Council of the Montreal board of trade to strenuously oppose the application to the Board of Railway Commissioners by the Halifax harbour commissioners and the maritime board of trade for a reduction, from 35½ cents to 19.34 cents per 100 pounds, in the "all-rail" rate on grain from Fort William, Port Arthur and Armstrong, via the National Transcontinental Railway, to St. John and Halifax, for export, for the following reasons:

1. That the granting of the application would not increase the amount of grain handled through Canadian ports, for the reasons:

(a) That the export movement during the winter months (when lake and river navigation is closed) is actually conducted on the basis of "water and rail" rates, by reason of the great storage facilities established at Buffalo and Canadian bay ports, from which the winter requirements of the export grain trade are drawn and from which rates to the seaboard are equalized.

(b) That the all-rail rate applied for from Fort William and Port Arthur is considerably lower than that available via other routes to the Atlantic seaboard, i.e., water to Buffalo and rail to New York, or water to Georgian bay ports and rail to St. John and Halifax.

(c) That every seaport on the Atlantic in Canada and the United States is in competition, one with the other, and the rail carriers serving the different ports will not long permit any particular port to enjoy discriminatory freight rates.

2. That the only practical export rate basis which would be competitive with United States ports has been in effect to St. John and Halifax for a great many years, and any action which would upset this competitive rate basis would be fraught with the greatest possible danger.

3. That a reduction in the grain rate would seriously handicap the milling industry in Canada, especially those mills located west of Fort William.

4. That the ultimate result would be a serious loss of revenue to the Canadian railways and other transportation interests.

This old bogey, Mr. Speaker, that has been used many, many times, that the cut in the all-rail rate would mean retaliation on the part of the American railroads, is again to the front. The Montreal board of trade favours American ports at the expense of those of the maritime provinces. They also point out that the rate is lower than comparable rates to other ports. This is not wholly correct. At times, owing to fluctuations in lake rates, insurance charges and canal rates, this may occur, but only for short periods. The same old cry of retaliation was raised when the rate was lowered over the National Transcontinental to Quebec. What was the National Transcontinental railway built for? It cost the people of Canada upward of $173,000,000, and was built for the very purpose that the maritime board of trade is now urging. Apparently Montreal is not satisfied with handling the grain during the summer months, but when that port is frozen over during the winter they take the unpatriotic stand that it would be far better to patronize United States ports. Eighty-five per cent of the manufactured goods brought into the maritime provinces are supplied by Quebec and Ontario. I note with much satisfaction that the Toronto Globe is very fully in sympathy with the request made by the maritimes that the grain rate be reduced in order to give fair treatment to the ports of Halifax and St. John.

In that connection, sir, I may add that the city of Quebec at the present time is desirous of being included in the Atlantic region. As you are aware, Levis is included. Quebec now is seeking admission, and we only hope that the request will be granted, because we have much in common with the city of Quebec, and we trust that the Atlantic region will be extended on to the city of Montreal, where in our opinion it should be extended.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to take up some other matters which are of interest not only to the people of my constituency, but I think to the government itself. First of all, I wish to deal with the Department of Public Works. Year after year in this house I have asked the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) to consider the construction of a post office in the city of Moncton. With a population of 22,000 the post office turns into the treasury over $1,000 a day net profit. The gross revenue was $482,578.82. After paying salaries to staff, postmaster, assistants, postmen, postal transfer agents at the Moncton depot, and allowing for contingencies to the extent of $1,741.13, there was a total expenditure of $116,300.98, leaving a net profit of $366,277.84. I think that record should commend itself to the minister. When you consider the dilapidated condition in which this building now stands, built forty or forty-five years ago, the unsanitary state of it and the unsatisfactory conditions generally under which the employees must work, it is very difficult indeed to think that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott), with a treasury overflowing, should not be able to see his way clear to set aside one year's profits in order to construct a post office building in Moncton, a building which would really look like a post office and be a credit to the administration. I cannot stress too strongly the condition of that post office at the present time. There is one department for stamps and in another building money orders are sold, and so on; the various departments are so separated that it is exceedingly difficult, particularly with people who are not familiar with the operations of the office, for anyone to get service at all. I am asking the minister again to take the facts into account.

I would also direct his attention to the fact that at a place called Cape Bald, the fishermen at the present time are utilising a breakwater which has a T top on it, behind which they can go with their motor boats when storms are raging. That is the only place they have for shelter along a coast line

of thirty five miles, and when a storm breaks they are obliged to put in there. They require an extension of 100 feet. This would cost only about $10,000 and the work should be undertaken. I am aware that considerable repairs are going on from year to year, and this has always been so with cement work in salt water. But this is a matter that should receive the minister's attention. We come to Ottawa and see the government spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in connection with a canal embankment, the work going on all winter, and we wonder therefore whether it is not possible for them to consider these weary fishermen who have to work their way along the shore in rough weather in an effort to find some shelter. If the minister would undertake the expenditure of $10,000 it would provide a shelter along the shore for these poor fishermen, and they and their families would greatly appreciate it. This is a humane proposal and I urge it upon the minister. I notice that in the city of Ottawa some very large expenditures are being made in connection with the work of the Federal District Commission. I wonder how the general public throughout Canada will like this. There are places in this Dominion where public buildings are in very poor condition to-day and where the public really require some assistance; they are looking for a do-something policy. Yet at the same time the Federal District Commission can spend $200,000 per annum. And who is benefitting by this expenditure? You are simply cutting a pathway, a strand, down through this portion of the city from Connaught place, and you have destroyed one of the best theatres in the city, the only place where a real opera could be presented. A very good hotel building has also been demolished. It seems to me that the government will have something to answer for when they go to the public, because the people, who are reading the papers carefully every day, are taking note of what is going on. Later on the government will be taken to task severely for the manner in which they are spending millions to-day, while they are failing to provide for the needs of the general public. I cannot understand a government going on with these enormous expenditures while the public is crying out for support for the vocational schools. What is the idea of starting to support these schools and then withdrawing your assistance? Is the same thing to be done later on with the old age pension system? After the system has been inaugurated, is the assistance to be withdrawn? Is it something of that nature? The people would like to know about these things. They would like to know whether the government are going to continue as they have been carrying on in the last few months.

I wish also to direct the attention of the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) to an important matter, and I am sorry that he is not in his place. To-day the government are carrying out a system of closing smaller customs houses. They have closed one in Kent county with the result that the people there are obliged to go into Westmorland county to do business. And now they are talking of closing the Shediac customs house. If they would appropriate the rake-off as between the man from whom they rent the building in Moncton and the original owner, they would have enough left to maintain the customs building in Shediac. I have not the figures at hand, but the government are paying something like $160 a month for the building to which I refer; they pay for so much floor space. Now the man who rents the building to the government pays to the man who owns the building something in the vicinity of $60; therefore he has $100 off the top. This is a situation which the government might look into with a view to providing the people of Shediac with a proper service. It does not cost more than $1,200 a year to maintain that service.

I regret that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) is not present. Ministers visit the maritime provinces when there is an election, and I do not know what keeps the hon. gentleman away. It has not been the custom in the past for the Minister of Railways to absent himself from that section of the country; as a rule, the Minister of Railways has visited the maritimes regularly. And particularly should a minister visit that part of the country to fix things up after making the statement that there are four things which the people of the maritime provinces do, namely: first, to be born; secondly, to get a free ride on the Intercolonial railway; thirdly, to get married; and in the fourth place to die. The minister on some occasions denies this but he is not denying it to-night. Now it is claimed that the Canadian National Railways are out of Politics. This government is paying its percentage towards the conduct of a labour bureau in Moncton. The government pays its share, the province of New Brunswick is paying its share, and the city of Moncton is doing likewise. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it would be absolutely impossible for a stenographer, a clerk or any ordinary clerical worker to obtain employment through that labour bureau; all such appointments must be made through the

Liberal committee. I might say to the minister that there are other matters in connection with patronage into which I do not care to go to-night, but do not let him say that the Canadian National Railways are clear of politics.

I think without doubt the government of the day is the most extravagant government we have ever had in Canada. I have noticed statements by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance that this is not an extravagant government and that they are practising economy, but I find that we have a tariff board which costs us $120,000 a year. The members of this board were not specially prepared for this work, and I think it is the opinion of the Minister of Finance that their findings are in accordance with their preparation. Then the government spent $542,000 for automobiles for one season; I hope they do not back into something

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to delay the house at this late hour; there are other matters which might be taken up but I do not wish to detain the house further to-night, so I will reserve my further remarks until the estimates are brought down.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to interject a word into the debate, if I may be permitted to do so, in order to ascertain from you just what interpretation we must place upon the rulings which have been made with reference to speeches delivered during the budget debate. I simply wish to call your attention to an apparent anomaly which seems to exist. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken discussed the affairs of the country generally, as he had a perfect right to do and for which I have no quarrel with him. However, I gather from your decision that having made this speech on the subamendment, as soon as that subamendment is voted down or otherwise dealt with, the hon. gentleman may rise again and discuss in a general way the government of the country. Then, the amendment having been disposed of, on the main motion he may make a similar speech, so we have this situation: A man who speaks towards the close of the debate on the subamendment may make three general speeches, whereas a man who speaks on the main motion at the beginning of the debate may speak only once. I must confess that I am somewhat mystified as to the course of jurisprudence in this matter, and for my own satisfaction and information and for the information of the members generally, I think it would be well if a definite rule were laid down as to just how many general speeches may be made during the budget debate.

[Mr. Price.]

My interpretation of your ruling may not be correct, sir, but I have discussed this matter with a number of my colleagues and they have come to the same conclusion. It would appear to me, therefore, that if we are to follow this practice there will be nothing to prevent any man who so desires from speaking for not 40 minutes but 120 minutes, and so the rule which we put into force some two years ago after so much study will be set at naught. For that reason I rise and interrupt the course of the debate, and while I do not expect you, Mr. Speaker, to give an answer immediately, I do urge that you and those who have to do with the conduct of this house endeavour to straighten out the matter so that it will be quite clear to all members of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Last year I gave a ruling on that point, and that ruling was sustained by the house. I have consulted the highest authority in the realm, the Clerk of the English House of Commons, and he agrees with the ruling I gave. This evening I directed the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) to speak on the subject matter of the subamendment, because he had already spoken on the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie).

It is not so difficult to understand the ruling. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken made general reference to the policies of the government; he indulged in general criticism, and if he so wishes he is entitled to speak at another time on the amendment, but then he will have to speak directly to the amendment.

Mr. POWER: When the hon. member comes to speak on the main motion I have not the least doubt but that he will be able to discuss the affairs of the country generally, because if there is one thing which we do understand in the workings of our constitution it is that when the budget is brought down every member of parliament has a right to discuss all subjects which may be properly laid before parliament. So on two occasions at least the hon. gentleman would have the right to speak generally. I am not quarrelling with your decision, Mr. Speaker; on the contrary I am rather inclined to agree with it, but I wish to point out that if we are prepared to follow that practice we will set at naught the rule which we laid down two years ago that no member should speak more than forty minutes on one subject. I want to point out that the situation should be so cleared up that it may be understood perfectly by the members of the house that one speech on the budget, of whatever length, should be sufficient for any member.

Mr. L. W. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton North-Victoria): Mr. Speaker, before the debate is closed I would like to make a few remarks, although at this late date, after the great flow of oratory which has issued from the lips of the hon. gentlemen who have taken part in the discussion, there is not very much left for me to say. Especially is that the case since the budget itself contains so little for us to consider.

While the budget speech delivered by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) contains a very glowing picture of Canada's prosperity as evidenced by the financial statement, and while it may give a large portion of Canada a feeling of satisfaction, I can assure the minister that it does not touch a responsive chord in the hearts of the people of the maritimes. They, as usual, have been practically ignored. The minister holds out no hope for the steel and coal industries, and it must seem very strange to the people of Canada, as I know it does to the people of the maritimes, that in the budget no mention is made of those two great industries.

In addition to this, not a word is said as to what the government will do with respect to the Duncan report. From the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) down the members of the government know very well that the Duncan report found in favour of the maritimes on some thirty counts, and this report was handed to the government in September of 1926. As a result, the absolutely unjust freight rates which then existed have been reduced and the government has carried out the recommendation of the commission in giving Nova Scotia a special annual subsidy of $875,000, to be paid until such time as the proper annual amount shall be arrived at. So far as I know, no effort has been made to arrive at that final sum which will be paid, not only to Nova Scotia, but to New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. There does not seem to be any intention on the part of the government to do a single thing to put the Duncan report into effect in its entirety. That is a gross omission on the part of the Minister of Finance and it cannot be allowed to pass unnoticed.

It is a well known fact that the people of the maritimes have less of this world's wealth than the people in other parts of the Dominion. Nova Scotia was probably the most prosperous of the four provinces which originally entered into confederation. Their shipping brought them in great wealth. At that time the shipping tonnage in Nova Scotia was greater per capita than that of any other country in the world. In every village where shipbuilding was carried on beautiful homes were to be found, and other evidences of luxury were to be seen. The sea brought them wealth from every portion of the world. But those days are long past. Since 1867 conditions have changed entirely, and the maritimes have been steadily losing their population. Prince Edward Island has a smaller population to-day than in 1871, the date of the first census. In 1921 the population was over 20,000 less than in 1881. Since 1871 the population of the province of Nova Scotia has increased 35 per cent; in New Brunswick there has been an increase of 36 per cent, while Quebec has increased 100 per cent and Ontario 81 per cent. During the same period the population of Manitoba increased from 25,000 to 610,000, and that of British Columbia increased from 36,000 to 524,000. In 1901, Saskatchewan had a population of 91,279, which had grown to 757,510 in 1921, and the population of Alberta increased from 73,022 to 588,454. These figures show conclusively the situation in the maritimes as regards the relative growth of Canada. The average per capita wealth of the three maritime provinces is $1,443, while the average per capita wealth of the three prairie provinces is $3,259, or more than double. The figures for 1927 make the comparison between the maritimes and the Canadian west still worse.

In spite of these conditions the budget has nothing to say regarding the situation in the provinces which have suffered so much as a result of the union. This suffering is due to the fact that the contract made at that time has not been carried out. How can the government of this Dominion expect a virile people, nearly all of Anglo-Saxon and French-Canadian blood, to rest content under a treatment which is discriminating against them and reducing them to poverty? Justice has been refused in every direction. The budget holds out no hope for relief or fair dealing. Those who have will hold, and those who have not, that which they have shall be taken from them. Is this a treatment which a proud and patriotic people is expected to receive and submit to without protest? Let me assure this government that it is making a great mistake. The maritimes have no intention of being the outcast portion of the Dominion, nor will they submit forever to injustice.

The confederation agreement entered into in 1864, and later made effective by an imperial act, came into force on July 1, 1867.

The three factors which compelled this treaty and in consideration of which it was made were:

1. The necessity for defence.

2. The need for interprovincial trade once the union came into force, in order to hold the provinces together and give them a chance to live.

3. Transportation allied to both the first and second factors.

It was distinctly understood that the provinces must trade together, but that this could not be done with profit to the proposed railroad. Promises were made that Ontario in particular, as well as Quebec, would buy our coal, our fish, our manufactured goods, and our imports from the West Indies. Those provinces in turn would sell us foodstuffs, including flour, and so forth, and the meats which were then being bought exclusively in the United States. Hon. George Brown said that our coal was essential to the prosperity of Ontario; that they must have it if they were ever to manufacture. It was understood that when the connecting railroad was built it would be operated so that this interchange could be made at a profit. The fathers of confederation were all agreed that without interprovincial trade the provinces could not be held together.

One of the terms of confederation was that the trade of Canada should be carried on through the maritime ports during the winter period, not only the trade of the Canada of that day but of the Canada which they saw would exist when the great western prairies were taken into the union and developed. Had not those conditions been solemnly agreed upon, the British North American provinces would never have been united. Unless the maritime provinces could sell their products in western Canada, and unless the traffic of Canada came through the maritime ports, then their position in the union would be hopeless. This was acknowledged; hence the agreement.

That agreement has never been kept. As yet, Ontario has not purchased our coal in any quantity, and it is only recently that she has been buying some of our fish. Why? Because the freight rates have been so high that it made the business impossible. This has been a violation of the terms of the union. If, on account of the transport charges, maritime coal cannot be sold in Ontario or Quebec in competition with American coal, we have the right to have the freight rates cut to a point where business can be carried on. The same principle applies to our fish and the other products enumerated in the schedule. Why should they not be carried at a low rate when the great waterway system, developed at a cost of $400,000,000, is made free, not only to Canadian traders but to the people of the United States? Are the people of the United States to be used better than your brother Canadians? Are the children of the people of the maritime provinces to be driven to the United States in thousands because the rest of Canada will not implement its solemn contract, while at the same time you can give far better terms to the people of the United States who wish to use our trade routes? This discrimination has been going on for fifty years, and until the last few months there has been no attempt made on the part of the people of the rest of Canada to keep this agreement. Is it any wonder the people of the maritimes are enraged and are not in a mood to continue to live here under such humilitating conditions?

The same reasoning applies to the export business. It is not necessary to tell the members of the house about the enormous traffic which finds its way down through the United States to the Atlantic seaboard. Under our treaty rights that traffic should pass through the maritime ports. Again the matter is one of freight rates. Make proper export rates and these two Atlantic ports will thrive as Montreal has done. These statements are not hearsay: they are matters of history and they are confirmed by the Duncan report.

It is not in the interests of Canada that the maritimes should deteriorate as they have been doing for years. We should have our great national ports on the Atlantic and the Pacific and we should not be dependent, as we are to-day, on the United States for our transportation. Canada should be self-contained and should be mistress of her own destinies. We thought the transportation problem had been finally settled when Sir Wilfrid Laurier brought down his transcontinental proposal in 1904.

It is only fair to state that during the last year or so the port of Halifax has been beginning to come into its own. Canada knows the value that this port was to the empire in those fateful years, 1914 to 1919. It was a great port in time of war; it should be an equally great port in time of peace. It has the treaty right. There should be no more bickering over freight rates. Under the terms of the treaty the rates must be made so that trade can be carried on. It is not a matter for the railway board; it is a treaty matter, one in which the honour of Canada is involved.

In a country where protection of our vital industries has been adopted and practised by both political parties since 1878, a full half

century, our coal and steel industries, on which the future of Cape Breton island and the maritimes depends, have been so sadly neglected that their treatment constitutes a political crime. If justice were done there would be 100,000 people profitably employed to-day in the coal, iron and steel trade of Cape Breton island. That is the considered opinion of men well able to judge. Can the members of this house realize what this would mean to the maritime provinces and the rest of Canada? Why should the great industries of the maritimes receive the treatment they have received when the great manufacturers of the other portions of Canada are so amply protected? Where are the coking plants that were to make it possible for our miners to raise more coal? The ones in existence are fed by United States coal while our miners suffer. I might at this point quote from a local paper as follows:

> In the session of 1927, parliament passed the Domestic Fuel Act in line with this recommendation—"An act to encourage the production of domestic fuel from coal mined in Canada.

A few weeks ago an Ottawa despatch to this local paper gave the answer made by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) to a question raised by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Cantley), as follows:

> No payments have been made by the Dominion government during the fiscal year 1928-29 by way of bounty on Canadian coal used in the production of coke in coke ovens situated in Halifax, Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, Hamilton, or in any other Canadian coke oven plants.

The article commented on this as follows:

> This confirms the worst fears of the people of this province. The Duncan report, as it relates to the question of coking plants, has not been implemented. And apart from the new plant of the Nova Scotia Light and Power Company in the city of Halifax, we know of no Canadian plant proposing to take advantage of the provisions of the Domestic Fuel Act.

Why is it that this Atlantic province cannot get a square deal and fair treatment? When we see foreign people treated better than ourselves who have borne the burden in the heat of the day, who have helped to develop this Dominion and who have seen our sons and daughters leave by the thousands to find opportunities in more prosperous lands, those of us who remain become embittered and wonder whether there is any justice in Canada. Every little while we are asked to put our hands into our pockets with the rest of Canada in order to develop new trade routes like the Hudson Bay railway, or the deep waterway system through Ontario and Quebec, or the huge railroad development from the Peace river or other portions of the west to Prince Rupert or elsewhere. while any demands we may make by which we may prosper are treated with coolness. Let the contract of 1867 be carried into effect in the spirit as well as in the letter of the law, and the people of Canada will see the maritimes prosper beyond their belief and become a great asset to this young and growing nation. Give us the freight rates that are necessary to make trade possible, that we were promised; give us a square deal regarding the tariff and others matters, and you need not have any fear regarding the future of the maritimes; it will be a country well worth living in.

While money has been spent like water for development in every part of Canada except the maritimes, our fishermen are left to drift to the United States and to sail in Gloucester ships. These fishermen are the hardiest and finest type of men that exist in any corner of the world. Every fisherman must be a hardy, brave man; one who is not cannot be a fisherman. These men leave in the very early morning and go out twenty or thirty miles to sea in small boats; they never know what weather they will have before they return home. If they are not provided with proper breakwaters, harbours and lights, they cannot follow their vocation. But still we hear a shout of merriment go up when the estimates come down for wharves, breakwaters and dredging in these little harbours, while the whole vote would not make chicken feed for the men who have those great contracts for canal construction, the Hudson Bay development and smaller works all over Canada. We have lost thousands of fishermen during the last twenty years and we stand to lose many more unless there is a wonderful change in this seat of the mighty at Ottawa. What policy has the government adopted to keep these fishermen at home? Has it a policy to-day? Has it fulfilled and implemented the Duncan report recommending the appointment of a minister of fisheries? Until a minister of fisheries is appointed and the whole system of fisheries is reorganized and placed upon a better basis than it is at present, our fishermen must remain in the same state.

Finally, the Duncan report has set forth the things that the maritimes have a right to have. It has made its recommendations, and except for two or three matters nothing has been done. It seems that nothing will ever be done without another convulsion, and I am fully assured that the next convulsion which arises in the maritimes will be a much more serious one than that which occurred

in 1925. We expect the Duncan report to be implemented in full. We expect that the maritimes will be put upon a fair and equitable basis with the rest of Canada. That is all we ask, and less than that we shall not be willing to accept. That we demand and we want redress without delay. Probably our people are to blame for their negligence in not pressing their demands far more actively than they have done, but the government may rest assured that the maritimes are awake to-day; that they intend to secure these things that are rightfully theirs; that they will never be satisfied until they achieve these results and, furthermore, that they do not intend to wait another sixty years before justice is meted out to them.

Before I close I wish to summarize some of our demands. My desire is not to criticise every little matter with which I do not agree in the budget speech. I wish, however, to emphasize those things in which our provinces are vitally interested. You have been told, Mr. Speaker, how the population has decreased, and that the per capita wealth of our people is much less than one-half of that of all the west of Canada and just one-third that of Saskatchewan. Those two facts alone should be enough to warrant the government in having something important to state as to their policy towards the maritimes.

The terms made in 1867 regarding transportation have been deliberately and intentionally violated for half a century. If our provinces, and especially Nova Scotia, were to have their claims adjusted from the time they came into confederation, as has been promised Manitoba, it would take a large slice of the national revenue to compensate them for their tremendous losses. Our greatest loss, however, is in the loss of our native-born population. Hon. gentlemen know how well the natives of these provinces have done when they have gone afield. Members from our prairie provinces, I feel sure, will endorse my statement that the maritimers who have gone to the west are a very valuable factor in their population. It is acknowledged that they have done a great deal toward the upbuilding of the United States.

Look at the port of Halifax. It was expressly stated by Sir John A. Macdonald that that city should be one of the great emporiums of the world. Sir George-Etienne Cartier went further and stated that the traffic between Halifax and Liverpool would look like a ferry across the Atlantic once the traffic of Canada was directed through the port of Halifax. Until the last two years, however, one-half the time our harbour was almost without a sail or a smokestack. The fact that this wonderful natural port, which requires so little to make it the greatest port in the world, has been neglected now for over fifty years, is one of the things that anger the citizens of Nova Scotia. They know they were deceived. The promises made respecting this development were positive and definite. It was agreed that the trade developing in Canada, passing across the Atlantic during the winter period, must come through Halifax or St. John. That was one of the conditions of confederation.

The conditions of the coal trade need not be referred to. There again definite promises were made which, if carried into effect, would have made the mines of Cape Breton a hive of industry. More American coal is used in Ontario twice over than is produced in Nova Scotia. This, we are told, is a matter of freight rates. The freight rates can be so adjusted that business can be done. This trade was promised, but the steel industry is languishing because it cannot get fair treatment at the hands of parliament.

When we look, Mr. Speaker, at our ruined industries, our neglected ports, our half-developed coal fields, we see a monument to the injustice of the federal government. We see the trade of Canada steadily directed towards the United States. We see our resources gradually falling into their hands. A change must be made, and a change will be made I hope in the very near future. Our natural resources and our raw materials must be kept at home for our own people to develop, and I am sure that if that were done, we would have our young men and women, who are educated by the Canadian ratepayers, staying at home and building up their own country, instead of, as they are doing now, helping to build up a foreign country. So I say Mr. Speaker, let everyone in this fair country of ours have for his motto, "Canada for Canadians."

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): I would be very glad indeed, Mr. Speaker, to support the subamendment but for two or three things. The subamendment in principle would perhaps be acceptable to me if it were slightly amended. It now reads as follows:

> That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after "house" and substituting therefor the following:
>
> "urges upon the government the consideration of an immediate and substantial increase of the British preference as a step towards freer trade relations between Canada and other nations."

I presume that the object of the mover and the seconder of this subamendment is to help the people in the prairie provinces, and

I am quite agreeable to that. We in British Columbia are very much interested in the welfare of the prairie provinces. When they have good crops and get good prices for them, we directly reap the benefit of that in British Columbia. The prosperity of British Columbia is very much tied up with the prosperity of the prairies. We are their Pacific seaport. We get many of their people when they have made enough money to retire or desire a change of climate, and we are very glad to have them. We therefore certainly do not wish to do anything that would hurt the people of the prairie provinces.

It seems to me that the wording of the subamendment might be changed a little. In the first place, it proposes that all the material words in the amendment be stricken out. That, of course, is something to which I cannot agree because the amendment sets out the policy of our party, and I think all the members of the Conservative party in this house are solidly behind the amendment. We therefore could not consistently vote for a subamendment which strikes out all the words of our own amendment. If instead of striking out the words of our amendment, the subamendment had been added to the amendment, then I think I could have voted for it except for one reason.

I am quite in favour of increasing our trade with the other nations of the empire. I think we do not do enough business now within our own family, as it were, in this great empire of ours. I think that Canada could afford to do more business with our sister nations of the empire, could afford to buy more goods from them, and to sell more goods to them. We all know what has been accomplished by the empire marketing board, which is being financed very largely by the people of the old country. As a result of the work which they have already done, the trade between the dominions and the mother country within the past three years has been very largely increased, and particularly is that true of the mother country, because year by year in the last three years she has purchased very greatly increasing quantities of the products of the dominions of the empire. I would be very glad indeed to see any resolution passed which would tend toward increasing Canada's trade with the empire, and I would therefore suggest adding to the words of the subamendment, after "as a step towards freer trade relations between Canada and other nations" the words "of the British Empire." If we had the amendment to the amendment in that shape, I think I could support it. As a matter of fact, I might go so far as to say that personally, and speaking only for myself I would like to see some form of reciprocity among the countries within the empire if it could be worked out. I think it would be a good thing all round; the empire would be self-contained in every way, and we here in Canada would not have to be at all concerned with any tariff changes that might be made by the United States or any other country. At the present time, of course, we are looking with some degree of concern towards certain tariff changes which might be made in the United States. That is their business, and we have no right to criticize any changes they may make, but similarly we have a right to look after ourselves.

I notice also that Japan only recently has increased her tariff, and some of those tariff changes are aimed directly at business which is at present being done by Canada with Japan and by the United States with Japan. I am referring particularly to the lumber industry. The Japanese representatives have said that the reason for making these tariff changes is to assist the lumber industry of Japan, that there is no attempt on their part to attack any of the other nations or to injure them in any way, but that they are making these changes in a spirit of self-preservation, to build up their own timber industry again. We cannot object to that.

I think that the great majority of the people of British Columbia, irrespective of their political leanings, are in favour of the amendment which has been moved in this debate. Someone has said that the tariff is a matter of geography. That may be so. So far as British Columbia is concerned I have only to point out that in the last Dominion election the people of that province sent to this house twelve members of the Conservative party as against one member of the government party, and that one member happened to be a minister of the crown, which, of course, gave him a little higher standing.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Of course they have seen their mistake since.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They have been very sorry for it.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I may say that at the next general election that lonely Liberal representative will be missing, for he had a very narrow majority at the last election. There must be some reason for this practically unanimous Conservative representation, because it cannot be supposed that the people of British Columbia are not capable of intelligently judging the issues presented to them in the election campaigns. I will tell you the reason—the tariff. British Columbia

is in favour of a fair measure of protection for its agriculturists and industrialists. I represent about 65,000 people. They are industrial and agricultural. I presume that I have more farmers in my constituency than are represented by any other member from British Columbia. Of course my constituency is one of the best in the province. I have been sent back here four times with large majorities. At the last election I got over a thousand votes more than in the previous election. In every campaign I have preached more than anything else protection for our farms and our industries. And that is what the people out there want. My farming community borders on the United States. We have a main, paved highway running down into the United States, and our farmers every day see coming over that highway large truck loads of the products of the farms south of the boundary line. So they know how their market is being interfered with.

Now, you may turn up statistics and tell me: Yes, but we get a comparatively small amount of those products from the United States. But please remember that just across the line from us they have a very great advantage climatically; they are two or three weeks ahead of us. Consequently they can bring in their products that much ahead of our products and get the cream of our market. That is occurring every year. Our farmers know it, and they do not like it. We as their representatives have been urging on the government for many years the necessity of at least equalizing our tariff with that of the United States. Nearly everything that is produced in British Columbia is unfairly treated by the United States tariff. I do not propose to go over the whole list, although I have it before me and if desired shall be happy to put it on Hansard. Let me refer particularly to some of the chief products of the farm. For instance, butter: the Canadian tariff is four cents a pound, the United States tariff, twelve cents a pound. Eggs: the Canadian tariff is three cents a dozen; United States tariff, eight cents a dozen. Hay: the Canadian tariff is two dollars per ton of 2,000 pounds; the United States tariff, four dollars a ton of 2,240 pounds. What does this mean? That it pays the Americans to send their products into the British Columbia markets and pay only a very small duty; whereas if our farmers desire to get into the Seattle market, for instance, the tariff practically debars them.

Many times I have had occasion to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) to these items. It is said "he knows his onions, and is very familiar with other varieties of vegetables" but he does not seem to recognize the necessity of giving the people of Canada a fair deal. He simply throws up his hands and says, Oh, we cannot do anything at the present time. The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) is kinder to us, and when he was out in British Columbia the last time he told the people that so far as he was concerned he would like to see the tariff on those items equalized. Well, if something of the kind is not done the people of British Columbia will not send a single Liberal to represent them in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the prosperity of the Dominion. I am not going to say that conditions are not prosperous in British Columbia. But in some lines we are not doing as well as we might. For example, we are producing a lot of eggs. My experience has been that the poultrymen of British Columbia are not making even a reasonable living from their poultry. We have some very large poultry farms in the province. Recently the poultry farmers formed a pool, and I notice that in a press report of a meeting held at New Westminster the other day those present owned 771,000 hens. It must be remembered that there were no more Conservatives at the meeting than there were Liberals, but they passed a unanimous resolution demanding that the tariff on eggs be equalized. As to beef cattle, our herds have been decreasing from time to time until now we do not produce as many beef cattle as we did a few years ago. The reason is lack of proper protection. I could go over the list with practically the same result. I do not think the protection we want is going to hurt the farmers on the prairies. I think gradually they will come to see that the policy of the Conservative party is not only the best for Canada as a whole but the best for themselves. I am confident that as the years go by we shall find that the prairie farmer wants protection just as much as the farmer in British Columbia, that is, when he goes in more for mixed farming. He is doing that already and he is noticing that he needs protection. I might point out another thing. When any of these prairie farmers remove to British Columbia they immediately change their ideas about the tariff and come out and support the Conservative party; a good many of them have done that for me in the elections in which I have been a candidate. As I said before, we should not spend as much money in the United States as we do. I am not going into the figures; they have been repeated here time after time. But the fact remains that we buy a great deal more from the United States than they buy from

us, and the proportion seems to be increasing rather than decreasing. The people of the United States are business people, and they would take no exception to our putting the tariff of this country on such a basis as we might consider necessary to protect the Canadian people. As a matter of fact, I think they rather make fun of us for the weak-kneed stand we are taking at the present time. I have spoken to several former residents of the United States and they complain that the tariff of Canada has not been rectified.

I have mentioned a few items. I have another one in connection with dressed lamb. This is a resolution from the British Columbia Wool Growers' Association. That is not a Conservative organization, but at its annual meeting held on March 6 of this year it passed the following resolution:

> Be it resolved that the Canada Dumping Act, customs regulations thereunder, and other related acts if any which in their present form cannot be invoked to bring relief in this and other similar situations confronting the producers of agricultural products in British Columbia be so amended, at the earliest possible moment, in order that they may be applied whenever conditions warrant it. It is urgently suggested that when amendments are enacted they provide for the application of duties on an ad valorem basis.

In British Columbia we are very much interested in mines. I am afraid there has been perhaps too much speculation in mining stocks lately, and in that connection I think possibly the Department of Mines might do something more than it has been doing. I quite appreciate the work that has been done. I appreciate also the fact that the Deputy Minister of Mines is a very capable official, and other officials of the department are doing their best. But it is necessary for the government first to adopt a policy. There are too many wildcats in this country, and so far as I can see the government is doing nothing to discourage people from putting their money into wildcat propositions. I think it is quite necessary that mining stock should be sold on the markets of this country, as otherwise we should not be able to get the money requisite for the developing of the mines of Canada. At the same time, I do not think it is right that stocks and shares should be sold when they have nothing behind them. I do not think it should be possible for any company to put on the market stock behind which there is only a hole in the ground. The government in its annual report should, after proper investigation, expose all those wildcats which they are able to discover and locate. Something should also be done to assist prospectors. There can be no doubt that the mines which we know of in Canada at the present time do not represent a very large fraction of the mines which might be discovered. I have on other occasions urged on the government that something should be done to assist prospectors, to grubstake prospectors if you like. I know that is done in other countries, and I know it has been very successful. I would therefore suggest that the Department of Mines might do something in that direction.

In British Columbia we are also greatly interested in the fisheries. Last year the fisheries of British Columbia in the coastal waters represented some $27,000,000, or about half of the total revenue from fisheries in the whole of Canada. But the fishing industry of British Columbia is not in very good shape at the present time. Some of our varieties have become extinct. For instance, we had the sturgeon, a fish that produced a lot of revenue at one time. That fish when mature weighs from 1,000 to 1,200 pounds, and it would sell at 8 cents a pound. Large quantities of sturgeon were caught in British Columbia waters, but there are practically none there at the present time. They are all gone. Then the salmon of British Columbia are also becoming depleted. On the Fraser river, which was a few years ago the greatest salmon river in the world, one of the main runs, the sockeye run, has become practically extinct. In 1913 on the Fraser river alone they packed over 800,000 cases of sockeye salmon; last year they packed about 29,000. With sockeye salmon worth about $16 a case you see what the loss has been to the country. It seems to me that the Minister of Fisheries should take an interest in the British Columbia fisheries. I do not think the present minister has done so. So far as I am aware, he has made no survey of the British Columbia fisheries. I do not think he has ever been along the coast of British Columbia; I do not think he has ever been on the Fraser river; I do not think he has ever shown any interest at all in our fisheries; and I think I am safe in saying that the Minister of Fisheries has never attended a meeting of the marine and fisheries committee. That is all wrong, and I trust that if this government appoints a minister of fisheries it will appoint a man who knows something about fisheries, a man who will at least take some interest in the industry. Possibly I should not blame the present minister too much, because he is also Minister of Marine, which is a very large department in itself; and it is possible that by reason of his duties as Minister of Marine he has not had any time to devote to fisheries.

I have mentioned salmon; there is also the halibut. Halibut as well is becoming depleted. The halibut fisheries of British Columbia are very important, and you need not accept my own statement that there is a very marked depletion in those fisheries. If you care to look up the reports of the joint international committee, formed some three or four years ago, you will find that their last report calls attention to the very serious depletion of the halibut fisheries on the Pacific coast. I do not suppose the Minister of Fisheries would know the difference between a halibut and a salmon; I believe we should have some one as Minister of Fisheries who knows something about these matters and who will take an interest in his department.

I have mentioned sturgeon, salmon and halibut, and in addition we have the whale fisheries. That is an important industry as well, and those fisheries are becoming depleted also. There are a great many matters to engage the attention of the Minister of Fisheries and I think it would be proper to appoint such a minister from British Columbia, or at least we should have a man who would take an intelligent interest in this work.

We have our cabinet minister from British Columbia in the person of the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. King, Kootenay). I think I can say that the minister has been paying a good deal of attention to the matter of pensions, but I am afraid the government is not so liberal as it might be in dealing with persons claiming pensions. I believe it is the desire of this house, and that desire has been evidenced whenever the matter has been up for discussion, that liberal treatment should be accorded the men who served overseas or to the dependents of such men, but I am afraid that the policy of this government or of the officials who are looking after that work is rather to keep such men from getting pensions if possible. I have come to that conclusion as the result of a number of cases which have been brought to my personal attention. I must say that whenever I have gone to the minister, as I have done in a number of cases, he has done the best he could under the circumstances and has adjusted some cases, but still I think there is room for improvement in that department.

However, I wish to deal more particularly with the Department of Health. I do not believe that department is doing very much to justify its existence, and in fact I do not know what it is doing that is of very great benefit to the country in comparison to the amount of money expended. I am afraid the government is not very considerate of the patriotic men and women who are trying to do work which really should be cared for by the government, and in this connection there are two organizations to which I would like to refer. The first is the Victorian Order of Nurses, and I think it is unnecessary for me to detail the important work done by that association. I need only say that one of their objects is to provide nursing service to poor people who otherwise would not get it, and they are carrying on that work in a great many cities and districts throughout Canada. They are enabled to carry on largely through contributions which they receive from private individuals, and the government assists them only to the extent of a grant of $10,000.

Then there is another similar organization, the Canadian Red Cross Society, which is doing a wonderful work in connection with the health of the Canadian people. That society cooperates with the government; I believe it takes care of all the immigrants who come into Canada. Up to and including last year it cared for some 130,000 immigrants, and it is estimated that this year will bring the total up to some 200,000. That organization has forty outposts throughout Canada and does a magnificent work, but it receives no grant at all from this government. Applications for such a grant have been made time after time without result, and I think it is a crying shame and disgrace to Canada that the government should be so parsimonious with regard to such an important matter.

There is also another question which is engaging the attention of the people of Canada; I refer to full time health units. I have before me a copy of a resolution which I have received from a great many women's organizations in British Columbia, as follows:

> Whereas it is expedient that the control of communicable diseases, and of maternal and infant mortality in childbirth, as well as the medical inspection of school children throughout the smaller towns and villages and rural areas of the Dominion of Canada should be made more efficient;
>
> And whereas the most satisfactory method of securing this result has been demonstrated in the province of British Columbia and Quebec and in many of the states of the United States of America, to be by the establishment of county or district health units in rural areas, such health units consisting of a full time medical health officer, sanitary inspector, public health and school nurses, and a secretary in charge of the clerical work;
>
> And whereas such units at present established are financed by half the cost thereof being borne by the local districts, one-quarter by the province in which the district is situated, and one-quarter by the Rockefeller Foundation;

And whereas the grants from the Rockefeller Foundation are of a temporary nature for a period of three years only;

Be it therefore resolved that the government of the Dominion of Canada, through the Minister of National Health of the Dominion, be requested to provide for financial assistance to the provinces of the Dominion in the same manner as is at present provided for the control of venereal diseases, to the extent of one-quarter of the cost of maintaining such local health units and thus assume permanently the portion of the cost of such units covered by the temporary grants from the Rockefeller Foundation.

I notice also that the Canadian Council of Agriculture has adopted a resolution along the same lines. That is something which might be taken up, and I hope the minister will seriously consider it.

Now, to change the subject, there is another matter to which I would like to refer, and that is the absence of an airport in the vicinity of Vancouver. This is urgently required. The government will do nothing to assist in establishing that airport, and I think it is making a mistake. It would be a great asset to Canada and is something which is absolutely necessary. I regret also to learn that the government does not propose to extend the air mail this year to the Pacific coast. An air mail over the mountains would be a great convenience and I think it would form one of the most important units of the system. The government should consider the matter and decide to continue the air service to the British Columbia coast.

I am very much pleased to note in connection with the Canadian National Railways that it is proposed to do certain development work in the vicinity of New Westminster. I congratulate the government, or perhaps I should say the Canadian National Railways, for adopting that program. I believe they are interested in New Westminster as a port because there is a saving to them of one cent per bushel on the grain shipped through that port. There is no argument about that; that is admitted. No grain coming over the Canadian National railways should be shipped through Vancouver at all. That may seem a rash statement, but the fact is that they do not enter Vancouver over their own tracks.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe the house adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Monday, April 8, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—PASSES

Mr. GOTT:

1. How many annual or trip passes were issued by the Canadian National Railways and the Department of Railways and Canals to other than employees of the Canadian National Railways, other railways' employees, senators, members of the House of Commons and their families, excluding all passes legally issued to government employees, during the year 1928?

2. To whom were passes issued?

3. What was the occupation of those to whom passes were issued?

Mr. DUNNING:

1. No annual or trip passes are issued by the Canadian National Railways, or the Department of Railways and Canals, other than those permitted by section 345 of the Railway Act; section 31, subsection 4, of the Immigration Act and section 70, subsection 3, of the Customs Act.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

NOTE.—The law in respect to passes applies equally to all Canadian railways and any discretion in the application of the general statute rests with the Board of Railway Commissioners under the Railway Act, and not with any railway, or department of the government.

The Act provides that records be kept of all free or reduced rate transportation and quarterly returns of all passes issued are made to the Board of Railway Commissioners, whose duty it is to examine such returns with a view to seeing that the law is observed. In addition, representatives of the board visit regional and district headquarters of all railways and make an annual audit of the stubs of all passes issued.

*Mr. SPENCER:

1. Is there a reduced rate of railway fares on the Canadian National Railways for civil servants or is such reduced rate or pass confined only to deputy ministers?

2. What are the names and present salaries of officials enjoying rank of deputy minister who have benefited by such reduced fare or pass, and what is the amount in money of such special benefit in each case?

3. How many heads of families in the department of the deputy ministers referred to in question 2, receive a salary of less than $100 per month?

Mr. DUNNING: With reference to this question, there appears to be an impression in the mind of the hon. member that with regard to railway transportation there is some difference as between the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific and other railways in Canada. I should like to make it quite clear that there is no such difference; all railways in Canada coming under the jurisdiction of the Railway Act are responsible to the railway commission with respect to transportation. In this respect the Canadian National Railways do not differ in the slightest degree from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I submit that it is rather objectionable to ask for information with respect to one of the railway companies under the jurisdiction of a common tribunal. It would appear to convey the idea that something is being done by one of these companies which is not according to the law.

With respect to the question generally, it will involve a very great deal of work; it might be required to stand as an order for return, but perhaps the hon. member would desire to give consideration to what I have said and let the question stand in the meantime.

Mr. SPENCER: In view of the explanation given by the minister I will be very glad to drop this question for the time being.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Dropped.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES

Mr. PRICE:

1. What amount has been paid for injury received in the service by the compensation board of New Brunswick to Canadian National Railways' employees during the past fiscal year ending March 31, 1928?

2. Under what conditions are claims awarded by the compensation board withheld from Canadian National Railways' employees?

3. Are skilled mechanics required to accept unskilled employment when the award of the compensation board is above a certain amount? If so, what is the amount?

4. Did the management of the Canadian National Railways mechanical department at Moncton instruct certain mechanics that their acceptance of awards allowed by the compensation board for injury would require them to revert to labourers' employment and pay?

5. Is the department aware that Fidele LeBlanc and Philbert Girouard, machinists in the employ of the Canadian National Railways at Moncton, who were awarded $1,245 and $1,250 respectively, have been informed that compensation in accordance with the findings of the board will be allowed them, only upon their agreement to accept unskilled labourers' employment with reduced pay during their future years of service?

6. What action, if any, will the department take about this matter?

Mr. DUNNING:

1.

Fatal cases, awards..	$ 21,122 04
Permanent partial disability..	7,049 27
Temporary total disability..	33,433 83
Hospital surgical and medical fees..	3,141 55
Total..	$ 64,746 69

2. None are withheld.

3. No. A man's employment after injury depends entirely upon his capacity to perform.

4. No.

5. With reference to LeBlanc, this man was injured on June 16, 1921, through having his left hand caught between two driving wheels, resulting in the loss of his thumb and first finger and permanent injury to his second finger. In October, 1921, the compensation board awarded him $1,237.50, payable in monthly instalments of $20 each. Upon his return to work his immediate foreman was of the opinion that by reason of the injury received his ability and efficiency had been reduced 20 per cent and instructions were issued to demote him from the position of stripper to a machinist's helper. LeBlanc made a strong plea that he be permitted to retain his old position, stating that if this were done he would waive the award. This was agreed to and he was retained at his original work.

No award was made in the case of Philbert Girouard.

6. All such matters are dealt with by the management and the men, either personally, or through their organizations. Action by the department is, therefore, not necessary.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—OFFICE CLEANERS

Mr. SPENCER:

1. How many women who are office cleaners at the House of Commons are widows?

2. What are the working hours of these women?

3. Are they allowed any wages in time of sickness? If so, how much?

4. What is the monthly wage?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. 46.

2. 6.30 a.m. to 8.45 a.m.

3. Yes, if doctor's certificate is supplied. Up to 4 days.

4. $1.25 per diem.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. LUCHKOVICH:

1. How many members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who belong to the mounted service proper, apart from the non-mounted service, formerly known as the Dominion Police, are stationed east of Port Arthur, Ontario?

2. How many horses for this service are maintained east of Port Arthur?

3. What was the total cost for the year 1927-28: (a) for mounted men, as to salary, allowances or other charges; (b) for horses; (1) as to the total cost of horses; (2) as to the cost of equipment; (3) as to the cost of fodder; and (4) as to the cost of stabling?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The following are answers to the above questions, as far as I understand it:—

1. There is no specially mounted service proper, but there are 173 members of the R.C.M. police stationed east of Port Arthur, exclusive of "A" division, Ottawa, formerly known as the Dominion Police.

2. 31.

3. "a". As stated in No. 1, there is no specially mounted service east of Port Arthur. All are taught to ride, and do so when required on duty in the public interest.

"b". $5,478.07.

1. Answered by "b" above.

2. $844.57.

3. $3,571.

4. Nil.

BEAUHARNOIS LIGHT HEAT AND POWER COMPANY

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Who are the directors of the Beauharnois Light, Heat & Power Company?

2. What security has the government secured as to the performance of their contract in permit issued under the Navigable Waters Act or as to bona fides of this company?

3. What consideration has been given the government for permit issued?

4. Who is to indemnify any navigation interests for any damage sustained as a result of said works sanctioned of this company?

5. Who is to settle for any damages accruing to the Cedar Rapids Company, the Soulanges Power Company, Canadian Light, Heat & Power Company, or others with vested rights infringed on by this permit?

6. Have any protests as yet been received by the government from either the United States government or the government of the state of New York, as to claiming damages for breaches of the Washington treaty or Boundary Waterways treaty by the granting of this permit?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. No information.

2, 3, 4 and 5. The usual statutory requirements have been observed and the site and plans have been approved subject to conditions set out in the order in council tabled. Agreement covering conditions contained in order-in council has not yet been executed.

6. No.

L'ARCHEVEQUE HARBOUR, NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond-West Cape Breton):

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Public Works to remove the over-casting left in the middle of L'Archeveque harbour, Nova Scotia, two or three years ago while dredging at that point?

2. What was the total amount of money expended on dredging at this point in the years 1925, 1926 and 1927?

3. Will the government bring down an itemized account showing the various individuals or firms to whom the above-mentioned money was paid?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. No dredging has been done at L'Archeveque on departmental account since 1924. No representations have been made concerning removal of material overcast in basin.

2. Nil.

3. Answered by No. 2.

CONFEDERATION BUILDING, OTTAWA

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. What department of the government undertakes the supervision of the construction of Confederation building, Wellington street, Ottawa, for which Lyall Company are the contractors?

2. What are the names of officials who have charge of this work for the department?

3. If not supervised by any department, what are the names and addresses of supervisors, and what remuneration do they receive for this work?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. Department of Public Works.

2. This work is under the direction of the chief architect, T. W. Fuller.

3. Messrs. Campbell & Shepherd, Northern Ontario Building, Toronto, are supervising and providing inspection services for this work as agents for the Department of Public Works at a commission of $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

IMPROVEMENTS ON FRENCH RIVER

Mr. LAPIERRE:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, requests and other documents received or sent by the government, relating to the construction of dams and other improvements on the French river in the province of Ontario.

ONTARIO MAIL SERVICES

Mr. ROSS (Kingston, for Mr. McGibbon):

For a copy of all correspondence between the Post Office Department and all other persons in connection with the following mail services: Gravenhurst and Walkers' Point, Hillside and Millar Hill, Huntsville and Seely, Huntsville and Hewholm, Kilworthy and Morrison Lake, Lancelot and Utterson, Bala and Sahanatien, Bear Cave and Rosseau, Bracebridge and Fraserburg, Bracebridge and Ziska, Craigie Lee and Minett, Cragie Lee and Wharf.

NORTHERN ONTARIO PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SIMPSON (For Mr. McGibbon):

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents in the possession of the Department of Public Works in connection with all public works in Gravenhurst, Bracebridge, Huntsville, Sparrow Lake, Honey Harbour, during the past four years.

MUSKOKA-ONTARIO POSTMASTERSHIPS

Mr. SIMPSON (For Mr. McGibbon):

For a copy of all correspondence between the Post Office Department, the Civil Service Commission, and any other person or persons, in connection with the dismissal of the postmasters at Rathburn, Uffiington, and Torrance. Also a copy of all similar correspondence and documents in connection with the filling of positions of postmasters at Utterson and Rossclair.

OLIVER, B.C., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. STIRLING:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents in connection with the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Mr. D. P. Simpson, the postmaster at Oliver, British Columbia, and the subsequent examination held by the Civil Service Commission as a result of which J. K. Anderson was informed that he was the successful contestant, including all recommendations, reports, memoranda and communications passing between the Civil Service Commission and the Postmaster General and any of his staff.

CHAS. A. PINCOMBE

Mr. JONES:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, documents and other papers with regard to the dismissal of Charles A. Pincombe, of Connors, New Brunswick, from his position in the National Revenue department of the public service.

[Mr. Elliott.]

MOTOR AND PLEASURE BOATS

Mr. SIMPSON (For Mr. McGibbon):

For a copy of all correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Muskoka Lakes Association, or any other body in connection with taxing motorboats, canoes, etc., in the Muskoka lakes.

SIMCOE, ONT., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. GEARY (For Mr. Stewart, Leeds):

For a copy of all recommendations, memoranda, reports, or communications of the Civil Service Commission, in any way relating to the appointment of either George E. Whitaker or Charles R. Bowyer to the office of postmaster at Simcoe, Ontario.

REJECTIONS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

For a return showing the names of persons appointed by the Civil Service Commission who have been rejected under section 24 of the Civil Service Act, in each department, for the last three years, with reason for the rejection in each case.

ST. JOHN-QUEBEC RAILWAY

Mr. MacLAREN:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents whatsoever during the last twelve months between the government of the province of New Brunswick or any minister or official thereof, and the government of the Dominion of Canada or any minister or official thereof respecting the sale of the Saint John-Quebec railway. (Valley railroad.)

PORT ARTHUR AND FORT WILLIAM PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. COWAN:

For a copy of all tenders, correspondence, and contracts, entered into by the government or any department thereof, in connection with the last contract for breakwater construction in the harbours of Port Arthur and Fort William.

Mr. COWAN:

For a copy of all advertisements, tenders, correspondence, and contracts, entered into by the government or any department thereof, in connection with the dredging contracts in the harbours of Port Arthur and Fort William, during the year 1928.

Mr. COWAN:

For a copy of all advertisements, tenders, correspondence, orders and contracts, in connection with the supply of coal for public buildings operated by the Dominion government in Port Arthur, during the year 1928.

Mr. COWAN:

For a copy of all tenders, correspondence, and contracts entered into between the government and any person, firm, or corporation, in connection with the ice breaking contract in the public harbours of Port Arthur and Fort William, during the year 1928.

FRUIT AND VEGETABLE COMBINE

Mr. MANION (For Mr. Stevens):

For a return of all correspondence passing between F. A. McGregor, Registrar Combines Investigation Act, or any officer connected with the administering of the said act or any officer of the Labour department and Mr. Hugh Bell, secretary of the British Columbia Hothouse Products Co-operative Association, or any other firm or persons in British Columbia connected with an application for an investigation into an alleged combine among the fruit jobbing houses in the city of Vancouver, as set in the affidavit dated the 1st September, 1927, and signed by Wilfred Lawrence Dence, Frank Davies, A. C. Brown, James Gray Speller, Edward Brown and Hugh Bell, and an affidavit made by Hugh Bell dated the 1st day of September, 1927; and also a copy of the said affidavits together with a copy of the interim report of the said registrar, F. A. McGregor, or any officer attached to the Department of Labour, and all other documents concerning the above-mentioned matter furnished to the said registrar.

Hon. PETER HEENAN (Minister of Labour): Unless my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) has some word from the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) to the contrary, I believe there was some understanding between the hon. member and some of my officers that this notice would be allowed to stand for some time.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I am not familiar with the matter, but if that is so it might stand.

Mr. HEENAN: That is my information. It might stand for the present.

Motion stands.

SUBSIDY TO NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. LAPIERRE (For Mr. Duff):

For a copy of all correspondence between the Honourable E. N. Rhodes, Premier of Nova Scotia, or any other minister of the said province, and the Honourable J. A. Robb, Minister of Finance, from July 1, 1926, to September 30, 1928, relating to the payment of the annual federal subsidy to the province of Nova Scotia; and the special grant, recommended by the Duncan commission to be paid to said province.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): The hon. gentleman in whose name this resolution stands is not now in his seat, but I might direct his attention and the attention of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition to the fact that, unfortunately for the country, I was out of office from June 28, 1926, to September 25 of that year.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): The year mentioned is 1928.

Mr. ROBB: Yes, but I was out of office during that period, and perhaps in fairness to my hon. friend the mover would like to amend the resolution in order to include us both.

Mr. BENNETT: The resolution refers to the period from July 1, 1926, to September 30, 1928.

Mr. ROBB: But my hon. friend was the Minister of Finance from about June 28 to September 25, 1926.

Mr. BENNETT: I take it that the motion refers to whoever was Minister of Finance. That is too small an observation for the Minister of Finance of this country to make; it is entirely out of keeping with the dignity of the office, but it is quite what we might expect.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE

EMPLOYMENT WITHOUT CERTIFICATES FROM COMMISSION

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River) moved:

For a return showing the names, positions occupied and salaries received of all persons employed in the several departments of the public service without certificates from the Civil Service Commission during each of the past five years.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: There are many positions which are exempted from the Civil Service Act. Does the hon. member ask for a list of all persons who do not come under the act?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I did not have reference to such positions as labourers, charwomen, or anything of that kind, but rather to those positions which may have been filled outside of the service.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are men employed at the Hudson bay as day labourers and who do not come under the Civil Service Commission; would the hon. member include those?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just what would the hon. member include?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Positions in the diplomatic service, secretarial work, and positions in the income tax department and Department of National Defence.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps the hon. member would amend this resolution, or leave it to the discretion of the government.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would ask that the motion stand for the time being.

Motion stands.

INCOME TAX ACT—REFUNDS

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): moved:

For a return showing:

1. The names of persons to whom refunds of not less than $500, under the Income Tax Act, have been made in the past five years, and the amount of such refund in each case.

2. The names of all persons or corporations in arrears or default of income tax, during each of the past five years, and the amount involved in each case.

Mr. ROBB: The Income Tax Act contains certain provisions with regard to secrecy, and I am not sure whether this resolution would come under those clauses. In the absence of the minister, would the hon. member permit this motion to stand so that it may be looked into?

Motion stands.

THE I'M ALONE INCIDENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister whether or not a despatch has been forwarded to the Secretary of State of the United States with regard to the I'm Alone incident, and if so, if a reply has been received. I ask that question because of the uncertainty which appears to exist in the newspapers. One press despatch says that a note has been forwarded, while another despatch from Washington contradicts that report. I think it is in the public interest that this situation be clarified by the Prime Minister.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As I mentioned to the hon. leader of the opposition on Thursday last, the I'm Alone incident has been the subject of communications between the governments of the United States and Canada, through our minister at Washington. A number of communications have passed between our government and the minister with a view to having formal representations made to the United States government. The last of these communications was sent forward to-day and I expect that formal representations will be made by the minister at Washington either to-day or possibly to-morrow at the latest.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

Mr. BENNETT: They have not yet been made?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The formal representations have not been made as yet.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The house resumed from Friday, April 5, consideration of the motion of Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of ways and means, the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. Hugh Guthrie, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of Mr. Spencer.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I shall occupy but a few moments of the time of the house, and I do so from a sense of duty which I believe I cannot evade. I desire to refer to certain important questions which have been raised in the course of this debate. While I have been unable to attend the opening sessions of the house, I have followed with the deepest interest the proceedings and the various discussions which have taken place. Never was I so proud of my membership in this house as when I read the speeches which were made in this chamber in approval of the resolution presented on the treaty to outlaw war. The debate was on a high plane throughout and would have done credit to any legislative body in the world. The true international spirit was apparent and manifested itself in all the views which were then expressed, and from all sides came the unqualified offer of the most intense cooperation for the furtherance of all moves which might lead to the establishment of permanent peace.

The world has moved forward; a new psychology of peace is gradually replacing the war psychology of the past, and it is no longer a sign of inferiority, a sort of inglorious stigma, to preach and advocate peace. Indeed, of all the beneficent effects of the League of Nations none is perhaps more commendable than the creation of a new international conscience whose feelings, whether or not they are officially expressed, are recognized and respected everywhere even by material strength and military power. This is the new international conscience which has given birth to the Kellogg pact and which has induced so many nations to accept compulsory arbitration of conflicts between states in order to replace violence and force by the rules of law and international justice. Nobody can fail to realize the supreme importance of a public act by which all the nations joined

together to declare that peace is the only goal to be reached and that war should be outlawed and denounced.

But the value of this agreement will depend largely upon the subsequent measures, upon the steps which will be taken everywhere by all nations for the purpose of reaching what they all declare to be their goal. Peace will be secured if nations can eliminate as far as possible the usual causes of conflicts, the ordinary sources of difficulties. The League of Nations has been during the last few years and is now investigating what those sources of difficulties and causes of conflict are. I am going to refer now to what has been declared to be the main source of difficulties between nations and this brings me directly to the subject under debate. On the 26th September, 1925, the assembly of the League of Nations adopted this resolution:

The assembly, firmly resolved to seek all possible means of establishing peace throughout the world; convinced that economic peace will largely contribute to security among the nations; persuaded of the necessity of investigating the economic difficulties which stand in the way of the revival of general prosperity, and of ascertaining the best means of overcoming these difficulties and of preventing disputes; invites the council to consider at the earliest possible moment the expediency of constituting on a wide basis a preparatory committee which, with the assistance of technical organizations of the league and the International Labour Office, will prepare the work of an international economic conference.

The convening of this conference under the auspices of the League of Nations shall be a matter for subsequent decision by the council.

The council took action on that recommendation and organized the preparatory committee composed of leading men of many nations. This preparatory committee started to work and organized an economic conference which sat in Geneva on the 4th May, 1927, and whose session extended until the 23rd May, 1927. The members of this conference were appointed by the various governments. Other members were nominated by the council or by certain international organizations invited by the council and experts accompanied members or were invited by the president of the conference. It consisted of 194 delegates and 226 experts representing 50 states, some of which were not and are not now members of the league. The president of the conference was M. Theunis, a former premier of Belgium. One of the vice-presidents was Mr. Henry M. Robinson, an American representative. Canada was represented at that conference by the following:

Mr. Albert Matthews, investment banker, director, Toronto General Trusts Corporation.

Mr. Joseph Daoust, LL.D. J.P., president, Daoust, Lalonde and Company, Ltd., Montreal, former president of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce, former president of the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association of Canada.

Mr. W. A. Riddell, M. A., Ph. D., Dominion of Canada advisory officer accredited to the League of Nations.

Mr. Adam Shortt, C.M.G., LL.D. chairman of the Board of Historical Documents, (economic and political), Board of Historical Publications, Ottawa, formerly commissioner of the Civil Service of Canada, and Professor of Economics, Queen's University.

Mr. W. A. Wilson, Canadian agricultural products representative in Great Britain.

I said that the United States of America were represented there and indeed they had a very strong representation. I will take the liberty of giving the names:

Mr. Henry M. Robinson, president of the First National Bank, Los Angeles, and member of the Dawes commission.

Mr. Norman H. Davis, formerly Assistant Secretary of Treasury and Under-Secretary of State.

Mr. John W. O'Leary, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Alonso E. Taylor, director of Food Research Institute, Stanford University.

Mr. Julius Klein, director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce.

They were accompanied by the following experts:

Dr. Arthur N. Young, economic adviser to the Department of State.

Dr. E. Dana Durand, chief of the Research Division, Department of Commerce.

Mr. Grosvenor Jones, chief of the Finance and Investment Division, Department of Commerce.

Dr. Louis Domeratzky, chief of the Regional Division, Department of Commerce.

Mr. E. W. Camp, Acting Commissioner of Customs, Treasury Department.

Mr. Asher Hobson, permanent American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome.

Dr. Percy W. Bidwell, an economist of the United States Tariff Commission.

Mr. Henry Chalmers, chief of the Division of Foreign Tariffs, Department of Commerce.

Mr. John P. Frey.

Secretary: Mr. Somerville Pinkney Tuck, Consul of the United States of America at Geneva.

The conference divided itself into committees, the three main committees being one on agriculture, one on commerce, and one on industry. I have the official report of the conference here which, after discussion, was presented and adopted by the conference. I am sorry that time will not permit me to read some of the very important considerations in that report as to commercial policies. I shall confine myself to reading the conclusion:

In view of the fact that harmful effects upon production and trade result from the high and constantly changing tariffs which are applied in many countries;

And since substantial improvement in the economic conditions can be obtained by increased facilities for international trade and commerce;

And in view of the fact that tariffs, though within the sovereign jurisdiction of the separate states, are not a matter of purely domestic interest but greatly influence the trade of the world;

And in view of the fact that some of the causes which have resulted in the increase of tariffs and in other trade barriers since the war have largely disappeared and others are diminishing;

The conference declares that the time has come to put an end to the increase in tariffs and to move in the opposite direction.

The conference recommends:

(1) That nations should take steps forthwith to remove or diminish those tariff barriers that gravely hamper trade, starting with those which have been imposed to counteract the effects of disturbances arising out of the war.

Moreover, in order to ensure that this action is continuously pursued, the conference recommends:

(2) That states should proceed to the conclusion of commercial treaties on lines and under conditions calculated to ensure the attainment of the aims mentioned herein;

(3) That, in future, the practice of putting into force, in advance of negotiations, excessive duties established for the purpose of bargaining, whether by means of tarifs de combat or by means of general tariffs, should be abandoned;

(4) That the Council of the League of Nations should be requested to instruct its economic organization to examine on the basis of the principles enunciated by the present conference, the possibility of further action by the respective states with a view to promoting the equitable treatment of commerce by eliminating or reducing the obstructions which excessive Customs tariffs offer to international trade.

In this enquiry, the economic organization should consult with representatives of the various governments, including non-members of the league, and also so far as necessary with the competent bodies representing commerce, industry, agriculture and labour.

The object of the enquiry should be to encourage the extension of international trade on an equitable basis, while at the same time paying due regard to the just interests of producers and workers in obtaining a fair remuneration and of consumers in increasing their purchasing power.

I will quote one sentence from the general resolutions in the final report with respect to agriculture:

It is desirable that all hindrances to the free circulation of and trade in agricultural products should be removed, in so far as their removal does not endanger the vital interests of the different countries and their workers.

In those states in which customs protection is maintained, it should be reduced, both for industry and agriculture, to the lowest possible point indispensable to production; care should be taken to assist in the maintenance of an equitable balance between industry and agriculture and not to stifle one to the advantage of the other.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

The final resolution concerning economic tendencies affecting the peace of the world reads:

The conference:

Recognizing that the maintenance of world peace depends largely upon the principles on which the economic policies of nations are framed and executed:

Recommends that the governments and peoples of the countries here represented should together give continuous attention to this aspect of the economic problem, and looks forward to the establishment of recognized principles designed to eliminate those economic difficulties which cause friction and misunderstanding in a world which has everything to gain from peaceful and harmonious progress.

The conference recognizes that the reception and successful application of the principles stated in the resolutions of the conference depend, not only upon the good-will of governments and administrations, but upon an informed and supporting public opinion throughout the world, and for this purpose would welcome, in the economic as in other fields, the development of closer international cooperation by scientific and educational institutions, as well as the help of the press and other agencies of importance for the information and enlightenment of the public.

These recommendations were unanimously adopted by the conference except for the union of Soviet republics of Russia and Turkey. These recommendations were afterwards approved by the council of the league, which recommended that as far as possible they should be carried out by the various nations which had taken part in the conference.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. At the last session of parliament, certain of these resolutions were laid upon the table of the house and the Prime Minister was asked whether it was the intention of the government to submit them to parliament for approval or disapproval or discussion, and the Prime Minister declared that that was not the intention of the government. I submit, therefore, that it is not in order by this indirect method to bring about a discussion of these resolutions at this late stage of the budget debate.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is a public document from which I am reading. Surely my hon. friend is not serious when he suggests that I am out of order in reading the recommendations of the League of Nations or of the economic conference. These are public documents.

Mr. CAHAN: I suggest that when the government has positively declined to allow a discussion by this house of certain public documents—

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend is at liberty to discuss this at any time.

Mr. CAHAN: Not at any time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend opposes it, he will align himself with Russia and Turkey.

Mr. CAHAN: I am perfectly prepared to align myself with Russia because Russia was one of the countries that so distinctly disapproved of it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am very sorry that I do not please my hon. friend by reading these recommendations of the economic conference of the League of Nations.

Mr. CAHAN: It is an indirect approach that is not becoming.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am always anxious to please my friend, but surely I am not committing a criminal offence by reading these resolutions which have been adopted by the goodwill of all the nations of the world.

Mr. CAHAN: You should have the courage to submit to this house the resolutions of the League of Nations of which you approve.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this time will not be taken out of my forty minutes.

I say that the council of the league recommended to the nations concerned that they should conform their policies to the wishes thus expressed, and the assembly, which sat in September, 1927, following the conference, adopted unanimously a resolution in approval of the work of the conference and its recommendations. These are the conclusions, Mr. Speaker, which have been reached by the representatives of most of the nations of the world, acting with the cooperation and upon the advice of experts representing almost all the nations of the world, experts who have no political interest to serve and no financial axe to grind.

Mr. CAHAN: May I ask a question? Have they since been approved by any legislative or parliamentary body in the civilized world, excepting the Soviet of Russia?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know they have. I will take the trouble to give the names of certain nations which have approved of them. I have seen that stated somewhere in the documents.

Mr. CAHAN: I have not been able to find any.

Mr. MANION: Were they put in force?

Mr. LAPOINTE: They have been put in force in Canada, and that is what I am coming to.

Mr. HANSON: What about the United States?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Those recommendations were in line with the principles formulated by that international conference which I have mentioned. They are also, I submit with due respect, in accordance with the policies which have been followed by the government of Canada since 1921. Indeed, our representatives at that conference, and later the Canadian delegate at the assembly of the League of Nations, Senator Dandurand, could state with legitimate pride that Canada had already acted in accordance with the views of the conference, and had not followed the policy which was then unanimously denounced as an obstacle to the peace of the world and to economic inter-relations between states.

Mr. BENNETT: And he added that it was the only country in the world that had done so.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We are proud of that if it is so, which I do not admit; but we have the endorsation of the representatives of the nations of the world in the persons of their leading economists and outstanding experts. Surely we are in good company in putting those principles into practice.

Mr. CLARK: Where is the company?

Mr. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend has not listened to me I am sorry. I thought I had made it clear that those principles had been accepted by all the representatives at the conference.

Mr. CAHAN: By the representatives of the United States as well.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am coming to that: by the representatives of the United States as well.

Mr. CAHAN: And repudiated by the United States congress.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is for my hon. friend to say. I am sorry, I do not think I am very aggressive when I address the house, but it seems to be the practice on the part of my good friend to interrupt me very frequently.

Mr. CAHAN: Then bring before the house the report of the economic conference for full discussion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is one of the regrets of my life that what I say is always unpleasant to my hon. friend from St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan), although it is so far from my wish and my purpose. We have put those principles into practice in spite of the protests and notwithstanding the objections of many who preach in this country the very doctrine which they denounce as selfish hostility when it is practised by other countries. But, sir, the conditions in Canada to-day show that the economic conference was right when it formulated those principles as being sound economically for the progress of the various nations of the world. I do not think we have increased any item of our tariff since 1921, and we have reduced many. We may say, with a certain amount of pride too, that those who year in and year out were predicting blue ruin and bankruptcy and disaster, are compelled to-day to thank or to blame Providence for the prosperity now enjoyed by Canada, for the buoyant conditions in transportation, in banking, in industry, for the large and expanding trade of this country —all figures speak with such a loud voice that the whispers of death have been silenced, I hope forever.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are other statements in the report I have read which to-day are also proved to be true in the clearest possible manner. What better evidence could we have of the danger of high protective tariffs, of their inherent menace to the peace of the world and to good international relations, than the words which have been uttered in this house at the mere suggestion of a possible increase of customs duties by the country to the south of us? Appeals have even been made to "red-blooded Canadians" for retaliatory action, suggestions have been made that parliament ought to adjourn or to prolong its sittings to take counteraction. It has even been suggested that the governor in council should be empowered to increase our tariff schedules should the necessity arise. Sir, the tariff policies of other countries are their own business—

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: —and certainly I will not venture to express any opinion thereon, except the hope that the apostles of high and higher tariff duties will not be more successful in other countries than they have been in this in carrying out a policy which was denounced so energetically and so unanimously by the representatives of all the countries sitting in conference in 1927.

But what if they succeed? Well, I believe that the Canadian people will not lose their heads. I am confident they will continue to trust the safe and sound judgment and the good, logical common-sense mind of my Scotch friend, the Minister of Finance, to deal with the situation. Those issues cannot be fought with heat and prejudice. If one market is closed to us, it is evident that we will have to find other markets; and if one market is made more difficult for our goods to enter, we will have to find other markets which are accessible. If it is necessary to modify certain tariff schedules for the purpose of developing a larger trade with nations which are desirous of trading with us, this may be done, but only in the Canadian interest and not at all as a result of a policy of retaliation or tariff war. In doing this, I repeat, Canadian interests, and Canadian interest alone, must be considered. Talk of red blood! Is it a manifestation of red blood to shape our tariff policies on the policies of foreign countries by imitation or in any other manner? Did it show a lack of dignity, was it a shameless action on the part of Britain to maintain her policies though her neighbours in the adjoining countries had protectionist tariffs, such as France, Germany and other nations? I know of no prouder words than those uttered by Sir Robert Peel in 1846 when, speaking to a world encircled by protectionist tariffs, he said: No matter what foreign countries do in the matter of removing their tariffs or not, Britain will act in her own way and in her own interests. And that Sir Robert Peel and other Britons were men of red blood no one could ever deny. The same words, or practically the same words were uttered by Mr. Asquith in 1903 when he replied to the argument for retaliation as set forth by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain.

Our neighbours will shape their policies in Washington and we will shape our policies in Ottawa in the interests of the Canadian people and in accordance with their views. Whatever may be my admiration for other countries, it does not go to the point of necessarily copying their methods and their policies and of looking at some social and political problems in the same way as they look at them.

Mr. CAHAN: Not even if expressed by an economic conference?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will my hon. friend allow me to proceed?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Though I do not resent anything coming from him, my time is limited. As I was saying, whatever may be my admiration for other countries I still prefer the Canadian vision, the Canadian mentality, the Canadian outlook, and I deem it very important to preserve our own national characteristics and maintain our own way of dealing with public questions. May I remark furthermore that I have never noticed a keen desire on the part of my protectionist friends to imitate even the United States when that country happened to lean towards freer trade. I know of some items which are being admitted free into that country and which are paying a duty in Canada; and they are of some importance. But, as I say, I have never yet witnessed any demand on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite for reciprocity so far as these items are concerned. I will not refer either to the reciprocity agreement of 1911 except perhaps to observe that only the other day I was reading a book of Mr. Underwood, The Drifted Sands of Party Politics, in which he says that the friends of low tariff in the United States deplored the defeat in Canada of reciprocity in 1911. He himself was leader of the Democratic party in congress at the time and had supported President Taft in that policy. Indeed, the policy of no truck or trade when things are going one way, and of retaliation when they are going the other way does not seem to me quite fair. After all, what we shall have to consider is whether a further raising of the artificial barrier at the border line of our country would be in the interests of our people en masse, whether it would make for greater prosperity, for greater harmony, for larger progress in our own country, whatever may be the effect on other countries. There lies the whole principle, and any other argument seems rather to be camouflaged rhetoric.

I should like to refer to one or two other matters but I am afraid my time is going. However, there is another question which I desire particularly to discuss, and I will come to it immediately. Canada can compete with the world, and is competing with the world, not with the weapons of retaliation, of distrust, of fear, of economic or other warfare, but with the weapons of sound organization, the energy of our people, easier transportation, better marketing, and credit being given to our citizens. This is done by leadership, by such leadership as has given to this country the policy of British preference, which I desire to discuss for a minute or two in connection with the subamendment which has been moved.

The subamendment, I am free to confess, is rather a shrewd motion. My hon. friends directly opposite have declared themselves to be afraid of the closing of the market which is nearer to us; my hon. friend from Battle River (Mr. Spencer) indicates to them other markets—he does so in this subamendment. Hon. gentlemen directly opposite have tried indeed to lead the hon. gentleman in the far corner to a stand against the government; but my hon. friend from Battle River is trying to align them behind himself in his own stand against us. Of course, this subamendment cannot be accepted by the government, and no one knows that better than the mover of the subamendment. It is a motion of want of confidence. The Minister of Finance has moved that the house resolve itself into committee of ways and means; my hon. friend from Battle River says: No; the house will not resolve itself into committee of ways and means but instead we will have a declaration for British preference. This of course would mean the defeat of the government, and those of us who have confidence in the government cannot vote for that motion. Even those who may not be in sympathy with all the policies of the government, but who prefer the government to any alternative or substitute which might offer itself—and that substitute can be offered only by my hon. friends directly opposite—are also unable to vote for such a motion. But I go further. What is the necessity for attacking this government on the question of the British preference? Is it fair to attack us on that question? Who were the originators of the British preference policy in Canada? They were the great Liberal leaders, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and W. S. Fielding.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Who borrowed the idea from Sir Charles Tupper—absolutely. I can quote you Sir Wilfrid Laurier to that effect.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will not discuss that question with my hon. friend; he is entitled to whatever comfort he can derive from it. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and W. S. Fielding initiated that policy. They made it the basis of the fiscal policy of Canada. We who are their political successors are also preserving that policy with loyalty and with care, and we are proud of the fact. I have always defended the policy of British preference; other markets were almost closed to us and it was necessary that we should find outlets for our Canadian goods. These were admitted into England free of duty, and it was only in the

interests of Canada that we should take advantage of this situation, because I repeat that this was not a sentimental device; this action was taken and has been maintained in the interests of this country.

Was it not a good policy? The very first year after it was adopted, in 1898, our exports to Great Britain mounted from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000. That progression has continued; our exports to Great Britain for the twelve months ending January, 1929, amounted to $446,000.000 in round figures, while our imports amounted to only about $193,000,000. In addition, the goods we imported from Great Britain paid a duty of over $35,000,000, while our own exports entered England free.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order; the hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

Mr. G. R. GEARY (South Toronto): Mr. Speaker, in common with every member on this side of the house, I am very glad indeed to see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) back in his place, apparently fully restored to health. He has spoken to us this afternoon very charmingly, as perhaps he can better than many others, but like other charmers his speech is full of sweet nothings. It is hardly a year since we heard the whole story which was given us again to-day by the Minister of Justice, and I have yet to hear of any formal action on the part of this government indicating that it meant to change its tariff policy in any degree by reason of certain resolutions which were repeated by the minister this afternoon.

The Minister of Justice takes some credit for reductions in the tariff schedule; he says that Canada has led the way in this respect as he claims that Canada has so often led the way and intends to continue to lead the way in international relations. But my hon. friends to my left, who perhaps are as keen as any to observe changes in the tariff, stated last year, the year before and again this year that the changes in the tariff amounted to nothing at all as far as their interests are concerned. Indeed one hon. member declared, after a computation, that the changes made by way of reductions by the Liberal government over a period of six years amounted in all to something less than one per cent.

The Minister of Justice made rather a protectionist speech; he rather subscribed to the policy supported by the party on this side of the house, to which we have adhered for years, that we shall so draw our tariff schedules that they will take care of our own country and protect, so far as they can be fairly protected, those industries both agricultural and mechanical which have a right to exist in this country. However, the minister went one step further and spoiled that protectionist idea; he inferred, although he was careful not to put it in words, that he is disposed to let some economic conference meeting in Geneva settle the tariff question for Canada. First and foremost in that conference, according to the minister, were representatives from the United States. That country now proposes to put up its tariff once more, and if I take any meaning at all from the remarks of the Minister of Justice they were designed perhaps to say nice things, to vaunt his patriotism, but perhaps more than that to make some sort of gesture to the United States.

In 1923 Right Hon. W. S. Fielding, in presenting his budget speech, put on record the determination of the Liberal government to make overtures to the United States looking to reciprocity, and in fact he did communicate to the United States that his government were open to a discussion with regard to a reciprocity treaty. This was after 1911, and if the Democratic party, which unfortunately for itself never has been in power since, could not carry its views throughout the whole country, according to this Liberal government, the Republican government, if it regretted the defeat of the treaty of 1911, has had the opportunity since 1923 of concluding a treaty with this country having the same effect.

Mr. HANSON: Why stir up the dead?

Mr. GEARY: I am not stirring up the dead; I am just laying it away. The minister works himself up almost into a passion over the idea that this party has in mind an economic war against the United States. If that is so I have not heard of it. I fully subscribe to everything the minister has said as to the right of this country to look after its own affairs and the right of the citizens of the United States to elect representatives who will legislate for the benefit of the citizens of that country. That is their business and not ours. But, Mr. Speaker, the remedy suggested by my hon. friend is that we seek new markets; if we cannot find a market in the United States we should go abroad for new markets. Let me say to the minister that he does not need to go out of this country for markets. Let him and his government take such steps as will conserve the industries of Canada and make them prosperous, self-supporting and beneficial to all the people of this country. Let him and his government take even one step towards helping these industries in such a way that the home market in Canada will be maintained for all

their products; let us look to the home market instead of looking far across the seas. That will be much simpler and much better for us and, as the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) said on Friday, that is what the government has signally failed to do.

Mr. MILLAR: Might I ask my hon. friend just how large a population it will take to consume our 500,000,000 bushels of wheat?

Mr. GEARY: I am not too good at arithmetic, so I will let my hon. friend work that out himself. If it were at all relevant I would have pleasure in discussing the question with him.

Now I wish to say a few words with regard to the budget, Mr. Speaker, although there is very little to be said as to the financial proposals contained therein. The budget has been called innocuous, but I would hardly agree with that description. To me the financial proposals are not innocuous; they are harmful in that they do not lay down or propose any constructive action on behalf of the people of this country. To that degree they are not innocuous but positively harmful. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said the same; perhaps they are not cold in their reception of the budget but at least they are lukewarm. My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Brown) says the budget is a parcel of bare bones, but the government need not worry; he will swallow it. To my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Glen) the budget is a negative budget but he will vote in the affirmative for its adoption. He vociferously regrets that the budget contains no measure of relief to the farmers, but he will vote against the amendment expressing in terms that regret. However, the hon. member has one reason for congratulating the government; there is an omission which pleases him very much: The income tax has not been cut this year. How touching it is, Mr. Speaker, to recall the loyalty and devotion to the government of the hon. gentleman who, just one short year ago, joined with the government in voting for a 10 per cent reduction in the income tax.

Finding no particular gratification in the financial proposals, my hon. friends opposite turn to the surplus and the consequent reduction in the debt. I agree that is a matter for congratulation; it might well give them some feeling of pride, but under the conditions which exist to-day there is no difficulty whatever for any government prepared to maintain a certain level of taxation to produce within reasonable limits almost any surplus required. The only financial calls upon the government to-day are the ordinary expenditures of the country and the usual, stereotyped capital expenditure. The time has passed when war expenditures, railway advances and demobilization costs must be met from the funds of Canada, and no one knows that better than the minister. If I were to make any objection to or any criticism of the surplus I would say it was too large. I am given to understand that that amount is not required to amortize and pay off the national debt of this country. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) is apportioning some $60,000,000 towards the reduction of the national debt, but the hon. members for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and Toronto East Centre (Mr. Matthews) developed a plan for the consideration of the minister whereby the sum of nineteen or twenty million dollars would be set aside each year for a certain number of years and thus in time dissipate the whole national debt. If that scheme be sound, to my mind the Minister of Finance has no right to proceed on the present unscientific basis, and take some $60,000,000 out of the people of Canada when, by a more scientific method, $20,000,000 would answer the same purpose.

The public accounts for 1928, the last year for which they are complete—every figure I use will be taken from that volume—show that the annual average surplus of the Conservative government for the six years 1917 to 1922 amounted to $66,000,000, while the annual average surplus of this government in the succeeding six years, from 1923 to 1928, was only $64,000,000. In spite of the difficulties under which they had to work, and in spite of the strain to which they were subject at that time, the Conservative government had an annual surplus which amounted to $2,000,000 more than the annual surplus of the present government since 1923. There is not much comfort in that for the hon. gentlemen opposite, especially when they consider that during the last six years the government has been in office the full man power of the country has been engaged in the industries of field, forest and mine. They were years of bountiful crops, but the six years which preceded them were, first, years during which the business of this country was carried on under a very heavy strain; years when business and production were at a low ebb, and, second, the equally depressing post-war period, during which the country was using every effort to recover from the effects of the Great war. No comparison is fair which compares the last six years with the six years immediately preceding.

My hon. friends take much comfort in saying that in the last five years there has been a reduction in the national debt, and that the Conservative party were not able to reduce it but were forced to increase it during the preceding six years. How do reductions or additions in the national debt come about? Leaving borrowings to one side the money to be used by the government comes from, first, the consolidated fund into which go all the ordinary receipts from taxation, and, second, a small account which is called special receipts. Normally this latter account does not amount to much but it has been a very advantageous account for the present government, because they have been able to take $35,000,000 from that account during the last six years, as against $3,000,000 during the preceding six years.

The consolidated fund has to take care of the ordinary expenditures of the country, and it normally can take care also of the ordinary stereotyped capital expenditures of the country exclusive of the special expenditures for railway advances and subsidies, and war and demobilization costs. If there is a surplus in the consolidated fund and it has to be used to pay capital or special expenditures, then there is nothing left to apply on the reduction of the debt. To the extent to which money has to be paid on those accounts in excess of the balance in the consolidated fund there is an increase in the public debt. On the other hand, if there is nothing to be paid out of that balance, then there is correspondingly a decrease in the public debt. Keeping in mind then the fact that the preceding government had a surplus each year which amounted to $2,000,000 more than the present government, why is it the national debt was increased during the Conservative regime and has been decreased during the regime of the present government? We will have to turn to the capital account and special expenditure accounts to find the answer. First, let us take, the capital expenditure account; this is the capital account which covers the ordinary stereotyped capital expenditures of the country.

Mr. BENNETT: The Welland canal is an instance.

Mr. GEARY: As the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) has said, there are canals like the Welland and Trent, and there are also government railways which come under this heading. The only item at the present time under the heading "railways" is the Hudson Bay railway. Only two or three million dollars per year has been expended during the last few years, but in former years there were items of $25,000,000 and $30,000,000 and so on, deficits on operation of the Intercolonial railway. During those years we had the Intercolonial under our control, but that deficit has disappeared because of the action of the Conservative government in amalgamating that railway with the National railway system.

Another division of the capital account covers public works, government buildings in Ottawa, the shipbuilding program of the government in power, and certain things like the St. Lawrence ship canal. Those accounts do not vary to any degree from year to year, except by reason of some abnormal condition. As a rule, they can be paid out of the surplus in consolidated fund without any trouble. During the six years when the Conservative government was in power the expenditures on capital account including government railways and the shipbuilding program amounted to $221,000,000; during the last six years, through no change of policy, nor effort of good management, but only by reason of the necessity for the expenditure having disappeared, the Liberal government has been called upon to pay only $94,000,000.

But there are other special expenditures which have to be considered when we compare the two six-year periods; one expenditure is that of war demobilization, and the other is railway advances and subsidies.

It is not necessary to give any detail regarding the railway advances and subsidies. Everyone knows that these were necessary in the process of taking over the decrepit railways of the country and amalgamating them into one great system. That was an enterprise which was carried out by the Conservative party, and it has since been amply justified in every particular. Under the six years of Conservative rule the government was called upon to advance some $210,000,000, in subsidies and allowances to railways while the present government has had to pay only $131,000,000 during the last six years. In addition the Conservative government assumed the burden of $284,000,000 nonactive assets representing previous advances to the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern Railways.

The third special expenditure account is that of war and demobilization. During the six years of the Conservative regime the government had to expend $1,462,000,000, on this account while the Liberal government during its term of office has had to expend only $8,000,000.

The addition of these capital and special expenditures shows that the Conservative gov-

ernment were called upon to expend $2,177,000,000, whereas the present government has been saddled with only $233,000,000. Is it any wonder that the public debt of the country was of necessity increased during that period? The people were taxed to the limit and no one can say that the Conservative party could have taken any more out of the people during those years. The Conservative party increased the debt by $1,807,000,000 or $370,000,000 less than the amount they were obliged to assume or pay out for abnormal capital expenditure for war expenditures and for subsidies and advances to railways. They were able to do that by good financing; not by taking too much money from the people but by conserving expenditures and showing a balance in consolidated fund which was more than the balance shown under the present government. Through proper management they were able to make a very much better showing with regard to the national debt than that made by the Liberal government which during the past six years has shown a reduction in the national debt of $125,000,000. One would not object very strenuously to all the glory taken, the boasting, if you like to call it so, of hon. members opposite in regard to this showing; but here is the unfair part of it, and it is to this I wish to direct most of my attention. In order to discredit the preceding government or to reflect credit upon themselves, this government and its members persist in comparing, as though they were on a comparable basis, the six years just ending of government by the Liberals with the six years immediately preceding of government by the Conservatives. Of course anyone in his senses knows that as between these two periods there is no proper basis for comparison. One would have thought hon. gentlemen opposite, realizing this, would at least be fair about the matter, but they have been unfair and they have made misstatements which amount to deception. I do not like to think hon. members would make such statements deliberately, and I can only ascribe their doing so to lack of knowledge of the true state of affairs and lack of attention to the public accounts. More flagrant than anyone else on the opposite side in this unfair comparison have been the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) himself and one of the members of his government. The Prime Minister has been time and again called to account for it but he still persists in making the same representations in regard to which he was corrected and which he must honestly know are at least that sort of deception that is more dangerous than the truth—a half truth. It is not long since the Prime Minister had occasion to speak about this same matter and he said that the public debt in 1919 had been increased by hon. gentlemen opposite—that is by this party—to the tune of $382,000,000. That is perfectly true. The impression to be left, apparently willingly by him, was that in the normal course of affairs the debt had been increased by that vast amount by a Conservative government. My leader (Mr. Bennett) corrected him saying:

That was direct payment for railways.

As a matter of fact during that year it was more for demobilization, but my right hon. friend did not know that, because he replied:

Mr. Mackenzie King: Not at all. It was made up of the general expenditures of hon. gentlemen opposite including these grants.

That is railway grants. Could anything be more unfair than that? It is as though he ignored a tremendous, special expenditure of millions upon millions of dollars and emphasized a small expenditure made in the ordinary routine out of the consolidated fund and out of the revenues of the country. It is just as though the right hon. gentleman had likened a mouse to an elephant because they were of the same colour; there is no more logic than that in making such a comparison. He went on to say:

In the next year—

That is 1920.

—there was not a direct payment for railways and yet in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920, the public debt of Canada was further increased by over $674,000,000.

And here I object.

That is the way in which the country was being governed while hon. gentlemen opposite were in office in 1919 and 1920.

The implication is that the money was wasted. The truth is that the money was spent on the most righteous of purposes, largely in carrying on the war in which this country was engaged at the moment, and in amalgamating and giving to the people under public ownership a great national system of railways. That is the way the country was being governed, and we are proud of the fact that it was being governed in that way during those years. Canada will never cease to bless the Conservative government of those years for the fact that they brought into being under public ownership the Canadian National Railways and that they so prosecuted their efforts in regard to the conduct of the war that with the troops supporting them, they

brought great glory to Canada. That is the way the country was being governed, and we take great pride in the fact.

My right hon. friend was again interrupted by my leader when he made a statement of the same sort. My leader said:

Due to the war.

My right hon. friend replied:

Due to their methods of financing. . . . We reduced expenditures and imposed some increased taxation for the purpose, mark you, to meet obligations which were left to us by the previous administration. At first about all that we were able to do was to hold the deficit at the point at which it had been the year before. The deficit instead of being $92,000,000 was brought down to $81,000,000 in 1922.

The right hon. gentleman and his cabinet had nothing whatever to do with bringing that down from $92,000,000 to $81,000,000. Mr. Fielding said that it was no part of the present government's work to deal with the spending of money in the fiscal year there referred to. The deficit was reduced by only $11,000,000, it is true, but it was reduced because conditions were improved. The present government had no hand in decreasing the deficit; it was none of their business at all. In spite, however, of the corrections of the right hon. gentleman's statement, he persists and his colleagues persist in that unfair and misleading comparison of those years of Liberal rule with the preceding years of Conservative rule.

The right hon. gentleman then went on to say that in 1923 his government began to function by way of imposing more taxation and reducing expenditures. An examination of the books will show that they did nothing in regard to reducing expenditures. There was a falling off of some $13,000,000 or $14,000,000 in expenditures, but this was not due to any change, because the expenditures of the departments, taking them by and large, about balanced with those of the preceding years. There were some millions of dollars less for elections and for pensions and other items which account for the decrease, but none of this was due to any change in policy on the part of the government. They said that the revenue was increased. The revenue was increased to the extent of $4,000,000 by taxes that bore so hardly upon the people that they had to take them off the next year.

They had to retrace their steps and take off many of those nuisance taxes which were not meeting with the approval of the people. The smaller increase in this debt that year was due to the fact that a great deal more money came through customs; some $10,000,000 came in from war refunds and there was a much smaller payment necessary for railway advances.

There is only one other speaker to whom I wish to refer and that is the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston). He is not in his seat, but I shall not refrain on that account from saying what I desire to say. As reported on page 1029 of Hansard, after making the same invidious comparison, unfair and misleading as he should have known it to be, he made the following statement:

When my hon. friend compared the period of 1918 to 1922 with the period of 1925 to 1929, he made a comparison concerning a different Canada altogether.

With that I quite agree. That has been the burden of my remarks. Why was it a different Canada? He goes on to say:

A Canada which had emerged from the gloom which existed during the last five years of Conservative rule and had entered into the sunlight of prosperity under Liberal rule.

Probably that statement is put more unfairly than any of the other statements that have been made. The hon. gentleman was taking part in the war; he was doing his gallant best; he believed he was right; he surely believed the government was right, why at this stage should he take sides against the government which was endeavouring so to hold up our hands over there in France that success would ultimately attend the efforts of the forces. I do not think two years ago he would have said any such thing, but he says he is prepared to subscribe to that, to say the least, disingenuous statement of his leader and for that he must accept full responsibility himself. He is making a statement and a comparison, ignoring the heroic efforts of the people at home to maintain the forces in the field. That is exactly what he is doing.

Mr. RALSTON: Would my hon. friend permit me? I expressly deducted every dollar that could possibly by any stretch of the imagination be deducted or appropriated to the war and demobilization expenses.

Mr. GEARY: My hon. friend did that. He made a calculation, but it is not that to which I am referring. I am saying that my hon. friend compared the six years of Liberal rule with the six years preceding of Conservative rule, and my hon. friend did not ascribe the heavier expenses under Conservative rule to the war. His inference was that the money was misspent by the Conservatives, and that there was a surplus under Liberal rule because they no longer misspent the money as the Conservatives did, not because they were

relieved from the necessity of raising money for the war. His inference was that the Liberals had governed better and that the Conservatives had spent an undue amount in the preceding six years. My hon. friend says yes, we spent an undue amount. If my hon. friend can show one dollar misspent by the Conservative government I should be obliged for the information for the involved statement in his speech does not show it. If he takes those six years of Liberal rule and the six years of Conservative rule preceding, he will find that the Conservatives made a better showing on capital expenditures during those six years than did the Liberal party in the six years following.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend will have to show that.

Mr. GEARY: I do not think that my hon. friend claims that there was any money misspent by the Conservatives.

Mr. RALSTON: I was talking about good and proper administration, and was dealing with the argument of my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that the administration in the last five years of Liberal rule had not been as effective and efficient as the administration of the Conservative rule because of the fact that more money had been spent and I showed where the money went.

Mr. GEARY: I am not going over these figures again. It is not at all the point to which I am taking exception. I am taking exception to the fact that the Minister of National Defence, ignoring the difficulties with which the Conservative government were faced and which they had to struggle against during the preceding six years, made a comparison in dollars and cents with the expenditures under this government and the expenditures under the Conservative government preceding.

Mr. RALSTON: I gave them credit.

Mr. GEARY: If my hon. friend thinks that it is fair to do as his leader and so many members opposite have done, to compare the two periods as though the war expenditures did not exist under the preceding Conservative government, well, I must allow my hon. friend to do it.

Mr. RALSTON: I was using the same five years that my hon. friend from South Wellington took.

Mr. GEARY: The principle of the thing is the same, and I am trying to show—it is not being done well, and it is perhaps nothing at all new—the true facts of the case. It is obvious that there is nothing to be gained by comparing the surpluses under the present government with the surpluses under the government which preceded it. That cannot be to the advantage of the party opposite, because their surpluses were not due in any particular to a change of policy or to betterment in management. They were due simply to one fact, that this government had been relieved of the impelling necessity of raising money, by borrowing, in order to carry on the war, and to pay the expense of getting the railways welded into the national system. With that in mind, and not to put too many figures on Hansard, I am going to leave the point. I am willing to discuss surpluses in any year with my hon. friend, how they were obtained, and whether they were justifiably obtained, and whether the government, in a proper manner, are reducing the national debt. These are matters of fair and open discussion. But when my hon. friend tries to compare the six years of Liberal rule with the six years of Conservative rule, with those war years and railway financing years, I say that he does not stand on solid ground, and my hon. friend and his party should rather take the patriotic view and admit that the capable sons and daughters of Canada, with her untold riches and natural resources, once the war was over, rose to their opportunities and gladly embraced the chance to restore themselves, and it is they who have induced the prosperity of this country, not the government opposite. They it is who have enabled this government, no longer faced with the necessities I have indicated, to show the debt reduction I have shown.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before my hon. friend leaves that point, may I ask him, is it not true that after deducting every dollar spent on the war and demobilization during the six years to which he has referred, there was still a deficit in the public accounts for those years?

Mr. GEARY: No, that is not true.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is true.

Mr. BENNETT: You had the railway.

Mr. CLARK: Did my right hon. friend deliberately omit the railways when he asked his question?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With regard to the railways, I will deal with that question if my hon. friend wishes; I was going to do that to-morrow.

Mr. GEARY: The railways and the war.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said war and demobilization.

Mr. GEARY: Not the railways?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not say railways, but with regard to the railways I will refer to that now if hon. gentlemen wish. My hon. friend said that it was not true that after allowing for the war and demobilization expenditure, there was still a deficit in the public accounts under Conservative administration, and that is why I asked the question.

May I say, with respect to the period to which my hon. friend refers, moneys were paid out to meet deficits incurred by railways that were not meeting operating expenses or fixed charges. The moneys that were advanced in the other period were advanced to a railway that was meeting operating expenses and could meet fixed charges, and went to the development of a railway system. That is an entirely different thing.

Mr. GEARY: When my right hon. friend says "other" he means the present government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. GEARY: Is that quite true?—no, I do not think my right hon. friend has taken my answer properly. I think I have these figures under my hand, and I am very glad of the opportunity to give them to him.

In the preceding six years, railway subsidies were advanced by the Conservative government to the amount of $210,000,000; I take those figures from the blue book. In addition there was $284,000,000, representing advances to the Grand Trunk Pacific and Canadian Northern railways which had been carried for a time as a non-active asset, but which was wiped out, quite properly, by the Conservative government of the day and added to the national debt. So the total expenses for railways was $494,000,000, whereas in the last six years there was paid $131,000,000, $77,000,000 of which to begin with was for expenses incurred in exactly the same way as those in the preceding six years. The balance was extended to the amount of $10,000,000 in one year, and $10,000,000 in another year, in advances to the Canadian National Railways. The Canadian National Railways were beginning to prosper, but they could not prosper at the beginning. They are prospering now only because the Conservative government in those six years preceding welded the scattered units into one great system and started the national system on its way. That is the only reason in the world. You would not have the National railways to-day if the Conservative government had not been in power. Nobody can dispute that because the records of this house show it. My hon. friend will have to admit that he himself opposed it in the session of 1919, and the battle was fought over their protesting and beaten bodies, and it was over their bodies that the Conservative party passed to the making of this great national railway. It is now beginning to pay. That is because it was a well-considered and well-advised scheme. It looked to the true interests of the country. The Conservative party looked forward with that same foresight which has always characterized the Conservative party right down from confederation. My right hon. friend would be taking what I think would be a most unfair position if he were to say that it was anything to the credit of his government that no moneys have been spent during the last six years on a going concern, and attempted to reflect any discredit on the railway expenditures which were made in the preceding six years, because the Conservative government were obliged to rescue bankrupt units from their bankruptcy and put them in a position where they could become a going concern. My hon. friends opposite are deriving great comfort from basking in the sunlight of the prosperous Canadian National Railway system. But this is due to no efforts of their own. It is due to the far-seeing policy of the Conservative party that to-day they find themselves in the happy position of having no railway deficits to make good and no subsidies to provide for our national railways. I have not the remotest idea, Mr. Speaker, how much more time is left to me.

An hon. MEMBER: Only a few minutes more.

Mr. GEARY: That being the case I must confine myself to the matter of the Canadian National Railways introduced by my hon. friend. He claims credit for its reorganization. All the facts should be brought out in a debate, and I know what the result will be; so does my right hon. friend. It will show that to the Conservative party and to the Conservative party only will belong the credit for this great enterprise. Another matter of transportation depended entirely—as did the Canadian National Railways—upon the capacity of the Conservative party to initiate and put into execution large schemes for the good of Canada. The Canadian Pacific railway was carried through to successful completion by the Conservative party in spite of the most bitter opposition on the part of the Liberal party of that day. The latter were men of

no faith, men fearful of results, men without vision. This great national undertaking had to be planned and completed by the clear-sighted men of the Conservative party, who foresaw the advantages of a transcontinental railway in uniting the scattered provinces into one great country. And it was the Conservative party that undertook the deepening and widening of the Welland canal. The Hon. Frank Cochrane, at that time Minister of Railways, and his colleagues in the government, declared that in undertaking this work they were looking to the day when there would be a great waterway from the head of the lakes to tidewater. Like their predecessors who sponsored the building of the Canadian Pacific railway, they were farsighted men, they too had vision. There is no doubt that some day this great St. Lawrence waterway will be an accomplished fact, but not until the Conservative party is once more in a position to render that service to the country which it alone has shown itself able to render in regard to great national undertakings. The Liberal party has not shown itself big enough to grasp matters of such magnitude. All the great national policies concerning the welfare of this country have been instituted by the Conservative party, and all the great national undertakings initiated by the party have been carried through to a successful conclusion. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Justice referred to the British preference. Let him take what comfort he can for his party from that policy; I do not think he can point to one major development of this country that in any manner, shape or form can be ascribed to the Liberal party. The Conservative party, and the Conservative party alone, can be credited as far as government is to be credited with all the major developments that have made Canada what she is to-day.

I had intended to touch again on the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, but time does not permit.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my hon. friend who is claiming credit for the Conservative party in connection with all the great undertakings he has mentioned, what has happened to the Unionist party?

Mr. GEARY: I do not think my right hon. friend is quite fair. I called it the Conservative party, but I will call it the Unionist party, or, if he prefers, I will call it X. The point I am making is the unfairness of the comparison of the six years of this government with the six years of the preceding government. It was my hon. friend the Minister of Justice who called it the Conservative regime, he it was who made the comparison between the two parties, the one Liberal and the other Conservative. My hon. friend shakes his head.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think I referred to that at all.

Mr. GEARY: I am sorry if I referred to my hon. friend, it was the Minister of National Defence I had in mind.

Mr. CAMERON R. McINTOSH (North Battleford): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part briefly in this debate, may I as a member from western Canada congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) upon the splendid financial statement which he has brought down for the approval of the house. It has been said that the popularity of budgets is something like the greatness of great men—some men are born great, some achieve greatness, and others have greatness thrust upon them. The budgets brought down by the hon. Minister of Finance for the last few years have become popular from three points of view. First, they are connected with a party that believes in retrenchment and in financial reform, a party with a financial history of which any Canadian ought to be proud. So this budget grows out of the viewpoint of the Minister of Finance, the viewpoint of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the viewpoint of the Liberal party in a financial sense; consequently it has grown in popularity since its introduction. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, it has become more popular because of the fact that it contains within itself the inherent qualities of popularity and stability. So notwithstanding the speeches we have had, some for and some against the budget, the opinion developed in this house is helping wonderfully in the formation of public opinion in its behalf throughout the Dominion and bringing about a condition of affairs that tends to make the budget appeal more and more to the people of Canada as the days go by. A further and a third reason for the popularity of the budget is that it is framed by the Finance minister with reference to the international situation. No budget not recognizing present-day international developments could really be a strong budget. Therefore this is a budget upon which Canada can courageously stand so far as its relationship is concerned not only with its neighbour across the International boundary but with the other nations of the world.

The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), speaking of the prosperity of Canada, admitted that Providence had showered all sorts of prosperity on this nation

but he qualified his statement by saying that the inclination of himself and of his party both in the house and in the country was that Providence and the people of Canada were to a major extent responsible for the prosperity announced in the budget. The hon. gentleman's theology and philosophy do not seem to be very sound. Providence does not cooperate by direct action; Providence cooperates through individuals and through governments to bring about national progress, national development and national prosperity. Providence inspires men to take action to organize a system of government that legislation may be passed for the welfare of the people generally. In other words, governments are the media through which national progress takes place. So Providence in cooperating with the people of Canada to bring about the splendid state of affairs which now obtains goes one better than did the good Tories of Toronto every time the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier visited that great city. They would turn out to hear him, they would listen to him, they would applaud him, but on election day—they would vote against him. Providence with Liberalism in the saddle goes beyond that kind of cooperation. He not only makes it possible for the Liberal party to come into power in Canada but when they are in power he cooperates with them in such a way that Canada's financial record is something of which we should all be proud.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) in discussing the budget, made reference to the fact that Canada was geographically a very difficult country to govern. We all admit that Canada embraces a large area and is a large country to govern wisely. But we have no colour problem in Canada; we have no major racial problem here. Consequently when we hear hon. gentlemen talking about the difficulty of governing Canada, because of its being a large geographical unit extending from one sea to another, we are inclined to ask whether these hon. gentlemen know Canada from sea to sea, whether they know Canada province by province, whether they know Canada east by west and north by south and whether, knowing it, they understand the sentiments and objectives of the Canadian people. We have a large country to govern, but I believe that if we know our country as we ought and understand our problems as we should we can go forward and make history.

The hon. gentleman also referred to the national policy; he spoke of the notable things it had done for Canada. It was, according to him, a wonderful fiscal policy. But he did not tell us why in 1896 Canada was stagnant commercially, why Canada was at a standstill industrially, why Canada's imperial and world trade had become very diminutive in quantity. And the point is just this: that although the Conservatives introduced the national policy it took the Liberal party to understand the machine and to operate it in such a way, by adjustment from year to year and from decade to decade, as to promote the development of Canada and to bring about the prosperity and progress which we have to-day in this Dominion. The hon. member referred further to the many things the Conservative party had done from the standpoint of confederation. One would imagine, to hear him talk, that the Conservative party was really responsible for that great movement in Canada—the confederation or union, of all the British North American provinces on the shoulder of this continent and their consolidation from coast to coast, with the proud history which that union has written from that day to this. What are the facts? If we turn to history we shall find it indicated that the Conservative party was not the cause of that great movement—not at all. We know that one cause was the imperative necessity of wiping out the protective tariffs between the different provinces then existing. The protective tariffs of that day were detrimental to the development of trade and also to interprovincial cohesion; their removal became necessary and that was one of the causes of confederation in 1867. Another was the political deadlock which had come about. And still another was this: The people of the provinces were living in dread of the states to the south and consequently they did not feel themselves strong enough in a military way to combat the people across the boundary line. There we have the three and only causes of confederation, one political, one fiscal and one military. And when the movement took place Liberals and Conservatives combined, hand in hand, to bring about that great union under which Canada has prospered and which we hope will continue to grow stronger and stronger as the years come and go.

When we touch upon the question of confederation, when hon. gentlemen opposite speak of the extraordinary things done by the Conservative party, we ought to bring into the perspective some of the things which the Conservative party have not done. For instance, they did not stand by the Liberal party in fighting for the right to negotiate our own commercial treaties, which right was granted in the year 1907. They did not stand

by the Liberal party in its action for the control of our immigration laws granted us in 1904 and for the bringing into existence of our navigation laws in 1870. They did not stand behind us in 1882 for the veto so far as the nomination of the Governor General is concerned; nor did they support the Liberal party in respect to its policy of securing Canadian representation on the privy council in 1897. And so far as the Ballot Act of 1874 is concerned, a great reform, the Liberal party had to put that act through by itself; and upon the secret ballot, to a large extent, has been built the political liberty and the financial and industrial welfare of this Dominion.

I noticed that the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Geary), in his speech this afternoon used the term protection, and I was glad to hear him use that term; because sometimes when our hon. friends meet in national convention they seem to run away from it. They appear to be afraid of the expression. The last time—as a matter of fact I believe it was the first time in their history—they had a national convention, when they met in Winnipeg, they considered a resolution on the tariff. A copy of that resolution I have in my hand and that term protection does not appear in it. The resolution was moved by Mr. Haggerman, of Unity, Saskatchewan, a few miles south of the riding I have the honour to represent in this house, and it was spoken to by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). The gentleman who moved the resolution came from one of the grain growing areas of western Canada and the idea was to have this resolution drafted in such a way that it would appeal to that section of the country and the rest of western Canada and thus secure the votes of the farmers and others on election day. Consequently the word protection is not used. In the first paragraph we are told about the wonderful growth, progress and prosperity of Canada under the historic fiscal policy, but the descriptive title of that policy is omitted. The reason for this we leave our hon. friends to explain. In the next paragraph we are told how adherence to this policy has brought about a gratifying development in Canada. As usual, our friends take all the credit for the development that has taken place in the Dominion since confederation. In the next paragraph they speak of revising and readjusting the tariff, and in the paragraph following that they submit the idea of a tariff commission, which was first appointed by the Liberal party. And in the last paragraph they deal with the question of preferential tariffs. Here is the statement they make on that question:

> And this convention expresses the view that while strong effort should be directed towards the establishment of a system of preferential tariffs—

As if the preferential tariff had not been established back in 1897.

> —throughout the empire, no preference should be given at the expense of the Canadian farmer or workman, and all such preference should be conditional upon the use of the Canadian ports.

The last part of that paragraph is of course Liberal policy. The statement is made that preferential tariffs must not bear upon the farmer or the working man. In other words, we have a sectional idea thrown into this explanation of policy, not recognizing the fact that if we are going to have empire preference it must be preference in a national sense. Sometimes one part of the nation will have to give a little, and at other times other sections of Canada will have to do the same; but as a whole a preferential policy is for all the Canadian people, and it is for us to stand by it, to develop it and to make it a greater instrument in tariff reform and in tariff adjustment than it was even when introduced in 1897.

We have heard quite a lot of discussion with regard to our national debt. I desire to touch that question briefly, and the thought comes to me that in discussing the national debt we should compare the records of both great political parties from confederation. This afternoon the hon. member for South Toronto said it was not fair to compare the reductions made in the national debt during the last few years, because the Conservatives were in power during the war and we should be as fair as possible and give them all the credit to which they are entitled. I want to do that, but I think it fair to compare the records of the two great parties on this matter from 1867 to 1929. When parties are in power they must accept responsibility; if a war comes along or upheavals of different kinds take place of course the party in power must accept the responsibility.

On March 31, 1928, our national debt was $2,296,850,232.92, and we are told that the estimated debt as of March 31, 1921, is $2,227,068,000. This year the reduction is approximately $69,000,000, and during the last six years we have paid off $226,708,000, or an average per year of $37,700,000. Previous to that the Liberal government made reductions in the national debt in 1900, 1903, 1904 and 1907; these reductions totalled $14,216,035, and if we add that amount to the reduction of $226,000,000 during the last six years we have a total reduction of $240,924,035. If that sum is divided by the twenty-eight years the Liberals have been in power we get exactly the amount

the Liberals as a party have reduced our national debt. I think that is an eminently fair way of getting at the question in order to find out just what the Liberals and Conservatives have each done in the way of financially redeeming Canada; that is what each party has done by a policy of financial retrenchment and reform towards the solution of all the financial problems concerning Canada. We find that the Liberals have made an average annual reduction in the national debt of $8,571,428 for every year they have been in office. Now let us consider what the Conservatives have done. They were in power in Canada during thirty-four years; in 1871 they reduced the debt by $503,225; in 1882 by $1,734,129, in 1912 by $122,591 and in 1913 by $25,617,836. In other words, during their thirty-four years in office they reduced the national debt by about $27,000,000, which works out at the rate of about four-fifths of a million per year, or $822,875, to be exact.

There you have the record of the Liberals as compared with that of the Conservatives. The Liberals have faced the question of the national debt as a great responsibility; they have gone to work and reduced it, as any party should. From year to year the record of the Liberal party in connection with reductions in the national debt has been a splendid one, and it appears that year by year that record is getting better, because the cut of practically $70,000,000 this year is the largest reduction ever made. In thirty-four years the Conservative party made only four attempts to cut down the national debt, yet since the budget has been brought down hon. gentlemen opposite have been telling us what we should do to reduce the debt. We have been told that we should abandon the policy that we have followed since 1922 and adopt a fixed method of paying off the debt over a term of years, and we have been told many times that the present leadership of the party is not as successful as it should be with regard to this great problem. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister and his cabinet and Liberals generally are very well satisfied with what has been done by the party as a whole during the last nine years. We are told that we are not going fast enough and that we should inaugurate a sinking fund scheme in order to pay off the debt in forty or fifty years. If we continue the progress we have maintained since 1925 the national debt of Canada will be paid off in twenty-four years. Since 1925 we have reduced the debt by an average of $47,750,000 yearly, and if we continue at that rate for the next twenty-four years we will wipe out our national debt.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

It seems to me that this is a splendid record, but I have before me an article which appeared in Willison's Monthly, written by a Doctor H. P. Spaulding, in which he takes the opposite stand and says we are paying off our debt too quickly. He states that the Liberal party is using a sort of whirlwind method, that we are paying off sums of money from year to year which are too large, and that we should change our system and for the next five years pay $10,000,000 off the debt yearly. That would give us a reduction of $50,000,000,and we are told that at the end of the five-year period we should add $1,000,000 to that amount for the following thirty-five years, which would result in the national debt being wiped off in twenty-four years. In other words, Doctor Spaulding thinks we are going too fast, but to me that seems a very good proof that our policy with regard to this great question is sound. I believe that in times of peace we should face our national debt and reduce it as much as possible; we are responsible for the creation of that debt, and we should not leave it to be paid by posterity. When times are good we should reduce the debt as much as possible. It is not like building a hall for which posterity must pay, when they may have the use of the hall; this is an obligation which we should take seriously and solve in a way that will be to the greatest benefit to Canada as a nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the national debt I would say we are going at it in the right way: I think we should continue just as we are doing at present until 1933 and 1934, when practically a billion dollars of our war debt will come due. That amount is all owed in Canada; when that comes due we should face that problem in all its aspects, and if we think we should do something different then let us evolve another policy and follow it through. However, with respect to our present method, I would say it is good, and I want to congratulate the Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister and the government on the wonderful financial record of this party during the last eight or nine years. I believe there is not a citizen of Canada who wants to be fair who would not say that the financial record of this government is bright and splendid and an honour to Canada.

In his address this afternoon the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) touched upon the question of imperial preference. Outside of the questions of tariff reform and financial retrenchment, I believe that that is a very important matter for the Liberal party to discuss. When Sir Wilfrid Laurier, one of the greatest statesmen that Canada has ever

produced and whose name is honoured throughout Canada to-day, brought down that preferential policy, I believe he meant that to be the policy for Canadians in years to come. He believed that Canadians would accept that policy and would develop it loyally, patriotically and imperially. The Liberal party stands on that foundation to-day, and I believe we are on solid ground. For many years the Conservative party talked about loyalty and patriotism, talked about the wonderful empire to which we belonged, but it remained for Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the leader of our party, to bring down that historic policy which will always be a factor in linking us more closely to Great Britain and the other portions of the empire. He brought down that policy the maximum development of which will make Liberalism stronger in Canada, and Canada a much stronger portion of the empire.

But what about the attitude of the Conservative party? The member for South Toronto told us this afternoon that we were making fiscal gestures toward the United States. During the course of this debate we have been told more than once that we are prone to barter away our fiscal liberties and have overlooked doing those things for our own country which would unite it more closely to the empire to which we belong. But what has history to say about that? What happened in Canada during the year 1849? We all know of the movement which took place during that year to bring about the annexation of this Dominion to the United States. Who took the lead in that movement ? Was it the Liberals of that day? No. The leaders of that movement were the ancestors, absolutely, of the Conservative party of the present day, and that movement was commenced because they felt that they had not a future in Canada.

We have been told this afternoon of the remarkable things the Tory party has done for the Dominion. We have been told about how they built the Canadian Pacific railway, but we were not informed how they failed to open up western Canada in order to make that great railway profitable. That undertaking could not be a success until the west was opened up. and that was brought about through the efforts of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal party from the year 1896 onward. We have been told that the Conservative party is also responsible for the Canadian National railway system. That system is only another sample of the national policy. They brought the organization together to a certain extent on paper but it remained for the Liberal party to pick a man who knew how to run the machine and who was able last year to produce a surplus of $58,000,000. They had to pick a man who would make a great contribution in a railway sense to Canada, and Sir Henry Thornton has done that. We have to thank the Liberal party, and not the Conservative party, for selecting the right man to be put at the head of that great railway system. We have to thank the Liberal party for opening up the west in order to make the Canadian Pacific railway successful in a financial way. We have to thank the Liberal party for widening out the Dominion and giving Canada a start in playing a successful part in the development of our empire.

We have been told also that we should adopt a policy of retaliation. The principle of retaliation is always a false one. We should study our own fiscal problem; we should have a government which knows more and more about Canada; we should have faith in our Dominion and develop the necessary trade with the countries which will trade fairly with us and thus bring about the greater development of trade with them and the motherland as well. The import trade with the motherland has grown tremendously since 1868, when confederation took place, as is shown by the following figures:

1868..	$ 37,000,000
1896..	32,000,000
1906..	69,000,000
1911..	110,000,000
1926..	163,000,000
1927..	214,000,000

Here we have an increase of $182,000,000 over the import trade for the year 1896. The drop in trade of $5,000,000 between the years 1868 and 1896 was one reason why Sir Wilfrid Laurier introduced the British preference and began to build up empire trade, one of the greatest steps ever taken by any Canadian to extend the trade of Canada beyond the boundaries of the Dominion. The above figures show what the British preference has done in the development of the import trade between Canada and the motherland. The following figures show the tremendous increase in our export trade with the motherland:

1896..	$ 62,000,000
1897..	77,000,000
1906..	127,000,000
1911..	136,000,000
1926..	512,000,000
1927..	542,000,000

Our total trade with the other portions of the empire was as follows:

1896..	$ 6,000,000
1926..	128,000,000
1927..	144,000,000

Those figures show our record of trade expansion and development with the motherland and the other portions of the empire. That is a great credit not only to the Liberal party but to Canada as a Dominion. We have also reduced the preferential rate from 21.6 per cent in 1922 to 16.4 per cent, which is the rate prevailing to-day. The preferential rate is the tariff rate which appeals to Canadians in the way of trade with the motherland, which trade is increasing in a way that is very encouraging.

When we come to solve the question of our fiscal problems with the United States we should not forget that we have a party possessing objectives as high and noble and as patriotic as any party could have. When we face that question I say, we are certainly going to solve it in a way which will be beneficial to our population as a whole.

Some people are wondering whether we shall be able to make the right kind of a bargain fiscally with the United States. Personally, I am not a bit afraid. I will stake a cabinet of Canadians against any cabinet in the world when it comes to bartering or organizing a fiscal policy which will be of lasting benefit to the country. Neither is there any danger of absorption by the United States nor by any other nation through the investments which have been made in this country. This is our present standing. Government securities in Canada total $4,200,000,000 and less than one-third of that total, or $1,300,000,000, is controlled outside of Canada. Surely we do not need to be afraid of economic control in regard to government securities. Railway securities total $3,500,000,000 and of that $1,400,000,000 is controlled outside of Canada. Mining stocks total $650,000,000 and one-half of that is controlled outside of Canada. Industrial securities total $4,050,000,000 and $1,300,000,000 of that is controlled outside of Canada. Trading establishment securities total $2,000,000,000, 90 per cent of which is controlled in Canada. Other public utilities total $3,100,000,000 and only one-third is controlled outside of Canada. In other words, out of a total of $16,000,000,000 of securities, only about $5,500,000,000 or one-third is controlled outside of Canada. So, financially speaking, I would say that we are on solid ground and, fiscally speaking, if our party and our leaders follow the reputation and the history of the Liberal party of the past, there will be no doubt about the future of Canada irrespective of what nation says: We will trade with you, or we will not trade with you.

In closing, I believe that while financial retrenchment is one principle of the Liberal party and fiscal reform another, there is still a further principle of great importance and Canada ought to be admired for adhering to it. That other principle which belongs to historic Liberalism is the principal of peace and the peace treaty that the Prime Minister of Canada signed last year in August in Paris is a proof that Canada is determined to play her part not only nationally but in an imperial and a world way in connection with international affairs,—that in a way I am sure will be gratifying to all Canadians. The Liberal party stands on the foundation principle of peace. It stands for internal peace, peace between one province and another, peace between the east and the west; peace, progress and development between Canada and the rest of the empire and peace with other nations. The idea is simply banishing war as an instrument of national policy and putting in its place the principle of peace. The sooner we take the lead in that—and we are doing so—the better for Canada. With regard to the question of peace not only within Canada but with other nations of the world we know that fiscally the Liberal party is doing what it can to work out a policy that will be of benefit to the whole Dominion.

Finally, in regard to Canada's relationship with the motherland, Sir James Owen, after visiting Canada in 1927, had this to say:

> The Canadians are developing along their own lines. One hears sometimes that they are being Americanized. There are no obvious signs of that. The Canadian does not speak like an American, nor does he think as an American. His outlook on life is less flamboyant than that of his neighbours across the border. There is in the Canadian a sobriety, a restraint, such as one would expect of a people who derive so largely from Scottish ancestry.

Then again Sir James says:

> Whether Canada will indefinitely remain a member of the British Empire is for the Canadians to say.

To that we will answer in the affirmative. He continues:

> I think the chances are that, having achieved their independence for all practical purposes, being linked to Great Britain and the empire by bonds intangible and spiritual, rather than material, the connection will persist, and may well become stronger with the passage of time, and the inevitable development of a common empire policy. But, whatever the future may have in store for us all, I am persuaded that Canadians will not surrender their independence, their nationhood, to become a mere appendix to the United States.

Mr. F. P. QUINN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, "some men are born great, some achieve greatness, while some have greatness thrust upon them". I am in the latter category this afternoon in being fortunately selected to follow

such an eloquent member as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. McIntosh). I cannot agree with much of what he has said. I refer particularly to his statement regarding the reduction of the national debt. I cannot agree that surpluses should be wholly and entirely devoted to the reduction of our national debt while federal aid is refused to such important matters as technical education or the building of highways or provincial roads; and further, while we have upon our statute books legislation providing for the payment of old age pensions only one-half of which is to be borne by the federal government, the provinces which cannot afford to do so being expected to assume the other part of the burden. There are in this Dominion provinces—and I refer particularly to the maritime provinces—which because of their limited sources of revenue find it impossible to provide one-half of the money to pay old age pensions.

I had not intended to take part in this debate. After listening to the able address of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) I felt that the ground had been fully covered. I felt that he dealt with the budget address of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) in such a clear, concise and logical manner that there was little left for any other hon. member to dilate upon. I feel, however, that I was challenged by the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) when he spoke in this debate and made references to the prosperity of my native province. He said that the prosperity there is remarkable. He referred in his address to the lamentations of hon. gentlemen opposite from Nova Scotia. I could not help pondering the terms that hon. gentlemen on the other side use when referring to hon. members on this side from the maritime provinces. The hon. member for Hants-Kings said "lamentations"; the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) said "doleful utterances" and the Minister of Finance said "whinings". Judging by results, I think I am going to continue in my lamentations, doleful utterances and whinings if we can continue to get the definite results in the maritime provinces that we have succeeded in getting during the past three years. I do not think that such terms become hon. gentlemen, and I would ask them respectfully to refrain from using them in respect to hon. members of this house who are simply performing their duty to their constituents. I remember the terms and epithets used by hon. gentlemen opposite during the session of 1926 when hon. members on this side were presenting the grievances and claims of the maritime provinces. The question was asked, "What is meant by maritime rights?" and one hon. gentleman opposite said that it was nothing but Tory propaganda; another said it was a political catch-cry and still another, a slogan used to get into parliament. But that has not been borne out by facts, because the efforts of hon. gentlemen on this side of the house have proved fruitful of results. They were successful in having the Duncan commission appointed, and I would ask where were hon. gentlemen opposite when that commission commenced to function? Where were the Liberals of Nova Scotia when that commission took evidence in that province? They were conspicuous by their absence. Not one of them came before that commission to give evidence.

Mr. RALSTON: Did my hon. friend?

Mr. QUINN: Yes, I think my hon. friend did, but I believe he appeared in the interests of somebody.

Mr. RALSTON: I asked if my hon. friend appeared before the commission.

Mr. QUINN: Yes. I am pointing out that hon. gentlemen opposite are now taking credit for the appointment of the Duncan commission and whatever benefits followed from it.

Mr. RALSTON: In spite of the protest of my hon. friend.

Mr. QUINN: There were no protests from me. My only protest was in regard to the method of appointment of the commission. I would point out to my hon. friend that I gave the commission my wholehearted support, as did the whole Conservative party. May I further point out that Sir Andrew Rae Duncan and his commission expressly thanked the Rhodes government of Nova Scotia for the splendid assistance which it gave to the commission in the brief which it presented.

The hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Illsley) has spoken of the general prosperity throughout the country, and he referred particularly to the prosperity of Nova Scotia. I dislike very much referring to an hon. gentleman when he is not in his seat, but it is not my fault that he is not here at the moment. I would point out that his views with regard to prosperity in Nova Scotia do not coincide with the views that have been expressed by his Liberal friends in that province. An outstanding Liberal of Nova Scotia, a gentleman at the present time occupying a seat in the Nova Scotia house of assembly, Mr. A. S. MacMillan, in a speech delivered

in the local assembly about the same time my hon. friend from Hants-Kings was making his speech in this house, referred particularly to the agricultural industry and the farmers of Nova Scotia. He said:

> Fifty per cent of the farms are going behind, twenty-five per cent of them are standing still, and twenty-five per cent of them are making a little progress.

Do these views coincide with the views expressed by my hon. friend from Hants-Kings? But we have other evidence. The junior member for Halifax in the local house of assembly also spoke of conditions in Nova Scotia and said that four members of his own family had had to go to another country in search of employment. The hon. member for Shelburne spoke along similar lines. Only the other day the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) told this house that he had personally visited the Cape Breton centres, and he told of the conditions which he saw among the miners and steel workers there. May I point out that the conditions among the miners and steel workers of Nova Scotia are in great measure due to the procrastination of this government in the matter of implementing to the full the recommendation of the Duncan commission with regard to assistance to the coal and steel industries. I shall not elaborate on that because it has already been dealt with in a very able manner by my hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. MacDonald).

Another very important industry in Nova Scotia is the fishing industry. Only a few weeks ago a representative of the fishermen of eastern Nova Scotia came before a committee of this parliament and spoke of the conditions among the fishermen of Nova Scotia. Speaking before the committee on marine and fisheries, of which my hon. friend from Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff) is chairman, Father Boudreau is reported as follows.

> Father Boudreau said he had many times seen the "gruesome picture of distress and poverty, numerous heads of families—fishermen, working hard, facing death itself sometimes in storms, and unfortunately losing their lives too often—I lost three men in one week in the fall of 1927—unable to get bare necessaries of life."
>
> He declared that everywhere on the eastern coast there were evident signs of distress. There had been a tremendous increase in the cost of living and in the cost of equipment.

I would ask the house if the views expressed by that clergyman coincide with the views expressed by the hon. member for Hants-Kings.

My hon. friend also said that prosperity was rampant in the city of Halifax. I would ask him if he reads his own Liberal newspaper, the official Liberal newspaper of Halifax, the Halifax Chronicle. What will he find there? He could pick up that paper any day during the last twelve months and see a whole page of properties advertised for sale for taxes. When people are unable to pay their taxes, is that an evidence of prospcrity? I am afraid my hon. friend has been in bad company, that he has been associating too much with the financial interests which have all been giving us such glowing reports of the prosperity of this country. As I pointed out to the members of this house a year ago, prosperity cannot be measured by the financial reports of the banks and financial institutions of this country. You have to go down among the workmen, the farmers and the fishermen, the mechanics and the labourers, to find out if there is real prosperity in this country, and as Sir Wilfrid Laurier said, when they feel the jingle of the money in their pockets, they can tell you whether the country is prosperous or not.

Before I leave the question of the fisheries, may I read to the house a resolution which I have received from the municipality of the county of Halifax:

> Whereas it has been reported that the Department of Fisheries is about to abolish the office of inspector of fish curing and packing and have the work thereof done by the fishery overseers;
>
> And whereas the fishing overseers have with their present duties as much work as they can satisfactorily perform;
>
> And whereas the thorough inspection of the quality of fish cured or pickled and of the containers and a general supervision of the same by a competent official is an absolute necessity both to fisherman and the trade;
>
> And whereas the county of Halifax having a large fishing population and trade, is vitally interested in the matter;
>
> Be it therefore resolved that the county council of the municipality of Halifax county, strongly urge upon the Department of Fisheries of Canada, that the office of inspector of fish curing and packing be retained and a competent man be appointed at once to the same.

Having put that resolution before the house, I would ask the responsible members of the government present to take cognizance of it.

The Minister of Finance has told this house that the government has been practising economy. I take issue with him when he states that this is a government of economy. I say that it is a government of extravagance, and that has been demonstrated on many an occasion. Take only one instance, the building of a magazine and arsenal on the shores of Bedford basin at Halifax. A contract was let to the same gentleman I mentioned a little while

ago, who seems to be a political favourite of this government, Mr. A. S. MacMillan. The contract was for $57,900. After various delays in commencing work on the contract the government paid him $10,948, which along with other extras brought the contract up to $72,138.30. This is taken from the Auditor General's report of March 31, 1927. I understand a considerable amount has been paid to this gentleman since that time. I have not taken the trouble to look at the total figures in connection with the building of the magazine and arsenal on the shores of Bedford basin.

Mr. RALSTON: Does my hon. friend know that the delays were caused during the regime of the so-called "shadow government"?

Mr. QUINN: That may sound clever, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RALSTON: It is the fact.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the reason they cancelled the first tender.

Mr. QUINN: It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that this government has committed itself to an unwarrantable expenditure. But while it was spending too large an amount of money to build an arsenal for the storage of ammunition and other war material, the Prime Minister was in Europe putting his signature to the peace treaty for the renunciation of war.

On May 31, 1928, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Black) asked the following questions:

1. Amount paid A. S. MacMillan or MacMillian Construction Company by all departments of the government for all material supplied by them on account of Hudson bay or Hudson straits during the year 1927.
2. Amount paid to Halifax firms by all departments of the government during the year 1927 for supplies to Hudson bay and Hudson straits.
3. Whether supplies were by tender.
4. If so, give details of tenders.

Just one year later—very prompt—we have the answers to these questions. The Department of Railways and Canals answered the second, third and fourth questions as follows:

2. $30,336.96 was paid to Halifax firms during the year 1927 for all supplies on account of the Hudson Bay railway terminals.
3. Supplies were not by tender, with the exception of 400 tons anthracite stove coal, in bags.
4. Tenderers and prices for the 400 tons anthracite stove coal in bags were as follows:—S. Cunard & Co. Ltd., Halifax, $20.45 net ton. Dartmouth Coal & Supply Co., Dartmouth, $18 net ton.

The order was placed with S. Cunard & Co. Ltd., at $20.45 net ton, as their offer was for immediate delivery and this coal was urgently required for furtherance to Hudson bay.

There is another instance of extravagance. They paid $2.45 per ton more to one firm because it was a Liberal concern, than they would have had to pay to the other, and their only excuse is that the coal was urgently needed. I claim it would not have taken more than two or three days to have had the coal supplied at $18 a ton. The Department of Marine and Fisheries answered the questions in this way:

1. The amount paid Mr. A. S. MacMillan for materials supplied for the Hudson strait expedition (1927), $40,721.99.

MacMillan is not doing too badly. He seems to be getting a great deal of preference from this government.

2. The amount paid to Halifax firms for materials supplied for said expedition is, $139,511.43.
3. In all cases where the quantities and nature of the goods required warranted, the purchases were negotiated by tender.

By tender. It does not say by open tender, as is evident from the answer to the fourth question, where they set out the "firms asked" and the "prices quoted". They did not advertise in the newspapers for tenders, but they asked their political favorites to quote prices. We find again that A. S. MacMillan was successful, his price of $37,644 being accepted. There are six other concerns—Liberal concerns; I know them all. Evidently the government did not advertise in the public press for tenders for those supplies. The answer proceeds:

(2) Lumber and timber outside buildings contract. A. S. MacMillan, $650.

The same man again. Then I come to the next section of the answer:

(3) Provisions. Tenders were invited from—

And they give the names of three grocery firms. Several other concerns were not asked to tender. I submit this is simply extravagance, because if open tenders had been called for lower prices would have been submitted, and the contracts could have been given to the lowest tenderer. This is what any real business administration would have done. Next come the medical supplies. I find another Liberal firm figuring here. The head of the firm, Hon. Mr. Kinley, has been very prominent in Liberal circles in the province and aspires to be one of the leaders of the party in the local house. His firm was paid $3,112.38. Kinleys are not wholesale dealers in medical supplies. Why did not the government ask the National Drug and Chemical Company to tender if they wanted to practise economy? I submit that their ideas of economy are rather loose, to say the least.

I find another instance of the extravagance of this government. In the last couple of weeks the government have been advertising for applications for positions in the civil service representing a total annual expenditure in salaries of $70,120. I submit that as our country is not growing in population we should be prepared to get along with the civil servants that we already have.

Now, sir, I intend to refer again to the report of the Duncan commission on maritime claims. Let me quote from that report at page 28:

> Very considerable evidence was laid before us on behalf of the maritime provinces, to show that in the public pronouncements of responsible ministers over a long period of time, and indeed in the statutory obligations under which railway companies operate, there is to be found the most explicit pledge that Canadian trade will be developed through Canadian ports, and yet, in spite of that pledge, ports such as Halifax and St. John are, it is stated, not being fully utilized.

That brings me, sir, to something which has happened in the last few days in the city of Montreal. The maritime board of trade and the Halifax harbour commission have asked the Board of Railway Commissioners for a lower export rate on grain. A reduction in the rate to the port of Quebec has already been granted. Halifax and St. John are asking for rates to their ports in proportion to the rate granted to the port of Quebec. On March 13 the council of the Montreal board of trade endorsed a resolution adopted by the Montreal Corn Exchange opposing the application to the Board of Railway Commissioners by the Halifax harbour commission and the Halifax board of trade for a reduction from 35.5 cents to 19.34 cents per hundred pounds on the all-rail rate on grain for export from Fort William, Port Arthur and Armstrong via the National Transcontinental railway to Halifax and St. John. The endorsation will be forwarded to the Board of Railway Commissioners, the Montreal board of trade believing that it would be ill-advised for any action to be taken which would upset the present rate situation as between the various Atlantic ports in the United States and Canada. They decided to draw the attention of the railway commission to the serious loss in revenue to the Canadian railways and other transportation interests from rate reduction on an isolated commodity or on a movement to a certain port when general rate reductions are in contemplation. The application has been before the Board of Railway Commissioners for several months, but as yet no date for its hearing has been set.

[Mr. Quinn.]

The Royal Grain Inquiry Commission reported in January, 1925. A member of the commission was J. G. Scott, of Quebec, who submitted a supplementary report on "Transportation". In his report Mr. Scott declared that the railway companies:

> —should make the rates on export wheat and flour from Armstrong or Fort William to Quebec or Montreal 11 cents per bushel, and to Halifax and Saint John 12 cents per bushel, so that they may get the winter traffic, and thus carry out the recommendation of the Quebec Board of Trade, endorsed by the special committee of the senate. Moreover,—

The commissioner added.

> —it is the duty of the government to do this, because it was on the distinct promise to parliament in 1904, that the Transcontinental would cheapen the rates of freight upon western grain to Canadian seaports, that the people consented to the building of this railway, which has cost the country $160,000,000. It is a breach of faith with the eastern seaports to keep the rate of freight at such a figure as to prevent this being done, after the railway has proved its ability to do it, and do it profitably.

That is the report of a commissioner appointed by the Dominion government, and reporting in 1925.

Up to August, 1927, the rates on grain from the head of the lakes to Quebec and to maritime ports stood—

> To Quebec, 34.5 cents per hundred pounds.
> To Halifax, 35.5 cents per hundred pounds.

Or 1 cent greater to Halifax.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was drawing to the attention of hon. members of this house the discriminatory rate on grain to the maritime ports of St. John and Halifax as compared with the rate to Quebec, and I was dealing with the protest of the Montreal Corn Exchange and the Montreal board of trade. This protest declared:

> . . . . the board of trade believing that it would be ill-advised for any action to be taken in the matter of rates which would upset the present rate situation as between the various Atlantic ports in the United States and Canada.

This attitude is very difficult to understand, because the rate situation was very much upset when the new rate of 18.34 cents per hundred pounds was given to St. Lawrence ports, creating a severe discrimination against the maritime ports. We have heard talk of retaliation or reprisals by the United States if Canada tried, through rail rate making, to

keep her own traffic for her own ports. Why is it, if this is the case, that retaliation did not follow the announcement of the new St. Lawrence rate? It is useless to pretend that this new rate has not increased grain shipments through St. Lawrence ports very materially. In 1927 the deliveries to Quebec elevators amounted to 9,773,376 bushels while in 1928, after the new rate took effect, they amounted to 12,276,082 bushels, so it will be seen that the increase was very large. Let us remind those who talk of retaliation of what Commissioner Scott said in his report, at page 212:

> The fear of retaliation on the part of American railways is not well founded. Is it likely that they would reduce their rates to an unprofitable basis for their own traffic, simply as a retaliation because Canadian railways made rates to bring Canadian traffic to their own seaports? . . . . there is no sentiment about it. Why should we not carry our own grain, over our own railways, to our own seaports? As the senate committee reported to the government, this cannot be injurious to our railways, because it is an export traffic which practically they are not getting at all. The railroad tariff prevents it.

Let it be remembered that those are not the words of an irresponsible individual; they are the words and the advice of a federal government commissioner.

In their application for a 19.34 cents rate the Halifax Harbour Commissioners declare:

> Our board felt that before we could make any serious effort to attract grain to this port, this wide discrepancy had to be adjusted.

The maritime people ask, in all fairness, if such heavy discrimination should be permitted longer to exist. The application of the Maritime board of trade, dated June 29, 1928, states:

> 1. That the National Transcontinental railway was constructed for the purpose of creating a route to Halifax and St. John that would provide for, among other matters, the transporting of Canada's exportable surplus of grain through the ports of Halifax and St. John at rates that would not exceed those to other north Atlantic ports.
>
> 2. That an all-rail rate of 19.34 cents per 100 pounds as requested in this application is necessary in order that the National Transcontinental railway be used for the purpose for which it was constructed.
>
> 3. That the board did, in general order no. 448, dated August 26, 1927, recognize this matter as one of national importance and directed the Canadian National Railways to publish an export rate, on grain, of 18.34 cents per 100 pounds to Quebec city. This order was complied with by the publication of C.N.R. tariff no. C.G. 93, G.R.C. no. E1268.
>
> 4. That the same conditions and circumstances surround the extension of the export rate on grain to St. John and Halifax as applied in the decision of the board with respect to the rate to Quebec city.
>
> 5. That, in view of the national importance of this matter, we would respectfully urge that it is expedient that this matter be given immediate attention by the board.

The case for the maritime ports is unassailable; this maritime claim is based on the soundest of ground.

I well remember, Mr. Speaker, the year 1904, when representatives of the Liberal government came to the city of Halifax; these included Right Hon. W. S. Fielding and the then Halifax representative, Mr. William Roche, who later was appointed to the Senate. I attended the meeting, and these two gentlemen asked the people of Halifax and the people of Nova Scotia to give them a mandate to build the Transcontinental railway, promising that if this mandate were given it would mean a tremendous benefit to the port of Halifax. That mandate was given; the people of Halifax and of Nova Scotia believed in the pledged words of those prominent politicians and sent a solid representation from Nova Scotia, fully believing that if they did so it would mean a tremendous benefit to the port of Halifax and to Nova Scotia generally. To-day, sir, I ask that those promises and those pledges be fulfilled, just as I have asked that the promises and pledges made by public men at the time of confederation should be kept. We are not here from the maritimes, as has been pointed out before, as supplicants or mendicants; we only ask for these things because we are partners in this great business, this great confederation known as the Dominion of Canada. We came into confederation believing that justice would be done to the maritime provinces, and we are demanding that the pledges and promises which were given be fulfilled. I put this matter up directly to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), and ask that he bend every energy, use every influence at his command and obtain the support of his colleagues on that side of the house toward preventing the carrying out of the requests contained in the resolutions of the Montreal grain exchange and the Montreal board of trade. With his tremendous influence I know he can prevent the granting of these selfish and sectional requests.

I do not wish my remarks to be interpreted as being anti-American. I give credit to the great country to the south of us for the excellent management of their affairs, but I ask the government of this country to exercise the same care in administering the affairs of Canada. Canada has a great future; it is a country with wonderful possibilities and splendid resources of the farm, forest, sea

and mines, and with the proper government administration, backed up with virile manhood such as we have in our country, I look forward with every hope and assurance to the day when Canada can maintain its position as a part of the greatest empire ever known; when it can take its place amongst the greatest nations of the world.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Antigonish-Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, I am sure after you have listened to the different speeches which have been offered during the last three or four weeks on the important matter of the budget, or what is perhaps more properly known as the annual statement of the government for ths year 1928, that you will feel, as I do, that the quicker this debate is brought to a close the better it will be for all concerned. However, I have not raised my voice very often during the last three or four years, and I may be pardoned if I take up a few minutes in discussing certain questions which have been brought to the attention of the house during the past two or three weeks. I have listened with a great deal of interest to most of the speeches, and while I cannot refer to all of them, I would like to discuss some of the remarks which were made by the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Quinn).

In concluding his remarks the hon. member referred to speeches delivered by Mr. Fielding and the late Hon. Mr. Roche with regard to the Transcontinental railway. Although the hon. member did not intend to do it, he paid a compliment to the Liberal party when he spoke of the building and the completion of that road. If Mr. Fielding's ideas and the ideas of the Liberal party had been carried out, more grain would be flowing over the Transcontinental to the port of Halifax than is the case at the present time. When the Liberal party was defeated in 1911, and when our Conservative friends came into power, instead of trying to build up the port of Halifax through the construction of that road, they started in to cut the grades down and put in wooden bridges instead of the iron bridges which had been contemplated by the Liberal party and the Transcontinental commissioners. Therefore, the Conservative party and not the Liberal party is to blame for the fact that more traffic is not going through the port of Halifax to-day.

Let us compare the record of the Liberal party with regard to the port of Halifax with the record of the Conservative party. We do not hear anything about what was done for the port of Halifax between the years 1911 and 1921, the ten years during which our Conservative friends were in power. But what did they really do for that port? Practically nothing. It is only since the Liberal party came into power in 1922 that the port has been developed, and everyone knows that during the last three years the traffic through the port of Halifax has amounted to three times the traffic which went through it during the years of the Conservative regime, with the possible exception of the war period. Who has spent money on the port of Halifax? The hon. member reminds me of some people with whom I have done business; the more you do for them the less they appreciate it. If you do ninety-nine good turns for them and you can not do the hundredth, they will turn on you and rend you. That seems to be the attitude of the hon. junior member for Halifax. Does my hon. friend condemn the Liberal party because we are going to vote five million dollars in a few days for the Halifax harbour commission? Does my hon. friend condemn us because a contract was given the other day to the gentleman he named for $300,000 to cover certain work for the harbour commission? Does he condemn the expenditure of $2,500,000 for cold storage facilities in the port of Halifax, $700,000 of which is being voted this year? The hon. member said that nothing had been done for this country or for the province of Nova Scotia during the time the Liberal party had a solid sixteen here from the province of Nova Scotia. Let me say to him that since I have been in parliament I have done as much as he has, and a great deal more. I have stood up for the port of Halifax and the province of Nova Scotia, while he has voted against the things which this government tried to do for that province and that port.

The hon. member referred to the fact that the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) had spoken of the lamentations, the whinings and complainings of Jeremiah which came from the Conservative side. I do not think my hon. friend on this side of the house has used the right terms and the hon. junior member for Halifax, being musically inclined, will be able to appreciate what I am going to say. During the last three years, day in and day out, session in and session out, they have talked about the Duncan report and have endeavoured to take the credit for what the Liberal party has done. We have heard complaints made that the Liberal government has not fulfilled 100 per cent the pledges or the promises contained in the Duncan report, and when they keep talking about this matter they remind me of a night I spent last year in one of the theatres in the city of

Ottawa. One of the vaudeville stunts that evening was a competition among old fiddlers. There were nine or ten of these fiddlers on the platform, some with whiskers down to their knees, and they had fiddles which were about one hundred years old. One of the contestants started and he ran over his fiddle, and there were wailings, gnashings of teeth, and caterwauling—that is the word I wanted to remind the hon. member of—and then the next one played his little piece. They all played just the same as my hon. friends from Nova Scotia, who have been playing, rasping and wailing on their fiddles, sometimes only on one string, and all being led by the leader of the orchestra, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Cantley). They complain that the Duncan report has not been carried out in its entirety, but I am going to show that not only have the Liberal party carried out that Duncan report in its entirety, but they have carried it out in one case to the extent of over 150 per cent; they have gone too far with it.

Before I take up that particular phase of the matter, I would like to refer to one or two things which were mentioned by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn) with regard to certain contracts which have been given in the city of Halifax. In order to make his point against one of the Liberal members of the local legislature, he referred to a contract given to that gentleman two or three years ago by the Department of National Defence. It is quite true that Mr. MacMillan was given a contract, I think in June, 1926, by the Department of National Defence. Tenders were called for and when this government went out of power on the 1st of July, 1926, the contract had not been awarded. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) came in as Minister of National Defence and he and my good friend the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Black) met in solemn conclave and gave the contract to Mr. A. S. MacMillian. Does the hon. junior member for Halifax disagree with his colleague the senior member who gave Mr. MacMillian that contract at the price of his tender? What happened? Mr. MacMillan, after receiving the contract, assembled his plant, brought horses, teams and men from the county of Antigonish and started work. He did certain work there and then some of our Tory friends in Halifax—no doubt my hon. friend the junior member for that city knows something about this—thought it would never do to see this Grit contractor do the work and so they got after somebody in Ottawa with the result that he had to cease work. He had to send his horses home and he had to disorganize his whole staff, the result being that afterwards, when he was asked to complete his contract, he put in a bill for $9,000 for extras, and if anybody is to blame for his putting in that bill, the Conservatives at Halifax should assume the blame and not try to load it off on to this government or the contractor.

The hon. junior member for Halifax referred to Mr. MacMillan's contract at Hudson bay. I know, Mr. Speaker, you are most generous; sometimes I think you are perhaps a little deaf, because this afternoon the junior member for Halifax was unquestionably entirely out of order in referring to the contract which Mr. MacMillan had to take supplies to Hudson bay, the reason being that papers have been called for and the matter is now before the public accounts committee. But since you allowed the junior member for Halifax to mention the matter, perhaps I may be permitted to reply to him. Mr. MacMillan has nothing to hide in connection with the matter. The Liberals in Nova Scotia are willing to have the public accounts committee meet and Mr. MacMillan will come to Ottawa and give a good account of himself.

But my hon. friend says that another member in the Nova Scotia legislature, Mr. Kinley, sold $3,000 worth of drugs to the Hudson's bay expedition. My good friend, with tears in his eyes, complained because Tory druggists in Halifax did not have a chance to put in a price or to get this contract. Why should they? I want to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin) because he did not ask Tory druggists or Tory contractors to contract for anything with regard to Hudson's bay. Perhaps I might have had something to do with that myself; I might have given him a hint that that was the proper way to do the thing, because this government is entirely too prone to give Tories contracts and positions when the Liberal party is in power. Let me say to the junior member for Halifax: It is true Mr. Kinley got a contract for $3,000 worth of drugs and he made the huge profit of $90 on that $3,000 contract.

Mr. BENNETT: How does the hon. member know?

Mr. DUFF: I happen to know. Perhaps I was the auditor. Mr. Kinley is quite willing to come before the public accounts committee and explain this little transaction of $3,000. He is a man who has given the best years of his life to the public service of the country and one who is now a member of the Nova Scotia legislature.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman will allow me, while I permitted the hon. member for Halifax to refer to this particu-

lar matter, it was because at the beginning of the session the whole of the Auditor General's report is referred to the public accounts committee and the Chair cannot know in advance what subject matter will be taken up for investigation. Otherwise, we could not discuss anything in the house, because the Auditor General's report covers so many subjects.

Mr. DUFF: Well, Mr. Speaker, you and I need not have any quarrel about the rules of the house because we are both pretty well grounded in them. The junior member for Halifax this afternoon also complained that the government did not continue the aid for technical education and for highways. These are not matters for the federal government at all. If Sir Robert Borden, when he was Prime Minister of Canada, was good enough —or perhaps did not realize exactly what he was doing—to vote federal moneys for these purposes, that is no reason why the present government should do the same. My hon. friend complained that the Conservative government in Halifax, led by a previous Speaker of this house, was not able on account of lack of revenue, to put into effect old age pensions for which this parliament voted 50 per cent. My hon. friend evidently did not read the newspapers lately or the report which was filed in Halifax a few days ago by the provincial treasurer. because that report shows that this year the Tory government in Halifax collected $2,000,000 more than the Liberal party did in 1925. Consequently there is no excuse for not putting into effect the Old Age Pension Act. If the Conservative government do not do it, the Liberal government when they come into power will certainly see that the old people in Nova Scotia are properly cared for.

Mr. BENNETT: "A thoroughly vicious principle."

Mr. DUFF: It is too bad we have any poor at all, but they will always be with us. The junior member for Halifax referred to conditions in Nova Scotia. The other day the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) spoke about his trip through that province. I never go to Winnipeg or Toronto and come back and wail about conditions in those cities. Why should the hon. member for North Winnipeg, who had a nice trip to Nova Scotia, come back and, because perhaps in the town of Glace Bay the streets were not paved with gold or even with concrete, or there was not proper sewage, or some children perhaps did not have proper clothing, say that Nova Scotia was not in fairly good shape or condition? My hon. friend should be very very careful about making any of those remarks because that is either a provincial or a civic matter in Glace Bay. He should not forget that the president of the United Mine Workers for Nova Scotia is mayor of the town of Glace Bay. Perhaps Nova Scotia is not as prosperous as it might be or as we would like to see it, but there is no need for anyone in this parliament or anywhere else to try to make other members from different parts of the country believe that Nova Scotia is not in fairly good condition.

Mr. HEAPS: Does the hon. member mean to say that conditions in the mining areas of Nova Scotia are satisfactory to him?

Mr. DUFF: No, they will never be satisfactory to me. I would like to see every miner get $50 a day if the British Empire Steel Corporation could pay it. Conditions in the mining area, however, were never as good as they are just now since the Liberal government came into power in this country, and I will prove that in just a moment. They are so good in the county of Inverness—I see my hon. friend from Inverness smiles—that this government is appropriating $375,000 to buy out the Inverness railway. My hon. friend said that there was no prosperity in Nova Scotia. He bewailed the fact and he played on his old fiddle with his strings rasping up and down—Duncan report, 100 per cent; Duncan report, not fulfilled. He went on for five or ten minutes and he said that conditions in Nova Scotia were terrible. I do not want the house to take my word for conditions in our province, but the junior member for Halifax—

Mr. QUINN: I rise to a point of order. I did not say that conditions in Nova Scotia were unsatisfactory. I was quoting from representative Liberals in Nova Scotia in connection with the comments of the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley).

Mr. DUFF: Then my hon. friend admits that conditions in Nova Scotia are good?

Mr. QUINN: You are not going to put words into my mouth.

Mr. DUFF: Of course not; I do not have to. But you put words into my mouth. Certainly the hon. member tried to make the house believe this afternoon that conditions in Nova Scotia were not good.

Mr. QUINN: I did not.

Mr. DUFF: I hold in my hand extracts from a certain newspaper in the province of Nova Scotia, one that is pretty well versed as to conditions in our province, and although it

sometimes supports the Tory party, yet on the whole it is not a bad newspaper. Here is what it says, under the heading "Facts for Fact-Finders:"

1. Statistics compiled by Sydney B. Smith, Ottawa, for the Fnancial Post, list gains in business, 1928 over 1927, as follows:

Prairies	16.2	per cent
Maritimes	15.0	"
Quebec	13.5	"
British Columbia	12.0	"
Ontario	10.0	"

The maritimes thus stand first in business gains in all Canada outside the prairies.

That is from the Halifax Herald, the Conservative organ in Nova Scotia. But let us go a little further:

Facts for Fact-Finders

2. Nova Scotia led all Canada in gain in percentage of construction in 1928, according to MacLeans' figures quoted by Cockfield, Brown and Company. The following is a paragraph from the Canadian Business Preview of that advertising organization:

"With the exception of Manitoba and Ontario, there was a decided increase in building in each province. The largest percentage was in Nova Scotia with a gain of 408.6 per cent over 1927 figures.

Of course, the junior member for Halifax forgets that we are spending $3,000,000 to build a new hotel and railway station at Halifax, and that we are spending millions of dollars for other purposes in that province.

Mr. QUINN: Tell that to MacMillan.

Mr. DUFF: Let us look at some other facts about the province of Nova Scotia, which our friends on the other side try to make out is in such a deplorable condition, and they expect us to whine and caterwaul with them, to bring our fiddles here and all harp on that one string. I continue to quote from the Halifax Herald:

Roger Babson, famous economist and statistician, issues each month a map in colours showing the sales and credit opportunities of the different parts of the country. When a district is printed in gold it means that the sales opportunities in that district are very favourable.

For the first time in many years Roger Babson has put the maritime provinces in gold. This is what he says about them:

"Both New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have shown so sustained an increase in general business conditions that we have entered them as gold areas on the Babson's sales map for the first time in many years. The maritime provinces may be considered an excellent field for sales campaigns."

And yet the junior member for Halifax tried to leave the impression on the house this afternoon that the maritime provinces are not in a fairly good condition.

Mr. QUINN: My hon. friend—

Mr. DUFF: I did not interrupt my hon. friend this afternoon, and I think he might do me the courtesy not to interrupt me. He quoted this afternoon the saying that "some men are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them." May I paraphrase that by saying "some men are born small, they never develop, but shrivel up and die."

Here is fact No. 4 for fact-finders, taken again from the Halifax Herald:

There is nothing wrong with business conditions in Halifax, Nova Scotia or the maritimes. We show an increase of 31 per cent over last year and our plant is working to capacity twenty-four hours a day.

That is from R. C. Moir, Ben's Limited, Halifax. I have another article here from the same newspaper headed "Optimism Generally Recognized." It says:

Business in the maritime provinces, especially in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, was never as good as it is to-day.

With regard to business conditions in the province of Nova Scotia, may I quote from another gentleman for whom I have the highest respect, a gentleman with great business ability, in the province of Nova Scotia. About a fortnight ago—I do not know whether it was during or before the Easter holidays—he went to Halifax to attend a meeting of a certain company in that province, and as president or chairman of the board of directors he sat at the head of the table and kept order during the proceedings. After the meeting was over he gave a statement to the press. It appears in the Halifax Herald, a Conservative organ. The article is headed, "Steel Company Directors Optimistic," and says:

There was a larger tonnage of steel put through the works at Trenton with some additional profit. Joint operation of the ore mines at Wabana has been found to be more economical than separate management.

The report shows the total assets of the company to be $31,544,073.29. Respecting the company's operations, the report says, "The prospects for the coming year are more hopeful—"

Listen to this, which is happening under a Grit government in power at Ottawa:

"The prospects for the coming year are more hopeful, as extensive contracts have been secured for the power shops, which will not only keep them fully occupied for some months, but will improve conditions at company's main works."

I congratulate the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Cantley) for having the good sense and the courage to make that report to his fellow-directors. May I add that part of that contract which the Trenton steel works is now getting the benefit of was given to them by

the Canadian National railways on account of the increased business coming from the West Indies treaty, which some of my hon. friends opposite do not seem to think very much of. An order for 500 refrigerator cars for the transportation of fruit was given to this plant, and when the cars are built they will be sent to Halifax and St. John to move fruit which the West Indies steamers will bring from Jamaica and other ports in the West Indies.

With regard to the Duncan report, previous to this commission being appointed we were told that there was a certain corporation in the province of Nova Scotia which was strangling the life of that province. We heard the same old wailings, that the province was being strangled by a great octopus, and if the Conservatives were put into power they would see that this octopus was quickly unscrambled. Well, the Conservative government has been in power in Nova Scotia for three years now, and this octopus still remains as it was before 1925; no attempt has been made by the provincial government to unscramble it.

But there are two Duncan reports. One is known as the federal Duncan report, and the other is known as the provincial Duncan report, and I am going to make a comparison to show how the Conservative government in Nova Scotia carried out the provincial Duncan report, and how the Liberal government at Ottawa carried out the federal Duncan report.

The provincial Duncan commission was appointed before the federal commission, and although the former commission long since reported to the premier of Nova Scotia, Mr. Rhodes, not one thing has been done about it. There has been no attempt made by the provincial government to carry out that Duncan report, and let me say in answer to my hon. friend from North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) that most of that Duncan report referred to conditions in the mining area in Cape Breton. If any government has the responsibility of looking after the conditions of the workingmen in the province of Nova Scotia, it is the government of that province, and not the federal government.

Now what did the federal government do with regard to the federal Duncan report? We reduced the freight rates in the province of Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces some 20 per cent, giving relief to the people of the maritime provinces to the amount of about $3,000,000 a year. The Canadian National railways gave over a very large amount to the province of Nova Scotia for provincial and municipal taxes, and the Conservative government in power at Halifax, instead of passing part of that along to the municipalities, put it all in their own treasury. This parliament also passed legislation with respect to coking plants, to ensure that coal from the mining areas in Cape Breton, and from Stellarton and Springhill, should be used in the manufacture of coke. Then, sir, we gave a special grant of $200,000 to move coal during the winter months from Nova Scotia to Montreal and points further west. We also appointed harbour commissions for the ports of Halifax and St. John; and while I cannot discuss those harbour commissions, there is no doubt that money has been spent freely in the maritime provinces because of those appointments. Then $700,000 was voted for the erection of that great cold storage plant at Halifax.

The Duncan report recommended that certain districts in Nova Scotia should be given railway communication. I want to thank the government and the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning), the minister from Nova Scotia (Mr. Ralston) and the Canadian National Railways management for arranging that this session the Guysborough railway bill should again come before parliament. I hope and trust in the interests of that part of Nova Scotia that the House of Commons and the Senate will pass the bill so that the railway may be built in the very near future. In addition to providing money for the Guysborough railway this Liberal government—although the riding is represented by a Conservative—is setting aside $375,000 for the Inverness railway.

There is another important matter, and I referred to it at the outset of my speech. Not only has this government tried to carry out the recommendations of the Duncan report 100 per cent, but in one case they have carried them out 150 per cent. I was rather surprised to read in Hansard a few days ago, in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Cantley), that in the year of Our Lord 1928 this government had paid to the Conservative government in Halifax the huge sum of about $1,300,000. The Duncan report recommended that till such time as a conference had been held and the matter of subsidies investigated, a lump sum payment should be made to each of the three maritime provinces, and in the case of Nova Scotia they named an annual payment of $875,000. We did not object to that, sir, we on this side of the house voted that this should be done, and in 1927 $875,000 was paid to the provincial government of Nova Scotia. But the following year, for some reason which I cannot

fathom, this government were so generous that they carried out the Duncan report in this respect 150 per cent and gave the provincial government $875,000, plus $437,500. I do not agree with this.

But my hon. friends opposite do not appreciate this liberality, and in the house and before the country they charge that the government are not doing what they should do in carrying out the recommendations contained in the Duncan report. They say, Oh, you have done nothing for coal and steel. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to show that we did do something for these great industries of the province. We reduced the freight rates 20 per cent, and certainly the steel and coal companies of Nova Scotia benefited by that reduction more than anyone else. We have also, as I have pointed out, given $200,000 to assist the movement of coal to Montreal and points west. As we all know, the application for further tariff protection on steel is before the tariff advisory board. My only regret in regard to that application is that my good friend from Pictou, who is an able business man and who knows the steel and coal industry perhaps better than any other man in Canada, could not convince his own confreres and the steel companies of Ontario to get together and decide what they want in the way of further protection. The trouble is that the steel companies all over the country are divided on this matter, and that is one reason why the tariff commission finds it so difficult to decide what shall be done by way of relief, if any.

Now, let me make a suggestion or two in regard to improving the conditions in the coal and steel industry of Nova Scotia. One hon. gentleman on the other side of the house spoke of the conflicting interests in the various sections of this great country. That, sir, is why in my opinion we cannot raise the duty on coal, and as far as I am concerned my voice will be heard against any such proposal. I believe in lower tariffs. Two years ago I voted with the government to increase the duty on slack coal to 50 cents. This was all right; but certainly as a Liberal and a low-tariff man I would not agree to a further increase in this duty. If it were raised, say, from 50 cents to a dollar a ton, it would only mean that the consumers in this country would have to pay the extra price.

But there is a remedy, sir. I said, in answer to my hon. friend, that conditions in the mining area were better this year than they have been for a long time. The men are getting more days' work now than they have been in past years. But certain things might be done to still further improve the conditions. They are trying to take advantage of the movement of coal west on the three-dollar rate which was arranged by this government with the Canadian National Railways. I am told, sir, that the Canadian National can carry coal from Sydney to Montreal and further west for two dollars a ton; I am told that they can carry it even for $1.70. If so, the lower rate should be put into effect. A rate of two dollars a ton would mean a great deal to the coal industry of Nova Scotia, because millions of tons of coal now imported from the United States for use in Quebec and Ontario could be displaced by our own coal.

Then again, sir, the movement might be further encouraged in this way. At present it commences in December. My information is that if in the Sydney and Cape Breton areas the movement was started in November it would mean a great deal to the local mines. With regard to Springhill and Stellarton, the rate should apply all the year round instead of only during the four or five months in the winter.

Those are ways in which the coal industry can be helped, and I submit this would be a better course to pursue than to raise the duty on coal or to give bonuses to the steel industry. I think it would be better, in the first place, to allow the steel company to operate for a year or two under the new management to see whether or not they can improve the condition of the industry.

There is something else, sir, that can be done for the miners. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Smith) in discussing the coal question referred to the fact that New Zealand butter was coming into this country and the rest of Nova Scotia to the detriment of the farmers whom he represents. This question, Mr. Speaker, is like a two-edged sword, it cuts both ways. Does my hon. friend believe in increasing the duty on butter so that the miners of Springhill would have to pay more for this commodity? Does he want to go back to the days of Tory rule when they had to eat oleomargarine in place of butter? Another solution so far as the miners of Cape Breton are concerned is for this government to reduce the cost of living. I agree with the junior member for Halifax that the cost of living is too high; but that is due to the fact that about fifty years ago a Tory government put into practice the principle of protection, which enables our manufacturers to charge from 25 to 30 per cent more for their goods than they could get in the open market. Until such time as the duty is reduced, and

consequently the cost of living also, the people in the maritime provinces, and particularly the miners in Sydney and Springhill, will not benefit.

I notice that my hon. friend from Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Ernst) also referred to New Zealand butter in the course of his speech in this debate. I remember, sir, perhaps more vividly and distinctly than he does, that seven or eight years ago we had to buy oleomargarine for our fishing fleet. Is my hon. friend in favour of giving our fishermen oleomargarine to spread on their bread?

Mr. ERNST: No, Lunenburg butter.

Mr. DUFF: That, Mr. Speaker, shows how little he knows about fitting out the Lunenburg fishing fleet. Not ten pounds of Lunenburg butter have been used on any Lunenburg fishing schooner in the last ten years. The butter has to be bought all over the country, and sometimes we have to buy New Zealand butter to fit out the Lunenburg fishing fleet. Of course, if my hon. friend wants to give our fishermen oleomargarine, that may be all right so far as he is concerned, but I can assure him that the fishermen of Lunenburg county believe in having good grub. They want good butter for their bread, even if it does come from New Zealand. My hon. friend also played on a fiddle. I do not know whether he had any bow at all; I think he was playing over the bridge all the time. He complained that conditions were terrible among the fishermen of Nova Scotia. Well, of course, conditions are not as satisfactory as we should like to see them. But to bolster up his argument he made the statement that the average amount earned by the fishermen was $300 a year.

Mr. ERNST: Shore fishermen.

Mr. DUFF: Very well, shore fishermen; I am willing to concede as much as possible to the hon. gentleman. Of course, I must take the hon. gentleman's word under parliamentary rules, as you and I know them, Mr. Speaker. But for your private information I may say that quite evidently the hon. gentleman got his statistics from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and they are not at all reliable. Nor have they been reliable for the last thirty or forty years.

I am told that my time is nearly up and there are certain matters I shall not be able to refer to. However, I wish to touch upon one remark made by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg. The hon. gentleman reminds me of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. He first complained that in this budget the reductions made in favour of the fishermen were infinitesimal; he regretted that the Minister of Finance had not done very much for this class of the population. That remark was intended of course to catch the votes of the fishermen in the county of Lunenburg. But the fishermen in Lunenburg county are intelligent people although they stray once in a while, as in 1926. Still, I say, there are intelligent people there and I am sure my hon. friend cannot catch any suckers in Lunenburg, especially with that kind of bait. He says that there are practically no reductions in the tariff, yet he bitterly complains because in the tariff there is a reduction on gasoline engines used by fishermen. Let me say this—and I do not say it egotistically or in any spirit of boasting; I merely want to show that I am a good Liberal and a believer in low tariffs. I am interested in two concerns which manufacture gasoline engines in the county of Lunenburg. Four years ago I was in favour of a reduction of the duty from 27½ or 25 per cent to 17½ or 15 per cent—I have forgotten the exact figures—and I am in favour of the reduction in this budget. And so far as I am concerned, even with the money I have in these two concerns, I should be willing to have the whole duty wiped out so that the fishermen might be enabled to obtain their engines at a lower price.

Mr. H. B. SHORT (Digby-Annapolis): I expected that my hon. friend (Mr. Duff) would have something to say with reference to this wonderful Robb budget about which the Liberals have talked so much, but he did not mention the budget at all. The hon. gentleman's whole speech was a tirade against the Conservative members of Nova Scotia. Evidently those members who had previously spoken had touched my hon. friend in the wrong spot. The hon. gentleman says that the Liberals have done a great deal for Nova Scotia; they have implemented the Duncan report 100 per cent and in fact 150 per cent. I venture to say that my hon. friend would not appear in his own constituency and tell his electors that story; nor would he make the same kind of speech in Nova Scotia as he has made in this house to-night.

Mr. DUFF: I am going to send out 10,000 copies to-morrow morning.

Mr. SHORT: My hon. friend made pretty nearly the same kind of speech in this house in 1926. I remember his standing over there and speaking about this commission which was going to be appointed to investigate maritime rights which we were presenting on behalf of Nova Scotia. He said it was nothing but Tory propaganda, because there was

nothing wrong with Nova Scotia; Nova Scotia was prosperous. That was his attitude: all you needed to do was to go to Halifax when a fair was on and see the automobiles driving in and look at the well dressed people who were on the streets. But when it came to his election down in that province it was a far different question. My hon. friend stated on the hustings there that he was in favour of the Duncan report; conditions were not right in Nova Scotia and, if he was elected, he was going to see that the report was implemented in full. He would see that it was carried out or he would resign his seat if elected. Does the hon. gentleman now stand up in this house and say that the Duncan report has been implemented in full?

Mr. DUFF: Yes.

Mr. SHORT: Well, I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the principal item in the recommendations of that report, referring to coal and steel, has not been touched by the government; so far as this item is concerned they have not turned a hand to give any assistance to the coal and steel industry. Yet the hon. gentleman says that the government have implemented the Duncan report 150 per cent. What has he to say in regard to the subsidy to the province of Nova Scotia? Evidently he has never read the report. The report stated that the $875,000 was an amount additional to the subsidy which was already being paid to the province. The government paid what the Duncan report suggested they should pay, and not one dollar more. So much for the hon. member; I will not refer to him again because it is not necessary. I might however observe this before I leave him finally. I was surprised that an hon. gentleman who is so much interested in the fisheries had nothing whatever to say about that great industry. He was so absorbed in his tirade against the Conservative members in Nova Scotia that he forgot all about the fishing industry.

Mr. DUFF: I am too modest.

Mr. SHORT: Now, Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to say anything with reference to the budget, for the reason that practically everything which it was necessary for us to say on this side of the house was so admirably put forward by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in his excellent speech some weeks ago. I feel however, as a member from Nova Scotia, that it is incumbent upon me to say something in refutation of what has been represented by some of the Liberal members opposite. Those gentlemen would lead the house to believe that conditions in Nova Scotia are thoroughly prosperous. Now I am not a pessimist by any manner of means; I am an optimist, and I believe that there are some sections of Nova Scotia that are prosperous. But there are other sections that are anything but prosperous. Take the farming industry of Nova Scotia, the dairy industry and the fishing industry: not one of these great industries is prosperous; there is no prosperity about it. I was surprised at the attitude of my hon. friend from Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) the other day. He suggested that there was wonderful prosperity in our beautiful province. As I say, I am willing and glad to admit that some sections are prosperous, and I hope the time is coming when the whole province will share in that prosperity. But that time will not come under this administration; we shall need to have a change of government before there is general prosperity in the country. The country will never prosper under this government.

My hon. friend from Hants-Kings would lead this house to believe that the Annapolis valley is one of the most prosperous sections of Nova Scotia. My constituency happens to join that of the hon. member and I venture to say that he dare not go down to his constituency and tell the farmers that they are as prosperous as he tried to make this house believe. It is true that they had a fair crop this year, but owing to lack of markets that crop did not pay the cost of production. We in Nova Scotia were not so fortunate in getting special rates on our potatoes as were some sections of Quebec, where the farmers were given special rates in order to permit them to send their potatoes to the markets of Montreal and Ottawa. Then our fruit crop was below the average this year; in some sections of the Annapolis valley the apple crop was almost a failure. It is true that the farmers received a good price for their apples but the returns were not anything like average.

The hon. member for Hants-Kings complimented the government on the reduction of one per cent in the sales tax; he said that was a wonderful thing for the people of Nova Scotia as well as for the people of Canada generally, and he thought the government should be commended for not wiping out the tax altogether. For years we on this side of the house have been advocating that the sales tax be completely abolished—not reduced at the rate of one per cent per year but wiped out entirely. The removal of the tax on telegrams and on parlor car tickets is no good to the labouring man; we on this side advocate those things which will help

the workingman rather than the rich man who travels by pullman or the large concerns which send so many telegrams. Those taxes might be continued, but I presume that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) is waiting until next year, when he will bring down his election budget, before he abolishes the sales tax. I am going to tell the minister, however, that he will get no credit for it then, because everyone knows that for years past we have been advocating the removal of the sales tax in its entirety.

Then let us consider the dairy industry, which has been so greatly affected by New Zealand butter coming into Canada practically free of duty. I am not going to say very much in that connection, but I have been asked by the Nova Scotia Farmers' Association to present a resolution which was passed at their convention in Truro last January. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas, in consequence of the persistent tendency to carry on dairying on too slender a margin of profit, or even at a loss, has resulted in a corresponding failure to cope with the ever growing demand of the home market, not to mention export trade for milk, cream, butter, cheese and ice cream supplied; and

Whereas the consequent shortage of the home made creamery pasteurized butter has resulted in opening the door widely to the importation of this necessary product from other parts of the empire under treaty privilege, thus enabling New Zealand butter, for instance, to be sold in Canada at prices with which Canadian dairymen cannot compete; and

Whereas the farmer who produces milk for human consumption is also so hemmed in by government regulations of health and standardization that his expenses have increased without any appreciable increase in his income; and

Whereas the dairy industry is now in such a state as to require an effective stimulant and guarantee of stability to bring about the necessary improvements and development to ensure progress and prosperity;

Therefore be it resolved that we members of the Nova Scotia Farmers' Association in annual convention assembled, do ask the federal government at once to increase the tariff on butter from the existing four cents to, say ten cents per pound, or to such a rate that after allowing the preference of three cents per pound, will give the butter industry sufficient protection to enable its paying the producers a rate that will be adequate to yield a reasonable profit on their investment of money and labour.

I am sorry the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) is not in his seat; I intend to bring up a matter now with which he has to do and which is of great importance to the fruit growers of Nova Scotia. They are up against the problem of freight rates to continental Europe; they have been held up by the North Atlantic Shipping Federation in this connection, and I think this is a matter which should be looked into by the Department of Trade and Commerce. The federation insist that in order to obtain the 80 cent rate to Great Britain the apple shippers must sign a contract guaranteeing that all their shipments will be sent by these steamers; otherwise they are charged $1 per barrel. At the annual convention of the Nova Scotia Fruit Growers' Association, which was held in January of this year, a resolution was passed which I intend to put on Hansard in order to bring the matter before the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, that we, the Nova Scotia Fruit Growers' Association in annual meeting assembled, resent the ultimatum of the North Atlantic Freight Conference, whereby, all shippers using their lines to European markets are compelled to sign contracts to use these lines exclusively, or pay a freight on apples at the rate of 20 cents per barrel, in excess of the contract rate.

We can only consider such contract, removing as it does the possibility of using any boats outside the conference, as a serious threat against the welfare of our industry, in paving the way toward a general increase in the apple carrying rate.

We commend the action of the Canadian National Steamships in announcing that they would not be bound by the contract requirements of the North Atlantic Conference, and would petition the federal government to use such influence as they may possess that such contracts be not required in future;

And further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the federal members for Annapolis and Kings, and to the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

I presume that my hon. friend from Hants-Kings received a copy of that resolution, but he did not mention it in his remarks.

Now I wish to pass on for a few moments and discuss our fisheries in Nova Scotia. This is one of our greatest natural resources, and it has been sadly neglected not only by this government but by practically all governments. I am not going to say that this government is the only one that has done nothing; we never have had a department of fisheries which has looked after that industry as it should be looked after in order to obtain from it all the benefits which the country should derive. The other day the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), during his excellent speech, stated that the fishing industry in Nova Scotia was going ahead by leaps and bounds. I think he must have been badly misinformed, because in looking up the statistics having to do with fisheries, I find that we have made practically

no progress in that direction since 1910. The following figures show the value of the fisheries industry of Nova Scotia:

1910	$10,119,243
1918	15,143,066
1920	12,742,659
1921	9,778,623
1922	10,209,258
1923	8,448,385
1924	8,777,251
1925	10,213,779
1926	12,505,922
1927	10,783,631

The figures given by the Department of Marine and Fisheries show that no progress whatever has been made, and still the Minister of National Defence tells the house that the fishing industry of Nova Scotia has been going ahead by leaps and bounds. It would go ahead by leaps and bounds if we had a department of fisheries which understood the business. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin) is a most estimable man, and I have great regard for him, but he is a lawyer. He is of the same profession as some of the ministers who have held that portfolio in the past, and I am not finding any fault with the government in that regard.

This great natural resource of this country was hardly mentioned in the house until what are known as the maritime righters came here. We have talked about fish, and I venture to say a great many members of this house have eaten more fish during the last three years than ever before. So long as I am here I am going to talk about the fisheries of this country, because I believe we can obtain the best advertising right on the floor of the house.

The Department of Marine and Fisheries has done absolutely nothing to help this industry. They appointed a royal commission to look into the fisheries of the maritime provinces, but what happened? That commission cost this country upwards of $80,000. They presented a report, and while many of the recommendations contained therein would have been of value to the fisheries, some of them would have been detrimental had they been carried out. This report was tabled a year ago but the government has taken no action on it at all. One of the recommendations made was that a minister of fisheries be appointed. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was asked during the early days of this session if a minister of fisheries would be appointed, and he replied that the government had the matter under consideration and would appoint one at the opportune time. Of course that opportune time will not come until just before the elections, but it will be too late then. It may be good politics, but no government should play politics with a natural industry like our fisheries. The trouble with the Department of Marine and Fisheries is that they have been playing politics ever since this government came into power. Nothing has been done about appointing a minister of fisheries although they have appointed a deputy minister, or rather changed the title of the director of fisheries to Deputy Minister of Fisheries. That is the only change which has taken place.

The fishing industry will never make any progress until there is a reorganization of the department and an efficient minister appointed. They should appoint someone who knows something about the industry, a man of business training and experience. The Liberal party have such a man on their side; why do they not appoint him?

The fishing industry of Nova Scotia has asked this government time and time again to try to increase the production of fish and find new markets for those products. I was impressed the other day when the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) suggested that the Department of Trade and Commerce might well look after our domestic trade. What has that department done in an endeavour to find markets for our fish or other natural products? Nothing whatever. It has done very little to increase our trade with foreign countries, and I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce might well look after our domestic markets in an endeavour to find an outlet for our natural products.

As I said, we have asked the Department of Marine and Fisheries time and time again to do something to increase the production of fish and find new markets for us. What has happened? In 1925 Mr. J. J. Cowie, practically the only expert man they have in the department, was sent over to England to look up markets for Nova Scotia fish. After visiting different places in Great Britain, Mr. Cowie came back and reported that there was an excellent market there for fresh fish, provided that some assistance was given by the government to get the markets started and assist the industry in an educational way as to the preparing of the fish, as to the varieties best suited, and that sort of thing. But nothing was done about that report.

In 1927, Mr. Cowie, accompanied by Mr. G. R. Earl, of Yarmouth, N.S., was sent to Great Britain in connection with the imperial economic committee's inquiry into the marketing of the fish production of the empire. On their return they presented a very elaborate

report. I cannot read the whole report, but I would like to quote a few sections in an endeavour to show the house how neglectful the Department of Marine and Fisheries has been. One of the sections is as follows:

It was pointed out there are two ways by which the situation in eastern Canada could be improved: One is by the shipment of fresh fish in ice to the British market. The committee was informed that it had been clearly demonstrated that such fish can be landed overseas in excellent condition but that transportation difficulties retard development until the volume of the traffic, by some means, has grown sufficiently to overcome them of itself. The other is by freezing the fish under the quick process known as brine freezing, which leaves the fish when defrosted, with all the original juices it contained when taken from the sea. It was pointed out that the Canadian fishing grounds were so near the shore in many places as to make possible the landing of fish almost alive, and, if frozen, could be placed on the British markets in a much better and fresher state than most of the so-called fresh fish landed there direct from the fishing grounds.

The committee was further informed that the marketing of brine frozen fish would have this great advantage: the fish need not be dumped on an over-supplied market, but could be held in storage until the markets had recovered and prices had risen.

The adoption of this means of marketing by the British trade, as well as the Canadian trade, would stabilize supply, demand and prices and push out the existing antiquated method of hurrying fresh fish to market and selling them immediately, whether the supply is such as to constitute a glut or a scarcity.

The report continues:

The opening up of this market would be of far reaching benefit to our shore fishermen particularly who produce fish of the more desirable quality. But as there are shipping difficulties to be overcome and as risks of loss would have to be undertaken in the beginning we would commend to the consideration of the department, the matter of giving to shippers financial aid of some kind during the few initial months to overcome discouragements that may arise from consignments arriving on unremunerative market days, and to enable them to enable them to hold on and continue until the trade has obtained a sufficient foothold to take care of itself.

The report concludes by stating:

We strongly feel that the establishment of central meal-making plants on the Atlantic coast is of as much importance as the finding of new markets for fish as a means of rebuilding our fishing fleets and retaining our fishermen. If, therefore, firms of standing engaged in the fisheries could be induced and encouraged to take hold of this means of development, there would appear to be no room for doubt that a shore fishery greater than has yet been on the Atlantic coast could quickly emerge from its present low unprofitable state.

To summerize, in conclusion, the main features of the foregoing report, which in our opinion would bring immediate beneficial results to the fishing industry of our maritime provinces, we would note that these are two, namely:—

1. The marketing of fresh fish in ice in Great Britain and

2. The establishment of meal-making plants to take care of the great amount of material at present being wasted.

That was a report made by Mr. Cowie in 1927 and still no action has been taken on it. They got this report, filed it away in a pigeon hole and nothing is heard of it again until some person like myself brings it up.

Mr. BENNETT: Until an election.

Mr. SHORT: That is right. That is when the people are going to have something to say about it. The government are waiting until next year when the budget comes down. No doubt the Minister of Finance thought he was doing something wonderful for the fishermen of Nova Scotia when he put needles for repairing fishermen's nets and brass swivels on the free list. I made inquiry as to what quantities of these two articles were imported and I was told they were so small that they were not enumerated at all. I have been in the fishing business pretty nearly all my life and I have never heard of fishermen in Nova Scotia using brass swivels. I think it must have been as a joke that somebody suggested to the Minister of Finance that he put those on the free list. The minister, not being a practical man, thought there must be something in it, but it is actually nothing but a joke. There is nothing in the budget this year for the fishermen or anybody else in Nova Scotia. I do not suppose there was ever a needle for mending nets imported into that province. I know I never heard of one being imported. Perhaps it was in order to sew buttons on their oil coats.

I trust that the time has arrived when something will be done in connection with this important industry. There are great possibilities in the fishing industry of Nova Scotia. We should be producing there not $10,000,000 but $50,000,000 worth a year, and we could do it. We have off the coast of Nova Scotia the greatest fisheries in the world, but the government do not realize this and do not appreciate their responsibilities. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not think he has any responsibility as regards the fisheries. All his attention is devoted to marine matters, but the time has arrived when he must pay some attention to the fishermen of the maritime provinces.

Let me say a word or two to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) with reference to breakwaters along the coast of Nova Scotia. There are perhaps more breakwaters

in my constituency than in any other constituency in that province,, and some of them are in a very bad state of repair. Ever since I have been in the house I have brought to his attention the matter of dredging and repairs in connection with many of these breakwaters. It is true he has listened to me in a few cases and some of those breakwaters have been repaired, but many of them are at present in a dilapidated condition and repairs are urgently needed. My hon. friend would not allow a building in the city of Ottawa to get out of repair or go completely to ruin. Why should he allow breakwaters in which we have invested millions of dollars in Nova Scotia to become so dilapidated that they are no protection whatever to the fishing industry? They were constructed for the protection of that industry; indeed we cannot build up a fishing industry in that province without them. The minister is a very good-natured man and I think a great deal of him. I implore him this year particularly, because next year we are going to the country, to do something in this matter for his own benefit and for the benefit of the fishermen of Nova Scotia. He will get some of the credit, and I will take some of it myself. If the minister will simply take the reports he gets from his engineers in connection with the condition of those breakwaters in Nova Scotia and grant the expenditures they ask for, I shall be perfectly satisfied. I am serious about this matter and I trust that when the supplementary estimates of the minister come down they will include substantial grants for breakwaters, especially for those of my constituency in Nova Scotia.

Mr. E. S. ST-PERE (Hochelaga) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, in the course of the year just ended, the press, banks and all large financial institutions of this country were highly gratified in being able to state that the financial and trade conditions were satisfactory, and that the future was replete with bright prospects.

The budget brought down a short while ago by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb), officially confirmed these previous statements.

In a parliament composed like this one of two great parties and various groups, the budget always gives rise to a debate in which the views of pessimists and realists are reflected. The former's loquacity takes the form of an unrelenting criticism. It is the allurement of power which haunts them. And as they must use all expedients and have recourse to hair-splitting so as to uphold their stand, they always stick to one or two subjects of the budget in their criticisms, embodying them later in an amendment or subamendment. The subjects under discussion at present refer to agriculture, industry and the working classes to whom the government it seems promises nothing for the future.

We are preoccupied, to-day, with the problem of agriculture. It has brought on a change of government in Rumania, and at the last presidential elections in the United States, the American farmer has insisted on protection of industries in return for his vote. The campaign which is in full swing in England presents the same problem. The Labour party requires the stabilization of farm product prices. The Tories seek the support of the farmers by offering them as an allurement the policy advocated by Churchill in the shape of the lowest taxation for the basic industries. The Liberals have as remedial legislation in their program, an increase in exports and decrease in imports. In order to satisfy the farmers Lloyd George has advocated a program of state ownership of lands, which, we must admit, does not guarantee to the English consumer a greater production of farm products nor, for that matter, prices more in keeping with their purse.

As it was in the United States that the great protectionist movement was started on behalf of the farmers, let us study the remedies advocated by the champions of the farmers' cause. Senator Brookhart suggests that the farmer should be assisted by doles and that he should have the right to raise money to sell his crops. Mr. Chester Davis wants the farmer to regain his status through the disposal of the surplus of his crops and the assistance of a higher tariff. Mr. Davis forgets that the evil lies, not in the surplus produced, but really in the cost of production, when it is a question of competing with Canada on the markets of the world.

Senator Borah, forgetting for a moment the great interest he takes in the international relations of the United States, suggests to President Hoover a high tariff wall against all imported products. He fears, it is true, the opposition of certain manufacturers already protected who are more interested in the enforcement of the tariff clauses against foreign products similar to those they manufacture; and he even ventures so far as to state that certain manufacturers will demand an embargo; however, what does it matter, the American farmer must be protected by a measure which will increase the cost of living for the consumer across the border!

The American farmer is aware that the foreign market is drifting away from him, and that he must prevent, by a higher tariff wall,

two billion dollars of foreign products competing with him on his home market. He was badly prepared for the after war depression; there lies the entire reason for the crisis he is at present experiencing.

The financial critic of the opposition (Mr. Guthrie) discovered in this great protectionist movement which is developing in the United States the subject of his amendment to the resolution of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb). His colleagues of the opposition found it possible to enlarge on the subject. As usual, it is the high protective policy they seek as a remedy to all the evils which Canada is supposed to suffer from at present. Allusion was made to unemployment, smoking smoke-stacks, well filled dinner pails—old stereotyped phrases which fit in nicely with the spirit of this definition which Disraeli gave of politics, "that it was the art of governing the people by fooling them." Echoes are constantly a threat against the spreading of a good opinion. The very moment that the American press spread throughout the world the news that the United States government would surrender to the pressure of the agrarian party in favour of a high tariff, our protectionists advocated a tariff of retaliation against the United States. An appeal to our national pride, using such terms as "red-blooded nation," etc., required us to polish our tariff weapons. Where would this lead us to, sir? To ask the question is to answer it; to the first step of oppression against the consumer by certain unscrupulous manufacturers—for let us not forget that the golden rule finds no place in business—who would take advantage of the high tariff to overcharge the consumer. And all this to afford a so-called protection to the Canadian farmer who, whatever may be said to the contrary, is in a much more enviable economic situation than his colleague in the United States, if we are to place any faith in an inquiry recently carried out by an important agricultural association of the province of Quebec. If we are to place any faith in the resolutions and data presented in 1925, at the meeting of the Catholic farmers of the province of Quebec, we find that according to conclusions based on an inquiry, eleven per cent only of the farmers interested contended that their present state, as well as the exodus of our country folk, was due to a rather low tariff. The high tariff, according to our hon. friends opposite, would be the great remedy to the new ills which they are endeavouring to find.

For some time past, it seems to us that the President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, has become a bugbear. The systematic Mr. Hoover, like the silent Mr. Coolidge, will certainly not allow himself to be influenced by outside interests. How could he do otherwise? How could he be so little consequent with himself after the great speech he delivered at Erie, Pennsylvania, in 1925, when he characterized the tariff reforms, monopolies and price control as satan's arguments. Never will the United States have recourse to such means in order to balance their economic situation.

It is always interesting—and this is a balm to me—to recall some historical statements notably the one that the great Gladstone made in 1881 before an English audience, he said:

"Your trade superiority is assured as long as the United States adhere to high protection. Let your sleep not be disturbed by the fear that the United States will dominate England on the free markets, so long as high tariff is their motto."

If we go further back in history, we should not forget that it was freedom of trade which built up large prosperous Flemish cities like Ghent and Bruges.

Unemployment has been broached in the present debate as an agreement in favour of protection. It is highly proclaimed that protection is synonymous with high wages. Nothing is so erroneous from the economic viewpoint. Duties are not imposed with the idea of equalizing the difference of wages between European and Canadian workers. Our workers are better paid—and I lay stress on this point—because their efforts tend more to mass production and they can accomplish in a set time twice as much work as the average European workers.

It is Andrew Carnegie, the great American leader of industry, who stated that the cheapest products are always manufactured by high wage workers, using modern machinery; and we could further quote, in support of this assertion the great economists Maurice Low, Arthur Shadwell, W. M. Evarts and Leroy Beaulieu.

Since the President of the United States is quoted a little everywhere as an authority, I shall give his views on the subject of unemployment and the best means of relieving such a situation.

Nowhere does he allude to tariff as a remedy to unemployment. This is how he expresses himself:

The control of credit by banks during prosperous times, the careful supervision of affairs by business men and the retardation of large municipal, state and federal enterprises, when the business of the country is good.

These, sir, are the means he advocates to guard against unemployment. The high tariff, for certain politicians, has always been a doctrine. It is rather a ritual custom accompanying an old-time performance. Unemployment is less felt in Canada than in the United States. More than 2,000,000 unemployed walk the streets of large cities in the United States. The new American tariff, unless revised with care—and any practical man understands this—will never succeed in equalizing the wages paid in the spinning-mills of New England with those paid in similar establishments of the southern states.

Let us now turn to the realists, and I am one of them. I look upon concentrated optimism as a dangerous thing, however, I willingly surrender to facts. Canada possesses a genuine government looking after the nation's interests as a whole and refusing to allow itself to be controlled by those who would benefit by its being muzzled in order to further their own interests. Our financial situation is more than satisfactory, our trade is expanding, in fact all tends to show that Canada is acquiring a national conscience, a progress which asserts itself through unrelenting work of preparation. We refuse as practical people to believe in the proverbial accident which would lead nations to success.

In my opinion, the prosperity of this country asserts itself still more through the general satisfaction reigning everywhere, than through the testimony of bare statistics. The people witness our markets expanding, our treaties with other nations increasing our exports. Our ambassadors of trade, trade attachés who devote their time in making Canada known abroad, are properly speaking the authors of this trade expansion of Canada. Mr. Isaac Marcosson, the great journalist and economist of the United States considers that these ambassadors of trade are most precious in helping the economic expansion of nations.

I stated, sir, just now that optimism was sometimes dangerous. Of course, we are living in the twentieth century, and times have changed since biblical days when all could live happy in the shade of their vines and fig trees, but who could deny that the conditions have greatly improved in this country since the Liberal party took over the direction of affairs?

Sir, I should like to have seen a greater reduction in taxation. There is a tax—the income tax—which weighs heavily upon the people. I would even state that, in order to avoid paying this tax, many citizens have used their revenues to speculate on the exchange and have lost large sums in the recent slump in stocks. Unfortunately, it is impossible to suppress entirely this tax under the present circumstances. Our war debt, the enormous obligations that Canada must face forces us to maintain it. One word as regards the manner it is being enforced. I have no hesitation in stating that the rate of interest which those in arrears are forced to pay to the government is an exorbitant one. Ten per cent is an excessive rate, for you are aware as I am, sir, that it is not through evil designs that certain citizens put off paying to the state the income tax.

The government has again reduced the sales tax this year. It is therefore entitled to our congratulations. As we are, unfortunately, too much in the habit, in the House of Commons of adopting certain social legislation without thoroughly studying the situation, without considering as to whether the exchequer of Canada is in a position to meet these obligations, I would suggest that this tax, if it is maintained, be turned over to a special fund which might help in paying family allowances to our large families. It would be the people's tax returning to the people, and I cannot see any more practical means of helping this new social movement which has recently sprung up.

The province of Quebec has never complained. Our claims in this house have been very trifling compared to those presented to us by our hon. friends from the Maritime provinces. The government has been kind enough to remember certain districts of the province of Quebec by purchasing two railways, a purchase which for a number of years past had become necessary. The government is again entitled to our thanks for having given to a group of our compatriots settled in the Canadian west, in the Cold Lake district, the means of transportation which they had requested for a number of years past. Our people who settled in that district were, like our missionaries after all, the pioneers of colonization, and since we have thought proper to send them in those parts, since they have been looked upon as the best settlers of the Canadian west, it is but fair that those groups be given by our government all the consideration due to them.

I represent a labour division in Montreal; I was not elected to represent them in the House of Commons because I posed as a demagogue, but I know their needs and I have no fear in stating that, as a whole, they are satisfied with present conditions. But there is always a dark side to a picture. I openly state that it is the competition they have to meet at present from certain classes of European immigrants. It matters to me little whether they are of British, French or

Flemish origin, etcetera, I state that Canada should cease inducing those artisans to come and settle among us; and I shall go one step further, I shall state that the moment these immigrants land in Montreal or Quebec, a job seems to await them. No doubt, the government takes no part with regard to such a situation, however, it seems to me that certain classes have a special preference and that these immigrants, on their landing in Canada, receive special advantages which have the effect of displacing, the native sons from jobs that they have earned by their work and intelligence. The Canadian artisans compare favourably with those in Europe. They hold responsible positions in all our workshops. Let genuine farmers be brought over, group them together in the west; so much the better. Our railways need them; our vast tracts of lands need hands to develop them. But I state that our fellow-citizens both English and French Canadians, born in Canada, suffice to fill in our large city factories the positions set aside for experts. Our provincial governments especially, and even the Dominion government have subscribed considerable sums for the development of technical education. Where shall we find positions for our graduates? What advantages shall we offer them if foreigners still continue to take the positions which by right belong to the students of our technical schools? Immigration commends itself and must be encouraged, but not to the extent of being detrimental in any way to the right held by our people to fill the first positions in the land.

Economists, sir, have their own way of solving the problem of unemployment. I do not think however that this problem can ever be solved by any government. That is my personal opinion. I state that the all important problem of unemployment must be solved by industry itself, and I cannot side with the views of Julius Barnes, the President of the Board of Trade of the United States, who persists in maintaining that artisans displaced because of modern machinery are absorbed by other rising industries.

Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labour also states, that industry itself should solve the problem of unemployment. Many means have been suggested. The five-day week, for instance, finds little support, even among labour unions. Industries are at present making enough profits to solve by themselves the problem of unemployment, and I do not think that the solutions to this problem will ever be found in any political measure, whatever shape or form it may take, be it tariff or otherwise.

The people—and I shall be frank about it —notwithstanding the present situation, felt somewhat uneasy. They note with some apprehension the intermarrying of millions in the shape of mergers and trusts. After all, it would only be right to establish a difference between this merging of industries and the great trusts which are established a little everywhere. It is an unfortunate state of things—and I avail myself of the privilege of being a member to mention the fact to the house, since it interests especially the working classes. I am not adverse to large industries. I shall always decline to take any part in stirring war between capital and labour, but what is to be said of the attitude, for some time past, of certain large manufacturers who, after our province had passed legislation in connection with labour accidents, endeavoured to protect themselves by dismissing from their workshops the fathers of large families? They are the same people who advocate and write articles in the newspapers under their own signatures or support in election times a self-styled policy opposed to the emigration of our people and who, to-day, put these very people whom they have dismissed from their workshops in the way of emigrating.

There is another question: how are we to prevent unemployment? The printing trade— and I have some knowledge of this business, having been a journalist for about twenty years—is, to-day, experiencing quite a serious crisis. Ask the owners of our large workshops, they will explain to you one of the causes of the emigration of our people. It is this: the great patriotic men who advise us to keep our people at home, those large manufacturers who would like to see all our fellow-citizens exiled in the United States return to us within fifteen days, have a very strange way of fostering our national industries by having their printing done abroad.

Our opponents have referred to considerable expenditures. In my opinion, it would be better for them to conform their actions to their principles, since, only a short while ago, they unanimously voted to burden the Dominion government with extraordinary expenditures in order to build up national highways and further subscribe for technical education, matters exclusively pertaining to provincial legislatures.

Mr. Speaker, I will close my remarks by saying that the amendment moved by the financial critic of the opposition rests on no sound argument so far as bringing prosperity to farm-

ers, or steady employment to artisans. I am opposed, moreover, to the subamendment because it is contrary to the policy advocated in the past by Sir Wilfrid Laurier; and being aware as a realist—not as an optimist—of conditions, at present, prevailing in our own country, a prosperous state, one that promises much for the future and, as I stated at the outset of my speech, a state which gives general satisfaction to our people, I shall vote in favour of the resolution put forth by the hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. W. K. ESLING (West Kootenay): Although many hon. members have spoken on this budget, I feel it incumbent to add a word by way of protest against the utter failure of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) to provide in this budget any relief for the farmer, the fruit grower, or the poultryman, nothwithstanding the fact that the government admits that it has both the power and the machinery to restrict at a moment's notice the importation of surplus farm products from the United States at glut prices during a period when the Canadian producer hopes to secure a reasonable and fair return from his labour and expense.

May I also emphasize the protests which have come from various boards of trade, mining companies and individual operators and many others against the new provision in this budget respecting the tax on the transfer of low-priced shares.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, any budget which provides for a reduction of taxation is always greeted with approval and applause, and the one under review is no exception. The Minister of Finance stated in his budget announcement that it was the policy of the government to do away with the so-called nuisance taxes, but I think it will be generally admitted, after the country has had time to digest the provisions of this budget, that it means practically nothing beyond relieving the big fellow of his taxes and transferring the burden to the shoulders of the little fellow.

Let us take the proposals of the Minister of Finance with regard to the abolition of the nuisance taxes, as they are generally called. First of all, there is the abolition of the tax on insurance premiums. No matter to what city of Canada you may go you will usually find a huge structure in course of erection for one of the large insurance companies. Their profits are so great that they hesitate to distribute them among the shareholders, and they are therefore compelled to put them into buildings. I submit that in abolishing this tax the minister is simply relieving the large companies, for after all, the tax on insurance premiums is not very much of a nuisance to the man in the street.

Next the minister proposes to abolish the tax on railway tickets costing over one dollar, and on pullman and steamship staterooms, compartments, berths and parlour-car chairs. This is another tax that is not very much of a nuisance to the average wage-earner. These conveniences and comforts are indulged in largely by the representatives of large corporations and commercial concerns, which, of course, are glad enough to get rid of this tax; but let me ask, what particular nuisance is this tax to the wage earner?

Then there is the removal of the tax on cablegrams and telegrams. This is another of the so-called nuisance taxes. When I read that provision in the budget I thought how these thousands of civil servants earning $50, $60 or $75 a month, and the innumerable wage earners throughout the Dominion getting about the same income, must have thrown up their hats with joy and taken a day off and night out to celebrate their being relieved from this tax.

Now all these so-called nuisance taxes have been abolished. But the sales tax, which is paid by every man, woman and child, has been cut only one cent. That is a tax that the wage earner pays on his clothing, boots and shoes, wearing apparel and every kind of household necessity. If, for instance, he builds a modest home on the outskirts of the city at a cost of $2,500 or $3,000, he pays all the way from $35 to $50 sales tax on the material which enters into its construction; if to get into the city to his work he buys a low-priced automobile, his sales tax is about $30; if he builds a fence or a sidewalk, or buys a little paint or other materials to improve his property, he has to pay this sales tax. For several years the Conservative party has been endeavouring to have the tax abolished, and in 1925 Sir Henry Drayton brought in a resolution for its total abolition, but practically every member among the government's followers voted against it. In 1927 the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said, Well, if we cannot have this tax abolished absolutely, we will see if the government will not be good enough to the man of small income to remove the tax on clothing and boots and shoes. Again every government follower voted against the proposal. It is difficult to understand how some of them can explain their vote to their constituents; but no doubt by the time the next election comes around the sales tax will be abolished entirely.

In order to find some other way of raising funds in lieu of these so-called nuisance taxes, the government proposes to tax the little fellow by a tax on the transfer of low-priced stocks. On the purchase of a share costing less than $3 there is a tax of one cent; on shares costing from $3 to $20, two cents; on shares costing from $20 to $100, three cents; on shares from $100 up, four cents. Let me illustrate the injustice of this proposed tax. We will say the little fellow has $25 to invest, and he buys 500 shares costing five cents each. Heretofore on such a purchase he paid no tax; under this budget he is called upon to pay a tax of five dollars. By way of contrast we will take an insurance company or a trust company with funds to invest, say $250,000. The company can purchase 500 shares costing $500 each—we have such shares to-day in the case of Smelters—and the total tax is but $20, whereas prior to this budget it was $75. So you see the government is merely putting the burden on the little fellow and relieving the big fellow. Or if you want to take it another way, we will say the little fellow has $1,000 to invest, and buys $1,000 worth of ten cent shares. I cannot believe that the hon. Minister of Finance had figured out this proposed tax, for on such an investment the actual tax is $100. One hundred dollars on an investment of one thousand dollars. But the big fellow with plenty of money says, I will take a chance and put $1,000 into ten shares costing $100 each. His total tax is only 40 cents. There is such a striking disparity in these cases that it is no wonder so many protests have reached the minister.

There is another phase of this matter worth consideration. The money that this little fellow puts into cheap shares goes to work and develops some mining property. The big fellow puts his money in as an investment, for interest only. Experience has shown, Mr. Speaker, that the most successful and popular way of raising money for mining development is by the sale of these low-priced shares. The fact is that it was the sale of these so-called penny shares that was responsible for the first lode mining in British Columbia; it was that lode mining which was responsible for the construction of the smelter at Trail. To be sure, it was a very small institution in those days, but it was the sale of those low-priced shares which developed more mining properties in the district, and these in turn enabled the smelter to be supplied with custom ore and to carry on until research work has made it to-day the greatest and most important metallurgical institution in the British Empire. That of itself, I submit, is an argument in favour of the low-priced shares.

Take the huge mining developments to-day in Quebec and Ontario, in Manitoba and Saskatchewan; they would not get very far without the initial purchase of those low-priced shares by the little fellow. The business on the Vancouver stock exchange is just about a million dollars a day. On that exchange during 1928 eighty-seven million shares were traded in at an average price of 42 cents. This year there promises to be from seven to ten times that volume of busines. Similar conditions exist on the Montreal and Toronto exchanges. Prior to this budget the tax on the transfer of these shares was three cents per hundred dollars. This produced a considerable revenue for the government and did no harm to the public. But there is something still more interesting in the figures of the Vancouver stock exchange. Of the huge volume of business to which I have referred only two of the stocks traded in are of a higher par value than one dollar; two are ten cents par; three are twenty cents par; eleven are twenty-five cents par; nine are fifty cents par; twenty-three are one dollar par. On nine of these listed stocks the new tax would amount to between fifteen and twenty-five per cent at present market prices. So that one must almost admit that this is not taxation but in reality confiscation; and if the government insists on this new tax it will really mean that the transactions in these low-priced shares, instead of being carried on in our Canadian exchanges, will be diverted to exchanges across the line. The result will be that there will be bootlegged stocks as well as bootlegged liquor. In view of the numerous protests it is to be hoped that the government will either withdraw or modify this feature of the budget, because there is nothing in Canadian history which has so contributed to mineral development as the sale of these low-priced shares. And in view of this huge development which is now in progress it is difficult to understand how hon. members opposite, following the government, can vote for this taxation and hope to justify their vote when they return to their constituencies.

I am a firm believer in the income tax, on the principle that a man should pay in proportion to his prosperity. But I do think there are some phases of taxation which have been already embarrassing to investors in Canada, and one of these in particular is dual taxation. As the situation now is, a company is taxed 8 per cent on its dividends.

And it should pay; there is no question about that. But to tax that dividend again after it is distributed to the shareholders is dual taxation and dual taxation cannot be justified as a means of raising revenue.

There is another inequitable feature to which I would ask the minister's attention, and that is the failure to permit, in the preparation of one's income tax return, of deductions for local improvement taxes. In preparing one's return one is permitted to deduct the tax on land and on the buildings from which revenue is derived. But he is not permitted to deduct the special tax for the construction of sidewalk or sewer or street paving in front of his property. That to me is manifestly unfair, for this reason. In municipality A, let us say, all such local improvements are paid for out of the general fund, whereas in municipality B they are assessed against the abutting property. The public at large uses all these improvements and has the benefit of them, and it seems only just and reasonable that the owner of the abutting property should be permitted, in preparing his return, to deduct such taxes as well as the general tax against his property.

The other day we had a resolution from the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Kellner) concerning federal aid to highways, and I know of no federal appropriation which returns to the federal exchequer more money than does aid to good highways. There is no question in the world about the meaning of the resolution which the hon. member introduced. He intended that resolution to be practically a renewal of the grant on the same lines as provided in the act of 1919 whereby $20,000,000 was appropriated and apportioned amongst the various provinces, 40 per cent being contributed by the Dominion towards the construction of highways, the other 60 per cent being furnished by the provinces. Such a contribution from the federal government is justified, I contend, because the tourist and the motor car are the main factors in encouraging good roads. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), in his publication of March, 1928, makes the plain statement that it is estimated approximately that through the motor car tourist traffic distributed throughout Canada during the year 1927 the huge sum of $260,000,000. That was from tourist traffic alone. In addition there was collected during the past year, in excise and customs, on freight and passenger cars, the sum of $25,000,000. And as there are—I think this will be admitted—approximately 1,000,000 cars in Canada, each one of which pays not one cent less than $30 in sales tax, you have $30,000,000 from that source. The various provinces, too, collect annually by way of fines, registration and gasoline tax another $25,000,000, according to the report of the highways commissioner. One can readily see therefore that there is probably no disbursement from the federal treasury which would bring back such generous returns to the business interests of Canada as would a vote in aid of highway construction. It is difficult to understand how any member opposite can go back to his constituents and justify his vote against federal aid to the construction of highways, because every province is keen to have more roads built into the hinterland, and this aid from the federal governmnt permits of the construction of more central roads. One hon. minister felt he would be so embarrassed if his vote were recorded that he sidestepped the vote entirely.

As to policy, the budget states that it is the policy of this government to encourage production at home and the export of excess products. That may be all very well in theory; it sounds well, but actual evidence shows that the real policy of this government is to discourage production at home by encouraging the importation of surplus farm products from the United States.

The Canadian producer only asks that he be given an opportunity to sell his products in the Canadian market. It must be remembered that such conditions existed years ago, and that in 1921 the Conservative party enacted statutory provisions restricting the importation of surplus farm products. These restrictions were discontinued in 1922, and an amendment was adopted making it discretionary with the minister to apply the restrictions if he saw fit. Unfortunately he never saw fit to do so; from 1922 to 1925 the Liberals applied these restrictions only in the year 1923, when several large fruit importing concerns were penalized. However, their penalties were handed back to them, according to page 109 of the Duncan report.

Then we come to 1926, when the Conservatives came into power for a short time. While we were in office only a few months we worked fast on behalf of the farmers. We went into office on June 29 and it took the acting Minister of Customs (Mr. Stevens) only two weeks to pass an order restricting the importation of these surplus farm products. That was a good order; apparently this government admitted that to be the fact, because they passed a similar order in council in November of the same year. However, while the government considered this measure an excellent deterrent to the importation of farm products there happened to be a political alliance between Progressives and Liberals. We

have heard a good deal about this hybrid grain ticket, but I would call this a hybrid political matrimonial alliance, by which those hon. members agreed to obey the Prime Minister so long as he met their wishes. It was not long until they demanded that these restrictions be removed; the Prime Minister hesitated to do so because several of his own ministers did not deem it expedient to adopt that course. However, this little group put the gun to the head of the Prime Minister and he had to remove the restrictions, which was done in March of 1928. Since that time many protests have been addressed to the government; we had protests against the importation of surplus strawberries and surplus crops of all kinds from many sources. The Conservative members moved a resolution asking that these restrictions be restored, but that resolution was defeated, Liberal members opposite were quite willing to sacrifice the farmers of this country.

We also had a rather amusing political situation in British Columbia in connection with the removal of these restrictions. According to a press despatch under date of May 16, I find that Hon. E. D. Barrow, the then Liberal Minister of Agriculture for British Columbia, expressed confidence that Canadian farmers would be adequately protected against attempts to dump imported produce upon their markets. Then a little later a telegram was sent by the then Premier of British Columbia requesting the government to restore the dumping regulations which had been removed by the order in council to which I have referred, and he asked Hon. T. D. Pattullo, then provincial Minister of Lands, to take up the matter. This will indicate the feeling of the people of British Columbia, not only of the farmers but of the Liberal party as well; we have both the Liberal Premier and the Liberal Minister of Agriculture of the province requesting that this situation be rectified, but nothing was done.

Then I would refer to the Minister of Health (Mr. King), and I do so because he is the minister from British Columbia. In defending section 47a he said that it was for protection against unfair and unreasonable competition and that the amendment was only intended to overcome conditions which arose at certain times when there was an unfair competition under which the grower of natural products could not exist. During the last session of this parliament I submitted several protests to the government which indicated conditions under which the farmer and fruit grower of British Columbia could not exist, but no attention was paid to those protests notwithstanding the fact that the Prime Minister said such conditions could be remedied at a moment's notice.

These two statements to which I have referred, coming from the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture of British Columbia, were made during April and May; there was a provincial election in the offing in July. The Premier and the Minister of Agriculture then became enthusiastic about having these restrictions restored and the matter almost became a campaign issue until some of their friends reminded them that from 1922 to 1928 the Conservative members of the British Columbia legislature had consistently and persistently urged a resolution asking this government to enforce these restrictions against the dumping of U.S. surplus farm products. That was rather embarrassing of course, because the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture and every Liberal member of the legislature had voted against that resolution. So they withdrew the dumping clause as an issue and took up other issues. You all know the result of that election.

The Minister of Health is the sole representative of our province in the cabinet, and he knows the adverse conditions under which the farmers, the fruit growers, and the poultrymen of that province are suffering. He took the trouble to go into the Okanagan district to ascertain just what those conditions were, but I submit that he, having been a member of the provincial legislature for many years and having been a minister in this government since 1921, should have known just what those conditions were when he voted against the restoration of these restrictions. I ask the Minister of Health to use his influence in urging the government to bring those restrictions into effect, which they say it is possible to do at a moment's notice, and thus give some relief to the farmers, the fruit growers and the poultrymen of West Kootenay and Canada.

Mr. A. GOULET (Russell) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, it is the first time that I rise to address the house since 1925, when the people of the riding of Russell did me the honour of electing me to represent them in parliament. I trust therefore that my hon. friends will be indulgent towards me.

With pleasure I join the hon. speakers who have preceded me in this debate in order to extend to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb), my hearty congratulations—no less sincere for being somewhat late—for the clear and precise statement which he made on the financial situation of this country. The budget which he has just brought down in the house is, I think, his eighth since he holds the strings

of the national purse. All have been received with evident and well justified satisfaction; the last introduced on March 1st is an additional proof of the efficient Liberal administration under the sound leadership of the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King.

Under the Conservative regime, the Canadian people awaited with uneasiness the end of each fiscal year. They foresaw that the statement of accounts would but confirm their doubts on the good faith of their government, that the announcement of the increase of the debt and thereby the decrease of its credit, would possibly be followed up by a peremptory demand—under the form of additional taxation—to cover the accumulated deficits. The present Minister of Finance has changed this state of affairs. Uneasiness has made way for confidence. The Canadian people calmly await each year the financial statement, knowing that their affairs are administered soundly and economically.

The financial statement for the year 1928-29 is most satisfactory, and the general prosperity which it discloses highly justifies the trust of the people in the Liberal government. It shows not only that our national revenues have been sufficient to meet our obligations, including the payment of $125,000,000 in interests on the public debt, inherited mostly from our hon. friends on your left, Sir, but also that the debt itself has been reduced by $70,000,000. A surplus of $70,000,000 from receipts of $455,000,000 is by itself a remarkable feat, and I am sure that the whole nation—with the exception possibly of hon. members on the left—will be thankful to the present administration. But we have greater expectations. This sum of $70,000,000 applicable to the reduction of our national debt foreshadows the redeeming of this debt in the near future.

I have before me an article published recently in Willsons Monthly, a serious publication discussing public affairs in Canada and the British Empire, and I shall quote the following extract:

> In his budget speech of March 1, 1929, Mr. Robb stated the present amount of the debt to be $2,330,835,086. For the past four years the average annual reduction of the debt has amounted to roughly $47,750,000. While for the past year alone it will amount to nearly $70,000,000. If we add together the amounts paid as interest on the debt and the amounts applied in reduction of the debt we find that for the past four years there has been applied to the debt an average amount of over $171,000,000. Taking the last year by itself, the total is over $190,000,000.
>
> If we continue to wipe out the debt at these rates, how long will it take to retire it completely? It may come as a surprise to many to learn that if the rate of reduction for the past four years is maintained, there will be no national debt in 24 years. If we keep up the pace we went last year the debt will be wiped out in less than 20 years.

In twenty years our national debt will be extinct if our Minister of Finance continues to present us with budgets like the one which now occupies the attention of the house.

The hon. members on your left, sir, although admitting that the country is prosperous, deny that the present state of our finances is due to the good administration of the country. They make use of all possible arguments in endeavouring to ascribe this prosperity to an entirely different cause. Their acknowledgment that after eight years of Liberal administration the country is prosperous is something in itself if we recall the alarm they raised during the electoral campaign of 1925, when they were seeking power by attempting to have the people believe that ruin awaited them if the Liberals continued to administer the affairs of this country. Forced to submit to evidence, they seem today more anxious for the future of their party than that of the country. They are aware that it is the Conservative party which the Liberal government is ruining by fostering national prosperity.

The hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. J. A. Mercier) quoted the other day certain statements given out by the leaders of our large institutions on the financial situation of Canada. The hon. member, I trust, will allow me to read again one of these statements, the one by the President of the Bank of Montreal, which is a further proof that the prosperity of the country is general and reaches almost every industry. Sir Charles Gordon says:

> Canada as a whole has enjoyed more prosperity than ever before; our live stock industry has shown marked improvement. Cattle have been in better demand at better prices than for some years past. Between 1926 and 1927 there was an increase of about 25 per cent in the output of our dairy factories, and progress has continued in 1928. One of the happiest developments has been the definite revival of prosperity in the maritime provinces, coming into line with the rest of Canada in this respect. Canada is great in agriculture, but the glory of her heritage lies in the variety of her resources. Minerals are steadily growing in importance. The tourist trade is of the highest importance; according to government statistics tourists from abroad spent $275,000,000 in Canada in 1927. Reports from all provinces report an even larger number of tourists, and the amount spent has no doubt also been greater in 1928.

The general prosperity of the country spreads to our railways. It is true that here our hon. friends disavow Providence and consider the

financial situation of the Canadian National as their work. They congratulate themselves on the purchase of this railway. They now pretend to ignore what, in 1919, they were at great pains trying to convey, that state ownership of the Canadian Northern was not of their choice but that they were forced to introduce this measure to protect the shareholders. They forget to mention that it is thanks to the sound and honest administration of the Liberal government if the Canadian National is to-day in a flourishing state. The Liberal government neglected nothing to make a success of this enterprise of which it assumed the management when it was bankrupt. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) and the President of the Canadian National (Sir Henry Thornton) are therefore entitled to our congratulations.

I am pleased, sir, to note that the budget includes a reduction in the sales tax and I express the hope that this tax will gradually disappear. It is no longer required and its disappearance will not be regretted. The income tax is certainly far more equitable, since it reaches especially those who can most afford to pay.

I have closely followed the debate on the budget and I am sorry to note that members have devoted too little time, in my opinion, to the study of problems connected with agriculture. Other industries have had their full share of the discussion; but agriculture notwithstanding its importance, was but touched upon. We should bear in mind that probably half of our population is either directly or indirectly interested in agriculture, and that the problems which concern and interest such a large number of our people is entitled to a more serious study. I would even venture to say that a wiser and more appropriate expenditure could not be made than the one which would foster prosperity and happiness among our farming classes.

I take this opportunity to congratulate and thank the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), for what he has already done for the welfare of the farmers. His task is difficult, but I am confident that he will bring to a happy issue what he has already so well begun. I wish to thank the minister, his deputy and also assistant deputy, for the special interest they have all taken in the beautiful county of Russell by endowing it with a demonstration farm for the preserving of home products, the first of its kind in Canada. This farm has given a great impetus to this industry in my county and its establishment has already been amply justified; it is only reasonable to hope that before long this industry will be flourishing not only in my riding but in all rural districts in Canada. You will no doubt be astonished to learn that the products of our demonstration farm are to be found already on the tables of our best hotels. May I ask hon. members, when they dine at the Chateau Laurier not to forget to ask for Indian corn preserved at Bourget. I guarantee them a real treat which will convince them at the same time of the excellent quality of this product.

Let me refer to another question. The hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Kellner) mentioned the case of a young Canadian who, having begged for a meal on the streets of Edmonton, was arrested and brought before the magistrate Having heard that he came from eastern Canada, he was given twenty-four hours to leave the city with the option of one month in gaol. On the same day, a number of immigrants, arrested for the same offence, were sent to the railway company which undertook to feed them. I had no intention to discuss the immigration question: it is an intricate subject which requires much study and especially interests the western provinces. I admit, however, after hearing of this incident, that it is my duty to make a few comments on the subject. The immigration problem is very much to the fore at present; the press is continuously discussing it, the public is daily taking a greater interest in it and the government are seriously endeavouring to solve the problem in a satisfactory manner. Much money is spent each year in an endeavour to attract to our western lands European citizens and, according to an agreement concluded for some time past, youths from 14 to 17 years old hailing from Great Britain and the north of Ireland, who wish to settle in this country are brought over at the expense of the Imperial and Canadian governments. Adults, themselves, who come over with the intention of settling on the land have almost their entire travelling expenses paid. I do not intend to criticize the government's policy, being of the opinion that this expenditure is justified; however, it seems to me that the first step to take in order to solve this problem of immigration and colonization would be to use every possible means at our disposal to keep in this county our people and thus stem the exodus of Canadians to the neighbouring republic. A practical way to attain this end would be to offer to the sons of our farmers the same material advantages that we beg immigrants from the British Isles to accept. I am convinced that the evil from which we suffer would not long resist this efficient remedy.

Most of the young men who emigrate are sons of farmers born and brought up on the farm, and they need no further training. They are already acclimatized and are the proper people to settle our fertile free lands in the west. Our old Canadian parishes which should be the natural recruiting grounds for our settlers, are unfortunately but the recruiting grounds of artisans for the industries of large American cities. There comes, in the life of most of the young people of our countryside, a time when they must leave their native village to go wherever they expect to make a livelihood. They have heard of the fertile soil of the Canadian west, where labour is generously rewarded, and many of them are anxious to settle there; unfortunately their financial means are not sufficient to realize the dreams of their ambitions, they are therefore forced to take the roads leading to the large American cities which seem to offer them an easy means of living. This emigration of our young people is a serious problem which gives food for reflection to all Canadians who have at heart the welfare of their country, and I have no doubt the government will give their kind and special consideration to this problem and that before long our young farmers will choose the road that leads to the beautiful western provinces in preference to that of large cities.

After taking every possible means to stem this emigration of our people we shall endeavour to bring back to this country those whom we have had the misfortune to lose; that will be repatriation. If we place at the disposal of Canadians abroad attractive financial advantages, we shall obtain very happy results and the return to the native land of these prodigal sons will be of great benefit to us.

I do not intend, sir, to praise up the riding of Russell; my feeble voice would not suffice to describe the beauties of this corner of Canada where I have lived for over 30 years, or to enumerate the real and stirling virtues of its people. It is an essentially Canadian population and they have at heart the expansion and progress of Canada first and all. The interests of my constituents are intimately linked with those of the citizens of the Capital. This means that what affects the government service affects them personally since a large number among them are members of the Civil Service, and I must frankly admit that many others would also wish to be included in this service. Unfortunately, they often find obstacles to their ambition, and these are legitimate for the most part. There is one obstacle, however, upon which I want to draw the attention of the house because it seems not to have been foreseen by the authors of the Civil Service Act, and to-day it creates a situation prejudicial to the interests of Canadians. The preference in appointments granted by the Civil Service Act to the veterans of the Great war has my hearty support in so far as it applies to our Canadians or veterans of the allied nations who resided in Canada when they joined the army. But this preference goes much further and in order to explain its effects, I cannot do better than to cite the following incident. The Civil Service Commission some time ago advertised an examination for a position then vacant. Two candidates applied for the post, one of them belonged to my constituency. The latter, had all the qualifications required but had only done military service in Canada. He had voluntarily offered his services in the first months of the war, however, for reasons of health, the military authorities would not send him overseas and employed him in Canada during the whole course of the war. According to the act, his services gave him no right to any preference. The other candidate had come from England three years previous and had, if my information is correct, been conscripted in 1918; his military service was limited to a few months passed in training camps in England immediately previous to the armistice. According to the act, England is considered as a seat of war, giving right to military preference; this gentleman was therefore given the position to the detriment of the Canadian whose qualifications were much superior to his. This case is probably not the only one. Other members no doubt could cite similar cases; it therefore seems to me that the time is ripe to remedy such a state of things. Canadians have a right to expect that they be placed at least on an equal footing with strangers. Our Canadian veterans find themselves displaced by people recently come to this country. Canada belongs to the Canadian, the latter is intelligent and industrious and must receive first consideration, especially when it is a matter of a position in the service of his country.

I am greatly interested in the Civil Service and I should have liked to discuss at length all questions connected with it. As I do not want to prolong this debate, I shall content myself with adding to what I have already said that I am entirely in favour of a reasonable minimum salary for all the employees of the Civil Service, in order that the most humble among them can live in a decent manner and provide for the needs of his family. This generous act of the government

would be not only to the benefit of the employee himself, but in the interests of the country at large.

I have, sir, spoken longer than I intended to. It was not in vain that at the outset of my speech I begged the indulgence of hon. members; they have granted me a very kind hearing and very sincerely do I thank them.

On motion of Mr. Casgrain the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, April 9, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Seventh report of select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.—Mr. Cahill.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to move:

That the name of Mr. Gray be substituted for that of Mr. Rutherford on the select standing committee on public accounts, and the name of Mr. Gardiner be substituted for that of Mr. Hocken on the select standing committee on agriculture and colonization.

Motion agreed to.

SUBSIDY TO NOVA SCOTIA

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): An order of the house was issued yesterday for the tabling of all correspondence between Mr. Rhodes, the Premier of Nova Scotia, and myself concerning the payment of the annual federal subsidy and the special grant recommended by the Duncan commission, and I desire to lay this correspondence upon the table of the house.

CIVIL SERVICE

SALARIES OF PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL OFFICIALS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) if he is prepared to announce the membership of the special commission which is to inquire into and report on the salaries of the technical employees in the service, and also if his attention has been drawn to a statement in the Ottawa Citizen of this morning indicating that the report of the Civil Service Commission which was made last year regarding this subject was an unanimous report, and not a partial report as has been intimated by some press despatches.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): I had not the time to read the papers this morning, but I find no fault with that report; my recollection of it is that it was unanimous. I am not in a position at the present time to announce the personnel of the proposed commission.

PRIVILEGE—MR. KENNEDY

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege in connection with an editorial in the Montreal Gazette of Saturday, April 6, entitled Regarding Misrepresentation. I will only read a few lines from the editorial which I think will be sufficient to indicate the point I intend to deal with. They are as follows:

Nor is the Peace River member any more fortunate in his denial of the statement that, from one of the divisions of the session of 1926, the government emerged with a majority of one, including his vote. "There never was such a division in that session," he says.

After omitting a few lines, the editorial continues:

Mr. Kennedy attempts to set up a case by referring to the votes cast by him in the "hectic divisions" immediately preceding the dissolution, but those were not the only divisions of the session, nor were they the only "hectic" ones. The government was on the edge of disaster from the very opening day of the session, and while nearly every division was critical, some were much more so than others. There was, for example, the vote on February 2, on Mr. Stansell's motion to adjourn the debate on the customs inquiry, a vital issue then, as later. Perhaps Mr. Kennedy will say that this was not a hectic vote; it is a matter which we will have to take up with the government which, at the time, regarded the Stansell motion as of such importance as to force a division. A vote was taken, and the Stansell motion was defeated by 119 to 118, and if Mr. Kennedy will look at the Hansard of that year and month and day he will find among the 119 nays the name "Kennedy (Peace River)."

The vote referred to took place on February 2, 1926, and my statement that there had not been such a division came immediately after quoting an article in the Montreal Gazette of March 5, 1928, which read as follows:

But he—

Referring to myself.

—occupied the seat, and when a petition was presented in behalf of the Conservative candidate, Mr. Collins, the government resisted its acceptance and it was not accepted. Mr. Kennedy stayed, justifying his action on the

ground that he had, somewhere or other, lost more votes than had been taken from Mr. Collins. The importance of this episode was revealed in one of the hectic divisions of the session when the government was saved by one vote, including Mr. Kennedy's.

My interpretation of that reference to the resistance by the government, and of the comment that the importance of the episode was revealed in one of the hectic divisions, is that it can refer only to a division taken after the resistance of that petition. I cannot by any stretch of the imagination think that its writer could refer to anything else, and I so understood it in my statement the other day. With that in mind, and having that in mind at the time, I may say that the vote referred to is that of February 2, 1926. The Collins petition was dealt with or resisted in the House of Commons, according as we like to take the words of the Gazette, on May 4, 1926, three months and two days afterwards. Throughout that session there was not another division that the government lost by one vote or gained by one vote, except one on the 31st May, 1926. I find that I did not vote on that date. If I remember correctly, Liberals and Conservatives in the customs committee paired with each other and I did not vote at all. The only vote during the session after that date was that of June 25, 1926, on the Woodsworth subamendment to the customs committee report where the vote stood 115 to 117, and where I voted against the government. These are the facts in regard to my position and the statement I made the other day that—

Mr. POULIOT: I rise to a point of order. There is nothing in the statement made by the hon. gentleman that is in accordance with the rules of the house. It does not interest us to know what happened three or four years ago. My point of order is that my hon. friend, if he so desires, can read the whole Hansard for that date, but there is no privilege in that and it is against the rules of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Bourinot, fourth edition, says:

> Members sometimes correct reports of their speeches, or inaccurate statements in the press on the ground of privilege; but these are personal explanations, not matters of privilege, and are allowed only by the indulgence of the house. Sometimes a member raises as a question of privilege what is, at most, merely a question of order. If a member has a serious complaint to make of a newspaper, he should formally move to have it read at the table, and then make a motion in relation thereto, if he desires to have the matter dealt with by the house. If a member rise to make a personal explanation in the English Commons and proceed in the course of his remarks to complain of attacks in a newspaper, he is not allowed to proceed unless he is prepared to take the proper parliamentary course. And if a member brings forward a matter of privilege of this character, the motion with which he concludes should be relevant thereto.

This is the old British practice, but in this house generally when a member feels that he is the victim of an inaccurate statement made by the press, he may rise on the ground of privilege and by the indulgence of the house give a brief explanation of the matter.

Mr. KENNEDY: I have just this to say: that I had no knowledge of any Collins petition pending or otherwise, until it was presented to the house.

Mr. POULIOT: So the hon. member did not read the papers.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member was in order.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

INCREASED REMUNERATION FOR RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS AND OTHER EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. A. HEAPS (North Winnipeg): Arising out of the question addressed to the Minister of Finance a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), I should like to ask this question: It appears that the minister is not willing to accept the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission in regard to the salaries paid to certain people employed by the government. There is also a similar desire on the part of the government not to accept the viewpoint of the commission in regard to the salaries of the postal workers. If we accept the statement of the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot), he is at variance with the Civil Service Commission with regard to postal workers' salaries. Will the government appoint a committee to inquire into the question of salaries of postal employees as they have done in the case of the more highly paid technical officials of the government?

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

Mr. HEAPS: Might I have an answer to my question?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the Minister of Finance gave an answer a moment ago.

Mr. HEAPS: This is another question dealing with postal employees. The matter referred to by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre dealt with the technical civil servants.

Mr. SPEAKER: It will serve as a notice.

Mr. ROBB: I shall note the question of my hon. friend.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PROPOSAL TO REDUCE CAPITALIZATION OF SYSTEM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Does the government propose to bring in any measures to give effect to the recommendation of Sir Henry Thornton with regard to reducing the capitalization of the Canadian National Railways?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): A few days ago I made a statement to the house as to the further legislation of the session and the particular matter to which my hon. friend has just referred was not mentioned in the list. It is not the intention at this session to introduce further legislation with respect to the Canadian National Railways.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The house resumed from Monday, April 8, consideration of the motion of Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of ways and means, the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. Hugh Guthrie, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of Mr. Spencer.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it was on the first of March that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) brought into the house the budget which we have now before us. It is just a month and two days since the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), in his dual capacity at the time of acting leader and financial critic of the opposition, undertook to reply at some length and to deliver a speech on behalf of the opposition in reference to the several matters in the budget and referred to in the speech of the Minister of Finance. From that time to the present, with the exception of the recess which we had at Easter and two days when another matter was precipitated into the discussion here, the house has continuously debated the budget, and it might appear that at this late stage of the debate little is left which has not already been said. May I say at once that my purpose in participating at this time is not so much in the expectation of contributing any new arguments, but rather for the sake of emphasizing the truth

[Mr. Robb.]

of some of the representations which have been made on this side of the house, more particularly in reference to the speech by the hon. member for South Wellington.

It was perhaps natural that the speech of the hon. member for South Wellington should attract considerable attention at the time it was delivered, and also occasion much discussion in the course of the debate. My hon. friend took full advantage of his opportunity as acting leader of the opposition to speak at length, and to cover, in so far as they relate to the finances of the country, the many subjects which were likely to be of interest in political discussion during the next year or two. My hon. friend has already been congratulated upon his speech on that occasion. He is an old parliamentarian; with the exception of yourself, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), he is perhaps the oldest member in the house, certainly the oldest member sitting on the opposite side. He has had great experience as a parliamentarian, and also in his chosen profession, and he turned both to the best of advantage in the presentation of the statement which he made to parliament at that time. I should like to congratulate him on the manner of the presentation of his remarks on that occasion; I wish I could do likewise with respect to the substance of them. He congratulated the Minister of Finance on the lucidity of his speech, on its precision, on its conciseness, but I must say to my hon. friend that what his own address gained in lucidity it seemed to me to lack in accuracy. What it had of precision was in large part, to my mind, mere pretence, and if he was concise in many of his statements, he was, I regret to say, not wholly candid. That is the criticism which I have to bring against my hon. friend's remarks, a criticism which I shall endeavour to substantiate in what I have to say this afternoon.

There was, however, one remark made by my hon. friend to which I think no exception will be taken, certainly no exception on this side of the house, a remark which will be remembered long after much of the rest of his presentation will have been completely forgotten. He referred to the present as a time of prosperity, and he did not stop at the word prosperity, but he said, a time of unbounded prosperity. While my hon. friend has stated what I think the country as a whole recognizes to be the fact, he endeavoured strenuously to discover ways in which credit for this prosperity might be given in some quarter other than that of the

present administration. He spoke naturally of Providence and of the energy and ingenuity of the people of our country. Of this the Minister of Finance himself had I think already made full acknowledgment. He went on to say that it would be interesting for those on his side to speculate how much more prosperous the country would have been, and how much more general the prosperity, had another government been seated on this side. May I say to my hon. friend that if he is free to speculate in that way, we are similarly free to speculate and I think we may fairly say that if hon. gentlemen opposite had been in office, there is no doubt that the prosperity of the country would not have been what it is at the present time.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that this prosperity, far from being, as my hon. friend sought to infer, restricted and not distributed as between the different classes of the country, has been very general and has been shared in some measure by all classes throughout the country. It is a prosperity discoverable, first of all, with respect to the great basic industries of the country, on which the rest of our industrial development so largely depends. It is a prosperity which has been apparent in the manufacturing industries of the country, a prosperity which has been great with respect to the trade of the country, a prosperity which has manifested itself in increase of employment and in diminution of unemployment, a prosperity that has shown itself in the activities of business and of banks and financial institutions, a prosperity which has also been disclosed in the savings of the people, and in their investments with respect to many matters which have to do with their standard of living.

It might be well, Mr. Speaker, in confirmation of what I have just said to give a few facts with respect to the present prosperity which will serve to indicate how general and how considerable that prosperity is. Before so doing, however, may I draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that the prosperity of the present year succeeds the prosperity of the year previous, which was noteworthy in the same particular; that, as a matter of fact, from the moment at which the government had found it possible to balance the public accounts there has been continual improvement in the public finances of the country, with which has come continuous prosperity until within the past year we have had a period of prosperity unmistakable in the history of Canada.

To begin with the basic industries, may I mention these facts with respect to agriculture, Canada's greatest basic industry?

The acreage under crop this past year, 1928, was 59,410,000 or 3,238,000 more than in 1927. The new land brought under crop this year represents an area half as large as the crop acreage of Manitoba—this on the top of continuous increases for many years past.

The wheat yield totalled over 533,000,000 bushels, or 53,000,000 greater than the previous high yield, or 145,000,000 greater than the average of the five years 1922-1926.

Exports of wheat reached the highest point ever recorded in a single month in November, 1928, namely, 75,416,000 bushels. The exports of 1928 were the highest ever recorded in a calendar year, namely, 365,428,561 bushels, valued at $433,767,578.

The previous largest twelve months was the year ending September, 1924, when the totals were only 294,000,000 bushels, valued at $302,000,000.

In mining we had the most active year in the history of Canada. The total value of production was $273,000,000, an increase of $24,000,000 over the total for 1927, the previous high year.

The chief activity was in copper, lead, zinc and nickel, but coal and gypsum made new high records, as did structural materials in general. Gold production was up, and cadmium, produced at Trail during 1928, was a newcomer among Canada's mineral products

Employment was about 7 per cent more active than 1927.

In forest products, newsprint production reached 2,382,011 tons in 1928, the highest on record, the previous peak being 2,086,949 in 1927. Seven years ago, in 1921, the production was 805,000 tons.

Conditions in the fishing industry in 1928 were notably better than in 1927. With the possible exception of 1926, last year was the most successful experienced by Canadian fishermen since the Fordney tariff was made effective by the United States in 1922. The production had a marketed value of more than $54,000,000, or $11,500,000, in round figures, above the marketed value of the catch of 1923. The total catch of all fish was approximately 1,300,000,000 pounds.

One of the most significant features of 1928 was the fact that power installation work valued at over $300,000,000 was under way. When it is remembered that every dollar spent on primary power presupposes an expenditure of $5 or $6 on subsidiary industrial plant, it is apparent that we are in the midst of a process of adding something like $2,000,000,000 to the capital industrial plant of the Dominion.

With respect to manufactures, it is conservative to say that the gross value of manufactures in 1928 will exceed $3,500,000,000.

Employment was 7 per cent more active than in 1927, the significant indexes being:

Manufacturing	1926	1927	1928
November 1..	102.7	104.9	115.1
December 1..	101.5	104.3	113.4

The basic industries of iron and steel were operated on very high levels.

Pig iron production was 1,037,535 long tons, or 46 per cent more than in 1927.

Steel ingots and castings increased from a production of 907,638 tons in 1927 to 1,240,214 in 1928, or 37 per cent.

These are the highest figures since the record year of 1918.

Automobile production was 242,382 cars and trucks, an increase of 35 per cent over 1927.

Boots and shoes have shown increased production—probably 3 per cent.

All previous records for construction of new work have been exceeded. Contracts have been awarded totalling, according to MacLean's Building Reports, $472,000,000 in 1928, compared with $420,000,000 in 1927, the previous peak, a gain of 12.7 per cent.

Perhaps the best single figure to sum up productive activity is the index of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics on the general volume of production. It stood at 168.7 for 1928, compared with 146.0 per cent in 1927—an increase of 15.5 per cent.

Coming next to trade, the figures show that with respect to foreign trade the exports of Canadian products for 1928 totalled $1,349,751,000, an increase of $131,414,000, or 10.7 per cent, over the preceding year, chiefly in wheat, newsprint, oats, nickel and automobiles.

Our imports for 1928 were $1,222,318,000, an increase of $135,200,000, or 12.4 per cent over the preceding year.

When allowance is made for exports of foreign products there was a favourable trade balance of $151,812,000, a slight increase over 1927. This is probably the highest favourable trade balance per capita in the world. This favourable trade balance was achieved in spite of falling prices of wheat and newsprint, Canada's two leading exports; it is accordingly indicative of "real" trading volume. The physical volume of Canada's trade in 1928 was undoubtedly the largest on record. Our total trade at 1918-20 prices would have run to at least 3½ billions of dollars.

With respect to domestic trade, the indexes of employment in wholesale and retail establishments showed a gain of 8.1 per cent over 1927, as follows:

Trade—	1926	1927	1928
October 1..	101.0	109.4	120.1
November 1..	103.9	111.9	121.3
December 1..	108.9	121.2	127.4
Average for year..	99.2	107.4	116.1

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

The huge proportions which the tourist trade has now attained is worthy of special mention under the heading of domestic trade. In 1927 it amounted to $242,754,000, and the estimate for the year just passed is substantially higher.

Coming now to transportation, carloadings totalled 3,697,106 cars in 1928, compared with 3,396,797 cars in 1927, an increase of 9 per cent, notwithstanding the diversion to motor trucking in progress.

The gross earnings of the Canadian National lines and of the Canadian Pacific Railway for 1928 were approximately 507,400,000, as against 450,000,000 in 1927.

The Canadian National system (including lines in the United States) had gross revenues of approximately $276,600,000, and net revenues of $53,200,000—all new high records.

The St. Lawrence canal traffic was the heaviest on record—almost half a million tons higher than last year, the previous high record. The Welland also made a new record.

With regard to labour, the general index of all employment was 111.6 in 1928, as compared with 104.6 in 1927, or an increase of 6.7 per cent.

The year was comparatively free from serious industrial disturbances. The time loss through strikes during the past three years was lower than at any time since 1915.

Let me refer to public finances and private savings and investments. The total ordinary revenues of the Dominion including special receipts and credits on consolidated fund, have reached $439,413,000 in the calendar year 1928, an increase of $30,214,000 notwithstanding the substantial reductions in the tariff of the last budget. This has enabled $53,000,000 of the national debt to be paid off, representing a saving of $2,650,000 in annual interest charges.

In banking, the savings deposits of banks increased from $1,431,000,000 on November 30, 1927, to $1,523,500,000 on the same date of last year. Never before 1928 have saving deposits reached $1,500 millions.

Current loans, reflecting the strong demand for credit in connection with commercial and speculative transactions have shown an even greater increase than notice deposits. Such loans on November 30 last amounted to $1,238,000,000, an increase of $158,600,000 over the same date of 1927.

The sales of ordinary life insurance based on reports of fifteen companies having in force 84 per cent of the outstanding ordinary insurance in Canada, were $580,674,000 in 1928, compared with $502,000,000 in 1927, an increase of more than 15 per cent.

The year may be summed up as follows:—

Unprecedentedly heavy production, earnings and profits in agriculture and all the other basic industries and occupations of the people.

Based on this, a heavy investment of savings, not only in existing enterprises but in the launching of new enterprises on an unprecedented scale—a process which has attracted foreign as well as Canadian capital.

An especially gratifying feature as I have already said, is that the prevailing prosperity is well distributed over the various provinces; it is as general for the different economic areas as it is for the different economic classes represented in the Dominion.

I have taken the trouble, Mr. Speaker, to make these facts a matter of record in Hansard, first of all, because they reflect a condition in the country of which, I think, we have all great reason to be proud, but also because they will serve, as I speak a little later on, to answer some of the points which my hon. friend made in the course of his remarks, with respect to the burden of taxation and the ability to pay. Strive as my hon. friend and his associates may not to credit the government with aught on account of this prosperity, they will have difficulty in having the country believe that the policies which we have put in force during the last seven years have not been in large part responsible for the progress which I have just mentioned.

The existing prosperity is due in no small measure to the fact that we have restored confidence in the public finances of the country. When we came into office, for years preceding there had been deficits upon deficits in the public accounts. Those deficits have been changed into surpluses under the present administration. When we came into office, what are to-day the Canadian National railways, a splendidly organized system, were an aggregation of bankrupt roads in the nature of liabilities to the country; to-day they are looked upon as one of the country's greatest assets. The hon. Minister of Finance in his endeavour to encourage production and to bring relief to the farming community of this country, in one of his outstanding budgets introduced early after coming into office, reduced the duties on the implements of production in all the basic industries, mining, lumbering, fishing and agriculture, with a view to making the cost of production less in these great basic industries. The prosperity which we have to-day is in part a reflection of the budgets of my hon. friend in that particular. Similarly, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Dunning) has brought in measures in connection with the railways of this country, providing for increased branch lines, which have had the effect of opening up new districts and so helping to bring about the prosperity of which we are now justly proud. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) as the house well knows, has been energetic in expanding the trade facilities of his department, increasing the representation of his commercial agents abroad, and, along with the Minister of Finance, has helped to further treaties that have been of great service in the expansion of our trade. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) has brought in many measures which have been of distinct advantage to the farming community and of advantage as well in the marketing abroad of the products of this country. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan), has made a record for the country and for himself in the promotion and maintenance of industrial peace.

I might say also, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the government's policies in other directions, that we have through pursuing a policy of goodwill towards all parts of the British Empire and towards other countries, done much to further friendly relations between this country and the countries most closely associated with us, and in so doing have helped to forward the general prosperity of Canada. The establishment of legations in the United States, France and Japan, are a part of that policy of international goodwill. Despite, therefore what my hon. friend has said, the country, I feel sure, will conclude that a prosperity which is unsurpassed in the history of Canada owes not a little to an administration in which fortunately the country itself has confidence at the present time.

May I come now more particularly to some of the financial matters mentioned by my hon. friend from South Wellington. He first of all undertook to deal with the debt of the country. He well knows, the house knows and the country knows that under the present administration the public debt of Canada has been very considerably reduced; indeed, it is one of the great achievements of the administration that the reduction in the public debt has been what it is. My hon. friend could not deny the reduction in the public debt, but he sought to lead the country to believe that the reduction had been very much less than it actually has been. My hon. friend said that the only debt we should take any account of is the funded debt. In Great Britain, he said, they do not take

account of anything else. There, according to him, they consider only the funded debt and he contended that here in Canada we too should take account only of that debt in estimating what the reduction has been. Now my hon. friend knows better than that. He knows that in Great Britain the Chancellor of the Exchequer is very much concerned about the floating as well as the funded debt. As a matter of fact the Chancellor of the Exchequer issues every week a statement as to the floating debt of England, and his first concern is to gather up outlying obligations of a temporary character.

My hon. friend took the public accounts and said that he would present only what appeared therein. He held up before the house a volume of the public accounts and spoke about the funded debt. At page 13 of the public accounts will be found a statement under schedule T with regard to the funded debt. To this my hon. friend referred, but he made no reference whatever to schedule S which immediately precedes it. Let me read that schedule:

Temporary Loans	
Loan of 1917-19, New York	
5 per cent, due Aug. 1, 1919..	$ 1,000
5 per cent debenture stock.. .	200,000
	$201,000

That is all there is outstanding at the present time of temporary loans or floating obligations. But, in making comparisons between 1922 and to-day, my hon. friend should have taken the public accounts ended March 31, 1922, and read what appears on the same page, 13, under schedule S with respect to temporary loans. What are the figures in that regard?

Temporary Loans		
Loan of 1917-19, New York		
5 per cent, due Aug. 1, 1919..	$15,000	
Treasury Bills, Canada		
6 per cent, due Oct. 1, 1922..	$24,605,000	
Treasury Bills, Canada		
6 per cent, due Oct. 15, 1922..	49,215,000	
Treasury Bills, Canada		
5¾ per cent, due Nov. 2, 1922..	35,000,000	
Treasury Bills, Canada		
5¾ per cent, due Nov. 15, 1922..	35,000,000	143,820,000
Debenture Stock		
5 per cent, payable on demand..		700,000
		$144,535,000

In other words, when we came into office there was a funded debt of a certain amount and there was, in addition, this unfunded debt of $144,535,000. My hon. friend says that, according to the figures, we have reduced the funded debt by $90,000,000; but he says nothing whatever about the unfunded debt of $144,000,000 by which we have also reduced the debt of the country. Instead therefore of a reduction in the interest-bearing debt of the country of $90,000,000 the reduction is $90,000,000 plus this $144,000,000 to which I have referred.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the Prime Minister permit a question?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend will allow me to make my speech, I shall be obliged. However, he may ask the question.

Mr. STEVENS: One question in fairness. Should not my right hon. friend take schedule B showing $162,000,000 as owing by the British government and other foreign governments in 1922?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. member for South Wellington took full account of what was owing by the British government. But as regards schedule B, let me point out that while the British government owed us something we owed them something as well for advances they had made to us. When speaking to the house and to the country my hon. friend was speaking of the interest-bearing debt; he was dealing with the funded debt. He said that in England they paid no attention to the floating debt and he urged that in Canada we too should leave it out of account, that we should consider nothing except the funded debt. Yet he was aware all the time of the existence of that schedule showing over $144,000,000, every cent of which, except for a few dollars, has been paid by this government. May I add further that the interest on that sum at the time we came into office was something like $7,000,000 per annum, so that in addition to paying off the principal we have been freeing the country of that amount of annual interest. These obligations were paying the highest rate of interest of any form of our indebtedness, the rates being 6 per cent, and 5¾ per cent. For this reason they were among the first obligations we sought to pay off, and we have paid them off, with the result I have indicated. In other words, I repeat, instead of the reduction to the interest-bearing public debt amounting, as my hon. friend put it, to some $90,000,000, it is, as I have shown, that sum plus $144,000,000; the annual rate of reduction of the interest-bearing debt

having been therefore between $33,000,000 and $34,000,000 since this administration came into office.

I come now to the next matter to which my hon. friend referred. He does not like to hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) allude year after year to surpluses, and after the many deficits there were during the time he was in office we are able to appreciate his feelings in that regard. In view of that record, to have the Minister of Finance record a surplus each year must be irritating to hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly where the surpluses are of their present proportions. To disguise the real situation what does my hon. friend do? He says: I am going to take the public accounts and I am going to show that after all there is not very much difference in the surpluses as between the two administrations. As a matter of fact, he says, the surpluses while we were in office—and the hon. gentleman chose his own period of years—were very much the same as the surpluses at the present time. And my hon. friend then directs the attention of the house to the consolidated fund, surplus and deficit. With a wave of the hand, he dismisses altogether the national debt as it is generally understood—the net debt of the country. That, he says, is of no account whatever. Pay no attention to that; take only the consolidated fund and look at the surpluses and deficits, and what do you find? You find, he says, very little difference between the surpluses this administration is claiming and the surpluses we had when we were in office.

Now my hon. friend knows that while it is true that most moneys are paid into the consolidated fund, it is not equally true that all expenditures are made from that fund. He knows that very well. He deliberately left out of account for the period of which he spoke, all expenditures made by the previous administration, which were not of the consolidated account—and they were some of the heaviest expenditures at the time. Perhaps I had better take the exact words of my hon. friend and read them to the house. At page 741-2 of Hansard my hon. friend is reported as follows:

> But let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the record of this government, starting with the year 1923 up to the present year inclusive, is scarcely one whit better than the record of its predecessor. The public accounts of this country disclose the fact, astonishing to some people, that the surpluses under the preceding government were but little below what they have been under the present government.

Then he says he will read the statement from the public accounts of Canada.

> I will start with the year 1917, when the Union government was formed, and give the surpluses which appear on page 45 of the public accounts:

Then he quotes from page 45 of the public accounts, giving the surpluses from the consolidated fund from 1917 to 1922, as follows:

1917	$84,101,950 77
1918	82,494,639 72
1919	80,215,464 20
1920	45,902,404 80
1921	73,268,391 39
1922	34,391,696 36

My hon. friend continued as follows:

> The aggregate of surpluses for the six years amounts to about $400,374,000, or an average surplus per year of $66,729,000. We will now give the record of the Liberal government, starting with the year 1923:

1923	$62,321,167 91
1924	72,024,492 47
1925	27,942,578 00
1926	60,085,026 44
1927	79,147,603 79
1928	86,550,021 70
1929	99,742,000 00

> The aggregate for these years amounts to about $487,812,000, or an average per year of $69,687,000, or just about $3,000,000 more per year of surplus under the Liberal government than was the case under the Conservative government which preceded it.

When my hon. friend was making that statement he had the public accounts before him, and he knows that the public accounts have been kept in the same way year after year since the days of confederation. If he had referred as he ought to have referred, to page 46, he would have found a statement of the total debt of the country. He would have found in the column next to it a statement of the total assets, which it is proper should be subtracted in arriving at the net debt of the country, and in the following column he would have found the net debt of Canada. Then in the last two columns appear the figures of the increase and decrease of debt, and I submit that in setting forth the net debt of this country he should have given those figures to the house, rather than the figures which he gave. These are the figures I intend to quote now in order to set forth the increase and decrease of the debt; these figures should be placed beside the columns quoted by my hon. friend in order that the two may be compared.

According to page 46 of the public accounts, the increase and decrease of debt is as follows:

	Increase	Decrease
1919	$382,646,969 94	
1920	674,337,591 35	
1921	92,010,359 90	
1922	81,256,818 04	
1923	31,641,067 01	
1924		$ 35,993,593 86
1925		345,589 29
1926		27,706,586 17
1927		41,896,729 33
1928		50,984,137 17
1929 (estimated)		69,782,000 00
		$226,708,635 82

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the proper figures to quote where comparisons are being made with respect to increases or decreases in the public debt. My hon. friend said that the only figures which should be taken into account in estimating the debt of the country are those which relate to the bonds issued by the government of the day, because those bonds have been solemnly sealed and delivered and carry with them an obligation for payment. May I say that what is true of the bonds of the funded debt is equally true with respect to the securities covering the funded debt, with respect to obligations in the nature of floating obligations, which my hon. friend should also have mentioned. In addition, there are all those amounts which have been paid on capital account. My hon. friend left them out entirely; he ignored the expenditures that have been made on that score.

May I now give the figures which accurately represent the national net debt and the per capita net debt based on the population as estimated from 1922 to 1929. Let us remember that it was my hon. friend who chose these particular years for purposes of comparison. These figures will serve to indicate how considerably the debt of the country has been reduced under the present administration as compared with the years immediately preceding. I shall give first a statement showing the net debt, and the net debt per capita as I have indicated, then a statement showing the total interest-bearing debt, the reductions in annual interest charges in average rate of interest and in per capita interest charges. They are as follows:

	Dominion net debt	Per capita net debt based on population as estimated
March 31, 1922..	$2,422,135,802	$271 89
1923..	2,453,776,869	271 79
1924..	2,417,783,275	264 21
1925..	2,417,437,686	260 82
1926..	2,389,731,099	254 51
1927..	2,347,834,370	246 64
1928..	2,296,850,233	237 82
1929.. estimated	2,227,068,233	227 25

	Total interest bearing debt	Annual interest charges thereon	Average rate of interest per cent	Per capita annual interest charges
March 31, 1922..	$2,669,967,110	$137,881,774	5.164	$15 48
1923..	2,653,869,212	136,007,667	5.125	15 06
1924..	2,614,147,586	133,198,052	5.092	14 56
1925..	2,617,706,451	130,686,851	4.992	14 10
1926..	2,603,615,729	130,086,627	4.996	13 85
1927..	2,565,651,263	128,674,340	5.015	13 52
1928..	2,514,066,568	125,200,730	4.980	12 96
1929.. .. .. estimated	2,478,000,000	123,300,000	4.976	12 58

May I say to my hon. friend that in making comparisons between the periods during which hon. gentlemen opposite were in office and the period during which the present administration has been in office we have no desire whatever to include in expenditures those outlays which were made during the period of the war, on war account. For the purposes of comparison we are quite prepared wholly to disregard every dollar that was spent by this country for the purposes of war and for demobilization during the two years following the war. Having written that off, however, we wish to make it clear to the house and to the country that even then, hon. gentlemen opposite did not raise sufficient amounts by way of taxation to balance the budget with regard to ordinary expenditures. In other words, it never must be forgotten that while hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, while they were financing that war period, they sought only to meet any of the current expenses of the country and did not try to levy taxation in order to meet the expenses of the war; they left all that to succeeding governments.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Every cent of it.

Mr. BENNETT: No. Sir Thomas White made that quite clear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am prepared to stand by that statement, and I have here the figures from the public accounts, beginning with the fiscal year 1914-15 and ending with the fiscal year 1919-20, under the headings total revenue receipts; total disbursements; deficit; and spent on war and demobilization account. First I will give the total revenue receipts, as follows:

1914-15	$ 133,073,482
1915-16	172,149,393
1916-17	232,701,294
1917-18	260,778,953
1918-19	312,946,747
1919-20	349,746,335
Total	$1,461,396,204

The total disbursements were as follows:

1914-15	$ 248,098,526
1915-16	339,702,502
1916-17	498,203,118
1917-18	576,660,210
1918-19	697,042,212
1919-20	786,030,611
Total	$3,145,737,179

Mr. GEARY: Should that figure of $786,000,000 not be $740,000,000?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The figure of $740,000,000 does not take into account $45,780,690 which was advanced to railways.

Mr. GEARY: I see what you mean.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is no mistake on that score. The deficits, by fiscal years, were as follows:

1914-15	$ 115,025,044
1915-16	167,553,109
1916-17	265,501,824
1917-18	315,881,257
1918-19	384,095,465
1919-20	436,284,276
Total	$1,684,340,975

The expenditures for war and demobilization were as follows:

1914-15	$ 60,750,476
1915-16	166,197,755
1916-17	306,488,815
1917-18	343,836,802
1918-19	446,519,439
1919-20	346,612,955
Total	$1,670,406,242

The total expenditure for war and demobilization amounted to $1,670,406,242 and the total deficit amounted to $1,684,340,975, leaving an amount of $13,934,733 which was borrowed for carrying on the business of Canada during that period, over and above the expenditure for war and demobilization. That is a true statement of the finances of that period.

In making a comparison between the two periods, it should be borne in mind that in speaking of revenues and taxation the hon. gentleman opposite did not take into account any payments for war expenses, while we are obliged to take into account, and do take into account, in addition to present expenditures due to the war and which constitute 47 per cent of the whole, the amounts by which we are reducing the public debt, which reduction is really in the nature of making payment on the cost of the war. In other words, it has been left to the administrations which succeeded hon. gentlemen opposite not only to meet payments subsequently arising out of the war, but to meet the whole cost of the war, and in addition to meet the interest payments on the sums which were paid out during the period of the war. The expenses which have grown out of the war, such as pensions and the like, I think it is true to state that 42 cents out of every dollar spent by the present administration is in one way or another an expenditure on account of the war.

My hon. friend mentioned a sinking fund and said that he thought the Minister of Finance should establish such a fund. One of his reasons for advocating a sinking fund was that the temptation to spend too much money might be removed from the Minister of Finance. If the minister were not presenting to the house the surpluses which he has, were he not reducing the public debt at the rate he is reducing it—$69,000,000 this year—there might be something in the argument for the immediate institution of a sinking fund to ensure that a given amount would be paid every year. If the hon. gentlemen opposite were in office I should say it would be eminently desirable to have a sinking fund. They did the financing of this country during their term of office by borrowing while we are meeting our obligations out of taxation. We are meeting our obligations and at the same time reducing in a very substantial way the public debt. At the same time, I agree with my hon. friend as to the value ordinarily of a sinking fund. I believe it is a desirable institution and I hope that one of these days a sinking fund will be made a part of our scheme of finance.

The next subject to which my hon friend referred was the rate of taxation and the burden of taxation. In the course of his remarks the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said:

> But who cares about the rate of taxation? The rate does not count. The only thing that counts in this world in regard to taxes is the burden of taxation—the load which the people have to carry. If my hon. friend would read the speeches of the late William Ewart Gladstone, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer in England, on this very point he would get some light. Gladstone pointed out very definitely that the rate of taxation means nothing; the burden of taxation means everything.

Who cares about the rate? Everyone cares, and no one more than my hon. friend himself. When he speaks about Mr. Gladstone's references to the rate and to the burden of taxation he overlooks the fact that Mr. Gladstone never spoke of the burden in contrast to the rate; he spoke of the burden in relation to the adjustment of burdens and in this regard he attached all importance to the rate. He said that the same rate meant an injustice so far as the different classes were concerned. He was continually emphasizing that fact, and especially so in his great speech on the income tax in 1850. At that time he stressed, above everything else, the injustice of an income tax which fixed one rate for all classes in the community, because all classes were not equally in a position to bear the burden.

My hon. friend knows that there is an all-important factor in considering the burden of taxation, and that is the ability to pay. That is an all-important consideration. A 10 per cent tax on a man who has an income of $1,000 would be a very considerable burden; it means $100 taken out of $1,000, $900 are left after the tax is paid. A 10 per cent tax on a man who has an income of $10,000 amounts to $1,000, and it is relatively not so hard a burden to bear, $9,000 are left after the tax is paid. When a man has to pay on an income of $100,000 it about reaches the point where he does not feel a 10 per cent tax as a burden at all. In the light of figures which I have already given to the house I think it must be fully apparent that the ability to pay has become increasingly greater so far as all classes of society in this country are concerned.

Mr. Gladstone's views with respect to the burden and the rate of taxation may be gauged from the following passage which appears on page 56, volume 2, of Morley's Life of Gladstone:

> It has often been said that he ignored the social question; did not even seem to know there was one. The truth is, that what marks him from other chancellors is exactly the dominating hold gained by the social question in all its depth and breadth upon his most susceptible imagination. Tariff reform, adjustment of burdens, invincible repugnance to waste or profusion, accurate keeping and continuous scrutiny of accounts, substitution of a few good taxes for many bad ones,—all these were not merely the love of a methodical and thrifty man for habits of business; they were directly associated in him with the amelioration of the hard lot of the toiling mass, and sprang from an ardent concern in improving human well-being, and raising the moral ideals of mankind.

Elsewhere, at page 471, volume 1, of his Life of Gladstone, referring to Gladstone's examination of the income tax, Morley says Gladstone spoke of "the sense in the public mind of its injustice in laying the same rate upon the holder of idle and secured public funds, upon the industrious trader, upon the precarious earnings of the professional man."

I would say to my hon. friend that the course pursued by Mr. Gladstone is exactly the line on which the present administration has been proceeding in the matter of its tax reforms; we have been seeking to ameliorate the lot of those who are less fortunate. We have followed this course with respect to our reductions in the tariff and in our treatment of the income tax, in the reduction of the sales tax, the rate of postage and other measures. We have attempted to follow precisely the line of policy which Mr. Gladstone, perhaps the greatest of all chancellors of the exchequer, laid down in his day as the best procedure. May I say to my hon. friend that the one real criticism I have to make of him is this: He seems to have forsaken too largely his old leaders and his old principles. He did not learn about Mr. Gladstone in the school in which he is at the present time, but long ago, and he would be much better employed to-day were he to follow his old convictions and apply the principles he knows to be the right ones in the way in which Mr. Gladstone, amongst others, would have sought to have had them applied.

I come to the next subject dealt with by my hon. friend. He treated next of the cost of government and undertook to say that the cost of government had been increased considerably since the present administration had taken office. He referred more particularly to the last four years. If my hon. friend looks over the figures for the last four years in connection with the increased cost of government as it is disclosed by the records, he will find that it comes to something like 10 per cent during this period of great prosperity. I will not trouble quoting the remarks of my hon. friend, but I make that general statement which, I think, he will admit is correct. The figures are as follows:

Year	Total cost of government
1924	$350,000,000
1929	385,000,000

Or an increase of about 10 per cent in that period. My hon. friend says that the business of the country has not increased in that ratio and that, the business of the country not having increased in that ratio, that the government has been extravagant in the extent to which it has been increasing the cost of government. I do not know what standard my hon. friend had before him in estimating the business of the country, but I have been trying to get together a few indices of the

business of the country—it is not an easy thing to gauge, but one can gauge it in a general way—to see whether the business of the country has not increased much more rapidly than any cost of government has increased, also to show whether the burden of taxation is not more easily borne than it was a few years ago, and whether the ability to pay on the part of the taxpayers is not greater than it has been at any time hitherto. I give my hon. friend and the house the following figures which will help to illustrate something of the increased growth of business in Canada. These figures can, I believe, be substantiated.

It is estimated by statisticians pretty generally that the national wealth of Canada increased from $22,195,000,000 in 1922 to $26,691,000,000 in 1926, an increase in that period of 20 per cent. I admit it must take some collecting of data to reach the conclusion, but nevertheless that is what I believe those who speak with authority would quote.

The bank debits of chartered banks in 1924 totalled $27,157,000,000, while in 1928 they totalled $43,477,000,000, an increase of 60 per cent in these four years.

Life insurance in 1921 totalled $2,935,000,000, while in 1928 it is estimated that it totalled $5,609,000,000, an increase of 90 per cent.

As regards savings deposits in chartered banks, which are an indication of the position of individuals in the community, they increased from $1,197,000,000 in 1923, to $1,496,000,000 in 1928, an increase of 25 per cent.

Exports of Canadian products increased from $740,000,000 in 1922 to $1,356,000,000 in the last twelve months, or an increase of 80 per cent.

Gross revenue from all industries, according to the Financial Post of January 4, 1929, was in 1926, $6,188,000,000 and in 1928, $6,840,000,000, or an increase of 10 per cent in those two years.

The developed water-power of the country in 1921 was 2,700,000 horse-power and in 1928 it was 5,350,000 horse-power, or an increase of almost 100 per cent.

Motor vehicles increased from 465,000 in 1921, to 945,000 in 1927, or an increase of about 100 per cent.

The number of employees in the leading industrial establishments has increased by something like 20 per cent.

These are indices which, I think, should help anyone to arrive accurately at the improvement there has been in the business of the country in the last few years in comparison with the increase in the cost of government.

But if we wish to make a comparison of the cost of government that no one will question, let us make it between 1914 and the present time. This will help to disclose as between political parties how much the cost of government has increased, how much it has increased under the present Liberal administration in comparison with what it was before the war in the days of the Conservative administration. In that comparison I think the house will agree that it would be proper to exclude amounts which to-day we are paying on war account, such as pensions and the like, and which do not appear in the accounts of the year 1914. If we exclude these amounts, it will be found that the total expenditure of Canada to-day is very nearly the same as it was in 1914. If we go a step further and regard the receipts of the Post Office Department as payments for services rather than as a tax, and exclude, in addition to the expenses now being met on war account, the amounts of the Post Office department, a comparison of 1914 with the present day will show that the cost of government to-day is less than it was in 1914, and that, notwithstanding the great increase in the population of the country from 1914 to the present time, and notwithstanding the fact that the value of the dollar to-day is only two-thirds of what it was in 1914. I should like to place the exact figures on record because I think they are important for purposes of comparison.

In 1914, when the Conservatives were in office prior to the war, total expenditures were $186,241,048. In 1928, according to the reports before parliament, they were $362,827,742, or almost double the 1914 figures. Account, however, must be taken of the expenditures attributable to the war, and these, as furnished by the Minister of Finance, are as follows:

Year 1927-28

Increase of interest on public debt over 1914	$116,009,440
War pensions	38,592,493
Soldiers' civil re-establishment	6,958,611
Soldier land settlement	1,334,008
Memorial War Graves Commission.	573,419
Battlefield memorials	183,067
Adjustment of war claims	1,656,011
Total	$165,307,049

If we deduct the sum of $165,307,049 from the total expenditure of 1928 we have $197,520,693, or an increase over 1914 of $11,279,645. This represents an increase of 5·71 per cent in total expenditures, apart from war expenditure, between 1914 and 1928. As I have said, the purchasing power of the dollar is only two-thirds of what it was in 1914, and if this is taken into account, the showing of the present administration is even better than these figures represent it to be.

In addition, as already mentioned, it must be remembered that not all government expenditures are payable from tax revenues. For example, postal revenue could hardly be considered as ordinary revenue for the reason that here the public pay not so much a tax to the government as a price for the transmission of letters. It is submitted, therefore, that the revenues and expenditures of the Post Office Department might, in fairness, be deducted from both the 1914 and 1928 figures. If this be done, the comparison of expenditures between the Conservative administration of 1914 and the present administration of 1928 will be as follows:

Year	Total	For war	Post office	General expenditures leaving out war and post office
1914..	$186,241,048		$12,922,058	$173,418,900
1928..	362,827,742	$165,307,049	31,782,968	165,737,725

In other words, the actual cost of government to-day is less than it was in 1914 not taking into account the increase in population in the interval and the fact that $1.50 to-day will only go as far as $1 in 1914.

And now may I come to one other phase of my hon. friend's discussion, and this was perhaps the most ingenious of all, if it was not also the most deceptive. My hon. friend undertook to deal with taxation. I stress this because I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite following him have continued to do the same. My hon. friend said: I think it will be admitted that most of the taxes go into consolidated revenue. Let us compare, he said, the figures in consolidated revenue during the six years during which the Conservatives were in office, the period from 1918 to 1922, with the amount of total taxation during the period when the Liberal administration was in office. He then set out both sets of figures side by side and came to the conclusion that there was an annual increase in taxation under the present administration of $51,000,000. In other words, my hon. friend tried to have this house and the country believe that under the present administration taxation, and meaning by taxation, the amount necessary to carry on the government, is $51,000,000 a year greater than is was during the years hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, and in presenting this plausible statement he produced government accounts to show the total amounts paid into the consolidated revenue. But my hon. friend never said one word in his statement about how much the government of his day was borrowing during the time they were in office, about how largely they were carrying on the business of this country, not out of taxation, but out of borrowed money, all of which has to be met by taxation at one time or another and which should be credited as taxation incurred at the time expenditures were being paid out of the moneys borrowed; not one word did he say about how this administration has to make good the borrowings for which my hon. friends opposite were responsible.

My hon. friend said: We taxed practically everything we could. May I say to him that he might much better have said: We borrowed practically everything that we could borrow. That is the truth. They did not tax everything they could tax. As my hon. friend knows, they never touched the income tax in the period of the war until about 1918, and then only a very small amount was raised from that source. When at last they did levy an income tax, they issued tax-exempt bonds, and yet my hon. friend says to this house that they taxed everything they could tax. They were very careful to see, while they were conscripting men for overseas service, that they did not conscript any of the wealth of the wealthy men of the country. They took good care to see that the bonds were issued at a very good price, that they carried a rate of interest of 5½ per cent for those in a position to invest their wealth and that these persons would be secured in their privileged position by the government undertaking that these bonds would not be taxed at any time in the future. They could be stowed away among the assets of the well-to-do of the country by those who were fortunate enough to be able to purchase them, and the government of to-day in its efforts to raise taxation is, as a consequence, prevented from getting a dollar of the income derived from those bonds at the present time. Not only are we expected to make good the borrowings of my hon. friends opposite, but in this effort we are deprived of the very source of revenue which ought to be the first source from which it should be possible for a government to collect.

398 millions of 5½ per cent tax-exempt bonds were sold to the public in November, 1918.

660 millions of 5½ per cent tax-exempt bonds were sold to the public in November, 1916.

What was the result of this policy of borrowing rather than taxing? The annual interest bills of the Dominion increased by leaps and bounds. Whereas in the fiscal year ended 1917 the total interest payments of the Dominion of Canada were $35,802,000, they rose in the fiscal year ended 1918 to $47,845,000; 1919 to $77,431,000; 1920 to $107,527,000; 1921 to $139,551,000; falling somewhat in 1922 to $135,247,849.

In these five years the previous administration increased the interest bills of the people of Canada by no less than 100 millions a year. Owing to the rapidly increasing interest burdens resulting from the policy of wholesale borrowing instead of taxing during the war period, additional taxation had to be imposed after the war to take care of the increased interest charges as well as pension obligations.

May I say that the only fair comparison between the two periods is to estimate how much in each case it would have taken to balance the budget. That is the only fair basis of comparison, and to see then what was left. If we take the period to which my hon. friend has referred, we will find that year after year, far from balancing the budget, there were these huge deficits, all of which at a later period had to be met by taxation. When you come to the present period, you find that, in addition to balancing the budget there is a surplus which goes to wipe off the public debt, to wipe out these borrowings of the previous period. I say that alongside the figures which my hon. friend has quoted the following figures should also be inserted, they represent the increase in the public debt through borrowing instead of taxation in the years which my hon. friend has chosen for purposes of comparison:

Conservative Debt Increase

1918	$312,697,764 70
1919	382,646,969 94
1920	674,337,591 35
1921	92,010,359 90
1922	81,256,818 04

What has been the comparison on the other side? The years during which the present administration was in office show the public debt, not increased, but, during the years which my hon. friend has taken for the purposes of comparison, decreased as follows:

Liberal Debt Decrease

1925	$ 345,589 29
1926	27,706,586 17
1927	41,896,729 33
1928	50,984,137 17
1929	69,782,000 00

In other words, there has been a decrease in the public debt during this latest period of $190,000,000. Those are the figures which my hon. friend should have quoted, and what do they mean? They mean, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, that the large debt increase for which they were responsible is a tax which has been imposed upon the present and future generations. My hon. friend should have said: We raised a certain amount in taxation, but this additional amount running into many millions of dollars, which will have to be met by taxation, we left to someone else to meet.

So far as the period of the present government is concerned, the position has been exactly the reverse. We are able to say with regard to our accounts: We have raised every dollar of taxation that is required to meet current expenditure, and in addition we are relieving all future generations of taxation equivalent to amounts in the form of surpluses which we have from year to year.

I have here a statement of the taxation necessary to balance the budget, not in war years or the years of demobilization, but in the subsequent years—a statement of the actual taxation and of what would have been necessary to make an even balance up to 1924, then a statement of the amounts raised in excess. They are as follows:

	Taxation Necessary to Balance Budget	Actual Total Taxation	Addition to or subtraction from Debt
	$	$	$
1921	460,780,858	368,770,498	92,010,360
1922	401,182,830	319,926,013	81,256,817
1923	367,094,408	335,453,341	31,641,067
1924	305,725,213	341,718,807	—35,993,594
1925	293,568,929	293,914,518	— 345,589
1926	299,868,426	327,575,012	—27,706,586
1927	304,752,543	346,649,272	—41,896,729
1928	313,721,665	364,705,802	—50,984,137*
1929 Estimated	321,268,000	391,050,000	—69,782,000

* After transferring $16,035,672, soldier land settlement and other advances from active to non-active assets.

1929 Expenditures include—

Maritime Freight Rates Act	
Due to 20 per cent reduction in rates	$ 2,992,000
Deficit on eastern lines, C.N.R.	4,303,000
Special grant to maritime provinces	1,600,000
Federal District Commission	2,190,000
	$11,085,000

I would ask permission to insert as well a table showing the tax contribution per individual and the increase or decrease in the amount of the individual's share of the na-

tional obligation for the fiscal years ended March 31, 1921 to 1929, inclusive.

Fiscal years ended March 31	Per capita taxes	Per Capita Addition to or subtraction from obligations	Total per capita taxes required to balance budget
	$	$	$
1921	41.96	+10.47	52.43
1922	35.91	+ 9.12	45.03
1923	37.16	+ 3.50	40.66
1924	37.34	— 3.93	33.41
1925	31.71	— .04	31.67
1926	34.89	— 2.95	31.94
1927	36.42	— 4.40	32.02
1928	37.76	— 5.28	32.48
1929 Estimated	39.91	— 7.12	32.79

Let me make further comparison between the years 1918-22 and the years 1925-29. Take the figures as they appear on page 786 of Hansard and recall that $190,000,000 of debt has been paid off in the last five years which left 1,809 millions of revenue to meet the current expenditure. What about the relative uncontrollable expenditures in the two periods, the relative interest charges, pensions, et cetera? In the first five-year period the increasing sums paid out in interest aggregated $507,603,475, as follows:

1918	$ 47,845,585
1919	77,431,432
1920	107,527,089
1921	139,551,520
1922	135,247,849
	$507,603,475

In the second five-year period the sums paid out in interest show a decreasing tendency, as follows:

1925	$134,789,604
1926	130,691,493
1927	129,675,347
1928	128,902,945
1929	125,000,000
	$649,059,409

The present administration has had to pay out in interest charges in the second five-year period 141 millions more than the previous administration had to pay out in its selected five-year period or at the average rate of 28 millions per annum—in itself sufficient to weight down the comparison against us.

Again, the pension payments in the first five-year period, aggregating $126,016,374, were as follows:

1918	$ 8,155,691
1919	18,282,440
1920	26,004,461
1921	37,420,751
1922	36,153,031
	$126,016,374

In the second five-year period there were pension payments aggregating $191,773,434, as follows:

1925	$ 34,888,665
1926	37,203,700
1927	37,902,939
1928	39,778,130
1929	42,000,000
	$191,773,434

Thus, on this account again, we had to pay out in the second five-year period over $65,000,000 more than the previous administration during the first five-year period. In a word, the present government paid off 190 millions of debt during the last five years, and had to pay out an extra 141 millions in interest and an extra 65 millions in pension charges, as compared with those paid in the previous five years. It will be readily seen that the ordinary administration of the country is being carried on vastly more economically in the second five-year period than in the first.

My hon. friend asks, where is the reduction in taxation under the present administration? He must have forgotten all the reductions that have taken place. May I refresh his memory with respect to some of them at least. Here are some: In regard to the income tax, the following exemptions and reductions have been made:

1922—Exemption for each child raised from $200 to $300;

1924—Additional exemption for each child raised from $300 to $500;

1926—Exemption limit raised from $2,000 to $3,000 in the case of married persons or those with dependents and from $1,000 to $1,500 in the case of other persons, in addition those with incomes of $5,000 or less to pay only 2 per cent of their taxable income instead of 4 per cent. Corporation income tax reduced from 10 per cent to 9 per cent;

1927—10 per cent cut off the 1926 rates;

1928—Additional 10 per cent cut off the 1926 rates.

Now I come to the tariff changes. These are as follows:

1922—Reductions on sugar, agricultural implements, textiles, boots and shoes, etc.;

1923—Tariff on goods imported under the British preferential tariff reduced by 10 per cent wherever regular rate of duty exceeds 15 per cent and where goods are imported directly to a sea or river port of Canada. Duty on sugar reduced;

1924—Duty on instruments of production used in agriculture, mining, forestry and fisheries reduced;

1925—Reductions on well-drilling machinery and engines for fishermen's boats;

1926—Duties on sugar, automobiles, tin plate, etc., reduced;

1928—Numerous changes contained in Chapter 17 of the statutes for 1928.

I put on Hansard last year at page 1301 of Volume II and page following, a more or less complete statement of the reductions in the tariff since the present government came into office up to 1928.

As to postage, we restored penny postage within Canada July 1, 1926, and in 1928 imperial penny postage was reestablished.

The following statement shows the reductions we have made in the cheque tax, the receipt tax and the sales tax:

Cheque Tax

1922—Imposed at 2c. on every $50 with a maximum of $2 on $5,000 or over;

1923—Reduced to $1;

1925—Tax on cheques not exceeding $5 remitted;

1927—Tax reduced to a flat 2c. on cheques of over $10;

Receipt Tax

1926—Imposed in 1922; abolished in 1926.

Sales Tax

1923—A flat 6 per cent;
1924—Reduced to 5 per cent;
1927—Reduced to 4 per cent;
1928—Reduced to 3 per cent;
1929—Reduced to 2 per cent.

A list of the earlier changes made by the government in customs duties will be found at pages 2137 to 2141 of revised Hansard of May 15, 1924.

This government, to state the fact, has been making a continuous reduction in taxation year by year. Statements have been made by the Minister of Finance in his different budgets indicative of the amounts of taxation that have been remitted. In 1926 the estimated reduction of taxation was $25,000,000; in 1927, $27,000,000; in 1928, $19,000,000; in 1929—the present year—$25,000,000. That is, within the last four years there has been an estimated reduction in taxation of almost $100,000,000. A reduction, be it remembered, which constitutes from now on an annual reduction as compared with 1926.

That is the record of the present administration with respect to taxation.

I come, Mr. Speaker, to another subject discussed by my hon. friend, and to a phase of that subject which has been taken up at some length in the course of the debate by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now that the Canadian National Railways have begun to pay, now that everyone recognizes that the Canadian National system is an asset to the country, and that the country is profiting by it in the eyes of the world, hon. gentlemen opposite are seeking to claim the paternity of that institution. Hon. gentlemen opposite are desirous of having it appear that they are responsible for the Canadian National system being what it is to-day. My hon. friend used all the skill of which he was capable in seeking to make out a case to that end. He started out by saying that with respect to the national railways they on the opposite side were all optimists. Well, it is easy to be an optimist when anything is going well, and particularly where its success has been assured by someone else. But my hon. friends were not always optimists. They were not optimists even in 1921 in their last year of office and when appealing to the country. I recall very well the discussions that took place at that time. The most they said about the railways was that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was responsible for the condition they were then in. It was stated that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was responsible for having constructed the Grand Trunk Pacific, for having built the National Transcontinental, for having been a friend of Mackenzie and Mann; that was the kind of thing one heard throughout the country as late as 1921 when hon. gentlemen opposite were hoping they might be returned to power.

But, as I have said, my hon. friend, in the course of the present debate, sought to build up a case to have it appear that at the time these railway matters were up for consideration in parliament, the Liberals were doing their utmost to destroy the Canadian National system. He said he well remembered the time that parliament sat in the old Victoria museum, in the fall of 1919. He was kind enough to remind me that in that year I came back into the house as leader of the Liberal party. He went on to say my first act was an endeavour to destroy these very railways for the success of which the government is now claiming so much credit. He said he recalled the discussion very well, that Hon. D. D. Mackenzie, as leader of the Liberal party in the early part of the session, had first of all sought to postpone any consideration of the question of the consolidation of the national railways, any organization of the Canadian National Railway system; that he was followed later by Mr. Fielding, who suggested that a royal commission should be appointed to inquire into the matter, but that the real intention was to destroy the organization of the Canadian National system. Then he said that I had brought in a motion to refer the whole matter back to

committee for the purpose of forcing a vote of want of confidence in the government and of destroying the bill. Finally he referred to the present Minister of Finance, and said that he had at the conclusion of the debate moved the six months' hoist. All of this is now on Hansard in the remarks of my hon. friend to show that those who to-day are members of the present administration were at that time seeking to destroy the organization of the Canadian National system.

Perhaps I had better read exactly what my hon. friend said, in order that there can be no misunderstanding. I quote from pages 743 and 744 of Hansard of March 7, 1929. He said:

In respect, however, to the national railway we on this side of the house are all optimists. We look upon that railway as practically our own infant and our own creature.

Then later on:

Moreover, across the ocean in France and Flanders we were carrying on Canada's part in the greatest war in history. There was serious financial calamity awaiting us at home unless speedy action was taken to relieve the railway situation and at the same time hundreds of millions of dollars had to be supplied to carry on the war. Such then was the critical situation in this country in the spring and summer of 1919.

Mr. DUNNING: In 1919.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, in 1919. He goes on to say:

The leader of the government (Mr. Mackenzie King) was not, I think, in the house until September of the year 1919, when he was returned for a constituency in Prince Edward Island and came back to the house as leader of the Liberal party. But he was present in the house during the session of 1919 and I recall with the greatest distinctness what transpired during that session. So will my right hon. friend; so will the Minister of Finance; so would the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) if he were in his place.

Well, he is here now.

A great fight was then waged by the Conservative party—

Remember, this all relates to the fall session of 1919 at which many members of this parliament were present.

A great fight was then waged by the Conservative party to take over these three railway systems that had gone into bankruptcy, reorganize them, consolidate them and make them into a Canadian National railway to be owned by the people of the Dominion of Canada.

Then later on:

Day in and day out in the old museum during the session of 1919 the railway bill was fought to a finish. Every kind and method of opposition was urged against it. Nothing was left undone or unsaid by our opponents.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

I remember some of the amendments that were moved on that occasion and I will mention one or two of them. Under the guidance of Mr. Meighen that bill was fought through the house. Amendment after amendment was moved to defeat it. The late Mr. D. D. McKenzie moved that the matter be dropped and not considered for the present time. His motion was defeated. Then came a motion by Mr. Denis, at that time member for Joliette and until recently a member of the house. His motion was defeated. Then there was a motion by the Right Hon. Mr. Fielding to appoint a royal commission to inquire into the whole matter, his object being to defeat the bill and to destroy the government as well. His motion was defeated. After that followed a motion by my right hon. friend the present Prime Minister on the third reading of the bill, just before it was passed, a motion to recommit it to the committee of the whole house, which constituted a want of confidence motion in the government on the third reading. It was intended to defeat the government and to destroy the bill.

Then later:

When the Liberals had exhausted every effort to beat us, when they had tried everything in their power to destroy that measure and prevent the nationalization of these railways, the present Minister of Finance was put up to lead the final attack, and in the early hours of the morning he solemnly moved that the bill be given the six months' hoist. . . The Liberals tried by everything in their power to destroy that measure but they failed. . . No, Mr. Speaker, hon gentlemen opposite had no faith in a national railway system then, and they tried to kill it at its birth, and for two or three years afterwards they continued their efforts to destroy it.

Now what are the facts? In the first place, my hon. friend says that they were busy with the war; they were straining every nerve to get enough money to carry on the war. He says this of the latter part of the year 1919. I do not think I need to remind the house that the war ended on November 11, 1918. The war was over. In the second place, my hon. friend talked all the way through of what the Conservative party were doing at that time. If I am not mistaken the hon. gentleman at that time was boasting that he himself was a Liberal in a Unionist administration. There was no Conservative party in office at the time; the government led by the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden at the time was a unionist government, and in that government, at the time of which my hon. friend speaks, were such gentlemen as himself, Hon. James A. Calder, Hon. Frank Carvell, the Hon. Newton Wesley Rowell, the Hon. A. K. Maclean, all of whom professed at least to be Liberals and most of whom, I am happy to say, have remained Liberals since. It was not a Conservative government that was in office at that time; it was a unionist administration. Now what about the bill itself to which my hon. friend

refers? I say to my hon. friend, and I challenge him to contradict me, that the measure to which he refers was not a Canadian National measure at all, not a measure to organize the Canadian National Railways. The measure with respect to which all these different amendments were made was a "bill for the acquisition of the Grand Trunk Railway Company," a bill a copy of which I have in my hand at the moment. That was the bill which was introduced in that session. And to show how proud my hon. friends opposite were of the bill they were then introducing, no mention whatever was made of it in the speech from the throne. The session which was being held at that time, as I reminded my hon. friend when he was speaking, was a session called for the purpose of approving the treaty of peace which had been signed at Versailles. That was what the session was for; it was not for the purpose of dealing with a railway measure. And after discussion had taken place on the treaty, this bill for the acquisition of the Grand Trunk Railway was introduced. All the amendments to which my hon. friend has referred, and the object of which he says was to destroy the Canadian National system as we know it to-day, were amendments not one of which was related to any bill respecting the Canadian National system but to the bill respecting the acquisition of the Grand Trunk railway and were introduced by members of the Liberal party because of the terms of the measure as presented to the house and methods taken by hon. gentlemen opposite to achieve their ends. As a matter of fact, as the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) reminds me, there was no Canadian National Railway system at that time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This was the keystone of the arch.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The keystone of the arch? I am afraid my hon. friend will find that he is the keystone of a very much mistaken statement. My hon. friend makes light of it at the moment, but all his followers behind him, one after another, repeated the statement over and over again, and I presume we should have heard it repeated from now until after the next general election unless something in the interval had been said respecting the matter.

What was the exact position? Mr. D. D. McKenzie, who was leading the opposition at the time, moved that the bill for the acquisition of the Grand Trunk railway should not be proceeded with at that session inasmuch as the session had been called for the purpose of dealing with the treaty of peace and nothing else. That was the reason of his motion; it was not as my hon. friend has said, to destroy any railway system. And the motion moved by Mr. Fielding was a motion asking that the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act should be applied to the finances of this particular transaction. That was voted down. My hon. friend says that I sought to destroy the railway system by a motion I introduced. But what was that motion? It was that the agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the government, which hon. gentlemen opposite were proposing to make by order in council after the close of that session, and which involved more in the way of financial obligation upon this country than any other single transaction in its history, should be referred to parliament for approval before it was acquiesced in. That was the motion, and that was the motion hon. gentlemen opposite voted down. They would not allow the agreement between the company and the government to be submitted to parliament; it was to be put through by order in council, and this notwithstanding that the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway in Great Britain were to have the right to approve it. Hon. gentlemen opposite were obliged later to come to parliament to have it approved, because in drafting the measure they had made some mistake and could not rectify it without bringing the whole measure to the house. To return to the bill and the session of 1919 after my motion was defeated, the present Minister of Finance at the end of that session, moved the six months' hoist, not at all in relation to the Canadian National measure but, as I have said, in regard to this particular transaction introduced at that particular time and in the arbitrary manner I have described.

When was the Canadian National measure introduced? At the previous session of that parliament a measure was brought in to enable the then Canadian Northern railway to be operated along with the Intercolonial railway under one management. That was by a bill entitled "to incorporate the Canadian National Railway Company and respecting the Canadian National Railways." It was assented to in June, 1919, and the bill respecting the Canadian National Railways as passed at that period was, as I have said, nothing more than a bill to enable the Canadian Northern Railway system to be operated along with the Intercolonial. Now my hon. friends the year before had acquired the Canadian Northern system. But how did they acquire it ? They had a royal commission appointed to inquire into the conditions of the railways in this country. That commission made its report, and among other things it stated that the stock of the Cana-

dian Northern system was not worth a single dollar. That was the report of a commission appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite. Yet, on the eve of the election of 1917, these same gentlemen gave to that stock a value of $10,000,000, and forced that transaction through the House of Commons under closure. They got the Canadian Northern into their hands and out of the hands of their friends in that way, and it was to enable them to operate the Canadian Northern along with the government railway that this act respecting the Canadian National Railways was then introduced.

But in speaking of the organization of the Canadian National system such as we have it to-day, may I direct the attention of the house to this further fact. In the bill with respect to the acquisition of the Grand Trunk railway there was not there one clause which related to bringing the Grand Trunk railway system under a Canadian National railway system such as exists to-day? Not a line. As a matter of fact the bill, of which I have a copy, provided that the management of the Grand Trunk Railway Company would remain in England, as had been the case in the past, with the president and the board of directors in that country, and it was not until 1921, when a crisis arose with respect to the arbitration of the Grand Trunk securities, that an agreement was arrived at whereby provision was made for a board of directors in Canada. This board remained a seperate board; it remained the Grand Trunk Railway board and was not brought in any way into association with the Canadian National system. That is what my hon. friend calls the keystone of the whole system, a keystone left absolutely by itself.

Mr. GUTHRIE: So it was, awaiting the judgment of the privy council.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To go a step further, what was the position with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific company, which in March 1919 had been placed in the hands of the Minister of Railways and Canals as a receiver? When the Canadian National bill was passed, when the Grand Trunk bill was passed, no provision was made for ending that receivership and making the Grand Trunk Pacific a part of the system; it was left with the Minister of Railways.

But most significant of all, when the Canadian National bill was before the house and something was said about government ownership, the then Prime Minister, Right Hon. Arthur Meighen was asked whether with respect to railways, the policy of the government was one of government ownership. My hon. friend, for reasons best known to himself, in the course of his remarks sought to bring forward Mr. Meighen as the personage above all others responsible for the present splendid organization of the Canadian National system, yet at the time the bill respecting the National Railways was introduced and Mr. Meighen was asked what he had to say about government ownership he absolutely refused to make any commitment. My hon. friend said he came forward with some carefully thought out scheme "a definite plan" he called it, as a matter of fact the whole policy was one of expediency, and there was no vision about it whatever. On April 11, 1919, during the course of the debate, Mr. McMaster put this pointed question to Mr. Meighen, who was then fathering the particular measure under discussion:

> I hope the minister will not think me unduly insistent when I ask for a declaration of the policy of the government. Public ownership, whether we wish it or not, has been imposed upon the people. If we were holding the railways only with the idea of disposing of them to private companies in, perhaps, as short a time as possible, one particular kind of organization might be better than another; but if we made up our minds to adopt the permanent policy of the public ownership of railways, some different system of organization would be necessary. The government therefore should state clearly whether they are for the principle of government ownership as a definite policy for Canada.

Then, after mentioning the fact that the responsibility for the principle rested with the government, Mr. McMaster continued:

> . . . . the port that they are steering for should be made known to the people before we are asked to vote for a resolution of this kind.

To this Mr. Meighen replied:

> I do not know just how many years ahead the hon. member thinks we should place ourselves in order to determine the port. I think the government is well advised to take its bearings by ports that are in sight, not to fix a policy with reference to yet unborn decades. So far as there is any necessity of stating policy, the government's policy as to railways has been stated and repeated over and over again. As to the roads that we now own, our policy is to continue to own them and to operate them; we have no intention of selling them to any private corporation. Certain roads we do not own.
>
> The Grand Trunk Pacific is one; our policy as to that has been brought down to the house, and we are engaged in the carrying out of that policy. The Grand Trunk is another; we have stated repeatedly our policy as to the Grand Trunk; we have stated what we are doing. The Canadian Pacific is another; the government has not intimated to parliament any intention of acquiring the Canadian Pacific Railway company. I do not know what more the hon. gentleman desires; I certainly do not know what more is necessary to the consideration of

this resolution. Every time the subject of railways is mentioned in parliament, is the government, as to its policy, to see years or centuries ahead? All the government has to do is to adjust its course with reference to circumstances now known; we have stated our course with reference to all the railway circumstances now known. All that is necessary to a consideration of this bill is a determination of the question whether it is the part of wisdom to operate such roads as we now and may in the future own under the system set out and by the principle clearly defined in this bill, namely, by the establishment of a holding and operating company, the Canadian National Railways.

That is the extent to which Mr. Meighen, who was supposed to have had the far-sighted vision to bring into being the Canadian National system as we have it to-day, was at that time prepared to commit himself and his party.

May I say that if the government of that day had had the slightest intention of bringing about the organization of the Canadian National Railways as we now know it, that measure would most certainly have received mention in some speech from the throne, but neither in the special session during which the Grand Trunk was acquired nor during the previous session when provision was made for the Canadian Northern being administered along with the Intercolonial as part of a national system was there a single word in the speech from the throne in regard to such a measure. In each case the railway bills were introduced, one might almost say, more or less surreptitiously after the session had commenced. Indeed, the impression was general at the time that the government's object was to return the roads to private control at a convenient season, and under conditions more or less favourable to some of the government's own friends.

What was the position at the end of 1921? As I have said, if hon. gentlemen opposite were so sure of the future of the railways; if they were so proud of their alleged paternity of the railway system, why did they not make a little out of it during the elections in 1921? They did just the opposite; they disowned the whole business, they blamed previous Liberal governments for all the misfortunes of the roads, and the situation as the present government found it when it came into office was this: Instead of there being any Canadian National Railway system such as we have to-day there were three different railway organizations carrying on, separate and distinct, at that time; the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway was in the hands of the Minister of Railways and Canals as a receiver, and its affairs were being administered through the Department of Railways and Canals; the Canadian Northern Railway system, together with the Intercolonial Railway, was under the management of a Canadian Northern directorate, not a Canadian National management or directorate, but with a Canadian Northern board of directors appointed under orders in council in 1918. That railway was travelling under an alias; it was called Canadian National but it could not be known legitimately as the Canadian National system because up to that time it had not become a part of such. There was simply a Canadian Northern administration, and in addition there was the separate administration of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which had its own president and board of directors.

Mr. BENNETT: That was necessary until the decision of the privy council was made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The decision of the privy council had been made. My hon. friend will find that it was made before the election. There may have been some appeal on a point of law, but apart from all that, the decision of the privy council had nothing to do with it. My hon. friends had it within their power, had they wished to do so, to pass such legislation as they deemed necessary to bring the Grand Trunk when it was acquired under Canadian National control and which would have relieved them from waiting for any decision of the privy council.

Mr. BENNETT: No, we had to wait.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is quite wrong; he is mistaken.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sure the Prime Minister will agree with me that as appeal was taken from the arbitration, parliament could not act pending a decision. I happen to remember that the decision was made after the election, because I was in London when the decision was announced.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did the decision of the privy council have anything to do with the forming of a Canadian National railway board to run the Canadian Northern?

Mr. BENNETT: Absolutely, because if the decision went in accordance with the contentions of the Grand Trunk the matter had to be re-arbitrated.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But that had nothing to do with the Canadian Northern.

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly it had, because the two systems could not be combined until after the decision was rendered.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Surely my hon. friend is not familiar with what took place.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes he is.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then if he is familiar with it he does not like the whole business. I venture to say that even to-day my hon. friend would not support the action of the government of the day in giving $10,000,000 to Mackenzie and Mann for the common stock of the Canadian Northern System. It was that $10,000,000 that brought the Canadian Northern under the control of the government, and it was to administer that particular road that the act to which I have referred was passed in the early part of 1919 or other roads which might be amalgamated. That act when it was passed had nothing to do with the Grand Trunk at all; it simply united the Canadian Northern with the government road for the purposes of administration.

Mr. BENNETT: I merely point out again that there could be no union between these two systems until after the decision of the privy council had been announced. With respect to the payment of $10,000,000, I declined to follow Mr. Pugsley and the Liberal party in giving them $40,000,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend speaks about there having been no unity between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern until a decision was given by the privy council. Whether that is or is not true does not affect in the least the fact that the Canadian National Act was passed in relation to the Canadian Northern railway and the Intercolonial railway, to bring the two under the one management. Even that much had not been done when the present government came into office in December, 1921, although the bill had passed during the early part of 1919. We found on coming into office two separate systems, and we also found the Grand Trunk Pacific being administered by a receiver. We realized that the first thing to be done was to end this duplication, this dual, if not triple control, to bring about a centralized control and to discover the right person to put in charge of the two systems when they were combined. In November, 1922, we succeeded in obtaining the services of Sir Henry Thornton, whose reputation at that time as a manager of railways in the old country was outstanding. If any one person above everyone else, is entitled to credit for the present success of the Canadian National system, I venture to say that that person is Sir Henry Thornton. But I think Sir Henry Thornton would be the first to admit that along with him should be associated the Minister of Railways and Canals who was in office at the time he came to this country, and the ministers who have been in office and have been associated with him in the work of administration. Too much credit cannot be given to the late Hon. William C. Kennedy, the first Minister of Railways and Canals in this administration; to the Right Hon. George P. Graham, and to Hon. Charles A. Dunning, the present Minister of Railways and Canals for the manner in which they have cooperated with Sir Henry Thornton and his board of directors and dealt with the affairs of the National railways in this parliament. Great credit should also be given to the officials of the railway for the loyal manner in which they have cooperated with Sir Henry, and credit as well to every man employed upon the system. They are the persons to whom credit is due for the success of the Canadian National railways, and not the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen or the hon. gentlemen opposite. So far as any government is entitled to credit it is the present administration which brought about the complete unification of the lines, secured and appointed the president and board of directors, and which along with Sir Henry Thornton, has worked out the best type of organization best suited, and has kept the system from political interference.

My hon. friend spoke about extravagance, and he brought up a number of items which he claimed were in the nature of extravagances on the part of the administration. He mentioned the legations at Washington, Paris and Tokyo. With regard to the legation at Washington, he said that the government had spent $500,000 on a palace for the present minister, to be used as a place of residence, whereas the government should have allowed him to rent or buy a house for himself. My hon. friend knows that such is not a true statement. He knows that the building which has been purchased at Washington was not purchased as a residence, but for the purpose of a legation, including the offices of the legation as well as a residence for the minister. He knows that practically all the ministers or ambassadors at Washington live in buildings which are either embassies or legations. My hon. friend instead of being penurious in his criticism might have been generous enough to have said that the present minister the Hon. Vincent Massey, deserves the highest praise not only of all political parties in this house but of the nation as a whole for the manner in which he has represented the interests of this Canada at Washington. He should receive the highest praise not only for the manner in which he has represented the interests of this country, but for the very generous manner in which he has placed a considerable portion of his own private for-

tune at the service of the state. Anyone who knows anything about the manner in which Mr. Massey has been carrying on the representation of Canada at Washington knows that whatever he has received from the government is only a small portion of what he has spent. His private means have been given liberally towards helping to maintain the reputation of Canada at Washington on the high plane which it holds in the estimation of the people of this continent. Instead of misrepresenting the situation with respect to the legation building, my hon. friend might well have directed his talents to a better end.

Mr. BENNETT: He took the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) up to the White House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And I have no doubt he would take my hon. friend there also.

Mr. BENNETT: No, he will not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think they would let my hon. friend in.

Mr. BENNETT: He will never do that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not only is this building being used for office purposes, but in the purchase made the furnishings for residential purposes were acquired as well. The amount which my hon. friend mentioned was in excess of the cost of the building and site, including the cost of furnishings. The hon. member for South Wellington also said:

> Last year the vote to maintain our Washington embassy was $60,000; to-day it stands in the estimates at $100,000—an unwarrantable and extravagant increase of $40,000.

My hon. friend knows that that is not correct. The vote last year was not $60,000; the vote was for $100,000, and the vote the year before was for $130,000. I told the house in the session of 1927-28 that if it would sanction the purchase of a legation building at Washington we would cut that estimate from $130,000 to $100,000, and we have kept that promise. The estimates included an amount of $100,000 last year, and the amount being asked for this year is $100,000, and yet my hon. friend tells the house and the country that there has been unwarranted extravagance in an increase of the vote from $60,000 to $100,000.

In reference to Paris, my hon. friend mentioned an expenditure of $75,000, and then remarked on an additional sum of $40,000 which he said was being provided for another building. He should be careful before he makes such statements. He should look up the records and see what the expenditures are related to. The expenditure of $40,000 was not for another building in addition to and in connection with the present legation. My hon. friend knows that while Commissioner General, the present minister occupied premises in one part of Paris, which premises were entirely different from those of the legation which we now have in that city. The expenditure of $40,000 to which he referred and led the house to believe was an added extravagance was an amount expended upon premises occupied by the minister while he was the Commissioner General, and during which time no money was being spent upon a legation building. There was in his statement a complete misrepresentation of the facts. We come next to the building at London. My hon. friend considers the expenditure upon that building as an extravagance, but I wonder if the people of Canada are not proud of the Canadian building in London. Every dominion of the British Empire has a building in London: New Zealand has one, Australia has one and South Africa has one, and I know that some of the buildings which are occupied by other dominions in London are much more expensive than the offices which we have. We have been fortunate in securing for our offices the finest site in London; we have been fortunte in obtaining a very good building there, and I think this country has reason to be proud of the purchase which the government has made. My hon. friend referred to the cost of administration of the High Commissioner's office, and compared it to the cost during the time his government was in office; he said:

> When I was in the Meighen government the vote for the whole establishment in London was $69,000; this year the vote is $117,000.

He is again guilty of a very serious oversight, if not of a deliberate misrepresentation, because when he gave the figure as to what the London office cost when he was in the government he deliberately omitted the salaries paid, although, when giving the figures with reference to the present government, he included them. My hon. friend apparently took the figures as shown in the statement of 1920-21, which are as follows: Supply, government contingencies, $69,586. That is the $69,000 which he said was the cost of the whole establishment in London when he was in the government. But right alongside that figure in the public accounts of that year stand the following:

High Commissioner's publications.. ..	$ 1,000
Supplementary, civil government contingencies..	7,000
Civil government salaries..	25,950

These figures give a total of $103,536, and not the $69,000 as given by my hon. friend. At that time the High Commissioner's office

did not include, as it does to-day, accommodation for some of the work of the immigration department, the Department of Trade and Commerce, the Department of Health, and the payment of pensions overseas. These are all additional branches of activities that have been gathered into the present office in London.

Now we come to Ottawa, and my hon. friend says: "Here again there has been an absolute waste. The destruction of property, destroyed for what? Merely to get a view." My hon. friend knows better than that. He knows first of all that the property in Ottawa that was demolished was for the most part in the nature of old buildings that were to have been taken down anyway. That is the reason why at the particular time the government took the step it did. We knew that these buildings were to be demolished. The old Russell House block had been for the most part disposed of; it was to be torn down, and it was a question of either acquiring the property for the state at that time or losing the opportunity of getting it later on because of the more expensive buildings that would certainly have been put up there. My hon. friend knows further that this House of Commons in general, if not in specific terms, approved of something being done to commemorate in the capital of the Dominion the diamond jubilee of confederation, and this particular commemoration was to take the form of a confederation park in the centre of the city, provided the civic authorities were prepared to cooperate with the government in the matter. He knows that an arrangement has been reached between the government and the city authorities for a very considerable improvement in the heart of the capital, a much needed improvement in the immediate vicinity of these houses of parliament which means much in the present but which will mean infinitely more in the future. He knows very well that what has been done in that regard has been done as part of a great scheme in the national interest and not, as he says, for the purpose of getting a view. I think hon. gentlemen opposite would be more public-spirited, more patriotic, to say the least, if instead of criticizing the government on every conceivable subject, they would recognize that there are some questions that might well be taken out of the realm of party discussion altogether. Improvement of the capital of this Dominion is one of those questions, and I say now to my hon. friend opposite I think the step he should take—and I am prepared to have him take it and to cooperate if he is agreeable so to do—would be to have a group of hon. gentlemen behind him or who are associated with him, meet with myself and a corresponding group of hon. members on this side together with representatives of the other group opposite, and discuss plans for the further improvement of the capital of this country. Let us then come to this parliament and say what we feel is owing alike to the present and the future generations and needed in order to make the capital of our country what we would like to have it and what we know future generations would wish it to be.

The talk about extravagance in the price of public buildings mentioned, reminds me of the discussion we had in this parliament with respect to the completion of the tower of these Houses of Parliament. Hon. gentlemen who were here then will remember that for two days the government, on an item which asked the house for enough money to complete the present tower, was held up on the score that the tower might well remain as it was and that we had better wait until the country was in a more favourable position. Notwithstanding the fact that the whole front of the parliament buildings was obscured by the equipment required in the reconstruction of the building, we were told that the completion of the tower might well wait; that we were too extravagant. This present opposition is pretty much on a par with that; only it is not a tower, it is the capital of the Dominion that is involved. We owe it to the country as a whole to make this capital worthly of this great Dominion and I may tell my hon. friends opposite that they will find in the hearts of the people in the back concessions much more pride in the capital of their country than they themselves have exhibited in the discussions in this house.

I might give the house a little information with respect to some of our expenditures. Consider the building at the corner of Sussex and Rideau streets, the so called Daly building, a hideous looking structure, an eyesore in the city, It was purchased by hon. gentlemen opposite, not for $500,000, as my hon. friend says the legation building at Washington, a very handsome building with furnishings complete was purchased for, but purchased for $1,000,000, and on what further terms? That $100,000 should be paid down on the eve of the election of 1921, and that from then on the sum of $100,000 should be paid each year with interest on the balance at the rate of 6 per cent per annum. Under that contract we have been obliged to pay $100,000 and to contribute 6 per cent on the balance each year from the time hon. gentlemen opposite went out of office until to-day, and the payments will not be completed until next year.

The payment when completed will amount to $1,270,000. These are the hon. gentlemen who talk about waste and extravagance.

May I refer again to what I have just said about the purchase of the Canadian Northern system? Hon. gentlemen opposite had a report from their own commission which said that the common stock of the Canadian Northern was not worth a single cent, but notwithstanding that they so engineered matters as to give to that stock a value of $10,000,000 and compelled the people of this country to meet that amount out of taxes by the use of closure in this House of Commons.

Mr. BENNETT: That was done by arbitration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What could we not do with $10,000,000 in the improvement of the capital of Canada? That money would be better in the treasury here for the improvement of Ottawa than in the pockets of friends of my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. BENNETT: The right hon. gentleman knows that was awarded by arbitration by Chief Justice Meredith.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend can make his statement later.

Mr. BENNETT: I was not there. It was by arbitration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I daresay my hon. friend thanks the Lord he was not there.

May I now conclude what I have to say? I had intended to say something about trade and the tariff, in regard to which my hon. friend spoke at some length, but I shall have to leave that for some later time. I should like however to say a few words in regard to the amendments to the motion that has been made by the Minister of Finance that the house go into committee of ways and means.

During the last few years on each occasion that the Minister of Finance has brought in his budget, we have been confronted, as regularly as by the years themselves, with amendments of hon. gentlemen opposite, amendments which were diametrically opposite in character. We have had one amendment which has asked us to increase taxation, to raise the tariff, to give more in the way of protection; and we have had from the other end of the chamber an amendment for less in the way of taxation, for reduction in customs duties, for less in the way of protection. On each occasion we have met those amendments by pointing out that it was the policy of the government to pursue a moderate course, avoiding an extreme in one direction as well as an extreme in the other, to take only that course which would help to bring prosperity to this country. Our course is vindicated by the position of the country at the present time. We have the prosperity at which we have aimed, and we intend to maintain it and, if possible, to increase it. We intend to maintain and increase it by exactly the same methods as those we have adopted in the past. To-day we are confronted with amendments similar to those of previous years. If we take the amendment of hon. gentlemen opposite and strip it of its verbiage, what does it mean? More in the way of taxation, higher tariffs, more in the way of protection. On the other hand, hon. gentlemen at the other end of the chamber ask us to go a little further in reducing taxation, in reducing duties and to do much less in the way of protection.

This year differs from other years in one essential particular. This year, when the government was preparing its budget, it had before it the knowledge which is common throughout the continent, that a neighbouring country was about to make certain changes in its tariff, changes which may materially affect trade between the two countries. Trade between this country and the United States is, I believe, the greatest trade that exists between any two countries in the world, and naturally we are interested in what the citizens of the republic do with respect to matters which may affect that trade. We are interested as well in all that affects the industrial conditions of that country because, as we know from experience, matters are so interrelated in economic affairs that it is seldom that one portion of this continent is appreciably affected by depression or the opposite without other parts being also affected. We have the word of those in authority in the neighbouring republic that there are certain measures to be introduced at a special session of congress now about to assemble. An important measure, we are led to believe, is a measure relating to farm relief. Another measure relates to "limited adjustments of the tariff"; that I think is the expression which has been officially used. Having that knowledge before us, I ask hon. gentlemen irrespective of party: In the condition of prosperity which Canada is to-day enjoying would it be desirable on the part of the administration to take any action with respect to the tariff in Canada at the present time which by those across the line who may be interested in seeking to raise the tariff in that country could be regarded as provocative? I say that with the knowledge which we have before

us at the present time, were we to do what hon. gentlemen opposite by their amendment apparently wish us to do, namely raise the tariff, we would be creating in the minds of the American people the very sentiment which would cause them to raise their tariff higher perhaps than it was ever their intention to raise it. We do not intend to take any action of that provocative character.

May I say to my hon. friends opposite, in the other corner of the house, that were we to-day to take a step along the lines of increasing the British preference to a greater degree than exists at the present time that step also might be misconstrued, for we know that there are people on the other side of the line who are just as anxious to be trouble-makers as certain people on this side of the line, who are ready to misrepresent matters, and we have to take human nature as it is, and deal with it as it is. So facing the situation before us, we have followed the policy that we have followed in the past and that we shall follow at all times, of dealing with each situation as it arises in the light of the conditions as they exist at the time.

That is the position which this government took when we came into charge of the administration of the country's affairs. What did we find? We found the depressed condition that Canada was then in. We had before us the record of hon. gentlemen opposite, where year after year deficits were exhibited in the public accounts. We took the step that was necessary to deal with that situation. We put on some extra taxation so that we might be able to balance the budget and restore public confidence in the public finances of the country. The moment we had restored public confidence and balanced the budget we began to remove taxation, and to remove it steadily. We saw that if the country was to prosper, what was needed above all else was that the basic industries of the country should be made prosperous, that production should be increased. So we dealt next with the duties on the implements of production in the great basic industries. Later on there were other changes that we felt should be made, and all along, year after year, whilst moving steadily in the direction of lower tariffs and taxation, we have consistently followed a policy of dealing with each situation as it existed at the time in the light of all known circumstances, hoping always that by so doing we might further the prosperity which we enjoy at the present time. I say that that is exactly what we intend to do with respect to any situation that may arise in the future.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Hon. gentlemen opposite have been very crafty in some of their methods in debate. This year they have been perhaps a little more subtle than before. They have not wished to refer to the past, and above all else they have sought to avoid the present, and so they have sought to create—and this is what we have had all through this debate—a discussion not with respect to an existing situation but with respect to something that may or may not happen next year. They have resorted to the device of shifting discussion from the present issue and fighting in advance an imaginary tariff war. They have told us that this and that should be done, not because something is being done at the moment, but because something may be done by the government of the United States next year or during the present year. They have conjured up and talked of tariff wars. They have suggested that special sessions of parliament should be called. They have urged that legislation on the tariff should be by orders in council; they have talked about a red-blooded attitude on the part of Canada. They have chosen their ground well, because if there is one thing above another that hon. gentlemen opposite are adepts at, it is jingoist pronouncements, more particularly when they relate to the United States. But may I say to my hon. friends opposite, it is not a red-blooded attitude that is needed at the present moment so much as a cool-headed attitude, and a cool-headed attitude is the attitude which this administration has taken with regard to all tariff matters from the time it came into office, and is the attitude which we intend to continue to take during the time we are serving the people in the position which we now occupy.

May I quote to the house the two amendments that are before us. First of all, may I make this clear, that each of them, though they differ so widely, as I have indicated, are alike at least in this particular, that each is in the nature of a want of confidence motion in the administration. The Minister of Finance has asked that the house should have leave to consider ways and means of raising the revenue necessary to carry on the government of the country. Hon. gentlemen immediately opposite say: No, we will not allow this motion to carry; we ask instead that there shall be increased protection. Hon. gentlemen at the other end of the house say: No, we will not permit the house to consider ways and means; we want the government to go back and consider the question of increasing the British preference. My hon. friends know, or they ought to know, that if their motions were to carry, the government would not be

able to consider the very questions they put before us, for the simple reason that the government would no longer be in power, having been denied the right of providing the ways and means of carrying on the administration of the country's affairs. I think that should be understood by the country in viewing the action of my hon. friends when they come to vote on their amendments.

Mr. IRVINE: Why allow any amendment at all to this budget?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are times and places for amendments, but the time and place for an amendment of the kind before us is not on the budget. May I read, so that the record may be complete, the amendment which is proposed by hon. gentlemen of the official opposition? It is moved:

That all the words after the word "that" be stricken out and the following substituted therefor;

This house regrets that the financial proposals of the government make no provision for reasonably safeguarding and protecting the interests of those "engaged in agricultural pursuits or in industrial" employment in Canada.

Then—hon. gentlemen representing an opposite extreme have the following as their amendment:

That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after "house" and substituting therefor the following:

"urges upon the government the consideration of an immediate and substantial increase of the British preference as a step towards freer trade relations between Canada and other nations."

Returning now to the amendment of the Conservative party, as I have already said, that amendment means nothing other than increased protection. It is interesting to notice what has happened with respect to hon. gentlemen, opposite on the question of the tariff. During the election of 1921 and the election of 1925 and the election of 1926, we heard from hon. gentlemen opposite endless talk about the necessity for increased protection. That was openly and avowedly the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite—increased protection. Wherever they went they talked about the need of increased protection. If they went into a mining district, it was the mining industry that needed protection. If they went into a manufacturing centre, it was the manufacturing industries that needed protection. If they went into a farming district, it was some branch of agriculture or horticulture that needed protection. Wherever they went they always preached protection in relation to the industries of the particular locality. But they did not succeed in 1921; they did not succeed in 1925, and they got a knockout blow in 1926, with the result that immediately afterwards they dropped the word "protection" completely. They had their convention at Winnipeg and they drew up their tariff program, but you can search from one end to the other of that platform and you will not find the word protection" in the whole of it; there is no mention of it, they talk of the "historical fiscal policy of the Liberal-Conservative party." Then when in this house they moved their first amendment, declaratory of their fiscal policy as determined upon at the Winnipeg convention there was not the word "protection" to be found in the whole of it. The idea was there, to be sure, but it was disguised. The action of hon. gentlemen opposite reminds one of something that Lord Asquith said in the last speech which he made as leader of the Liberal party in England. In reviewing the work which the Liberal party had accomplished in the period of his leadership, he referred to an election that had taken place in Great Britain in 1905, I think it was, when the forces of protection were so completely routed that thereafter, protection on the part of its advocates never raised its head, but according to Lord Asquith, "went creeping about under modest and belittling pseudonyms"

They talked first of "tariff reform" then of "safeguarding," but studiously avoided the use of the word "protection." That is exactly what hon. gentlemen opposite have been doing here with respect to the word "protection". Their course has not even the merit of originality; it is a belated imitation of an old country pseudonym. Look at this resolution. They have got here the word "safeguarding", and they have been careful to place it in front of the word that relates more specifically to protection, to sort of shelter it; and they do not even use the word "protection", but the word "protecting", afraid to come out with a substantive but as a means of declaring their intention having resort to a participle. Let me read this resolution:

This house regrets that the financial proposals of the government make no provision for reasonably safeguarding and protecting—

Safeguarding comes first and then this participle, protecting.

—the interests of those engaged in agricultural pursuits or in industrial employment.

Last session my hon. friend was careful to avoid any use even of the participle "protecting." He told all his followers not to use it, or the word "protection," and you can look through their speeches to see how they struggled against employing it, but, here and there, a few broke loose. But after the session was over my hon. friend found the forces around him had been too strong. So

when he went down to the eastern townships and some of the counties along the American frontier where he had a chance to talk to the vegetable growers he himself began to use the word protection. He received some applause, and thought the whole community was behind it. He proceeded then much enheartened to the maritime provinces, and thinking to kill two birds with one stone, he decided to preach protection, and at the same time hy his eloquence help his friends in the provincial government at a pending election. From every parish pump, from every local wharf he preached protection. With what result? Why, the provincial government was nearly defeated. My hon. friend then went back to the west, where he was told he had been talking too much protection. Now, torn between two extremes, he puts forward this resolution, not employing the word protection, but the word "protecting," placing it after, and as it were, sheltering it with the word "safeguarding." That is the position my hon. friend is now compelled to take.

Mr. BENNETT: That is better than domination by Washington.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the position to which hon. gentlemen immediately opposite have been reduced.

Now, may I say a word to my hon. friends at the far end of this chamber with respect to their particular amendment. As they well know, the British preference has been a part of the policy of the Liberal party from the days when Sir Wilfrid Laurier introduced in the parliament of this country the first measure of British preference. This Dominion of Canada has led the empire in the matter of the British preference; and the Liberal party has led Canada. Year after year we have considered carefully wherein we could justifiably extend and increase the British preference. And may I say to my hon. friends, we intend to continue so to do from this time onward. I want no misunderstanding as to why we have to reject their resolution. It is not because we are not strongly in favour of the British preference. It is not because we have not considered it. We have made some increase in the British preference in the present budget. But I have to tell my hon. friends quite frankly, and I think they must in their hearts agree with me, that there are strong reasons why in this session above all sessions we should do as little as possible by way of change in the tariff. That we believe is the wisest course to pursue.

Next session we will, as I have already said, deal with the situation as we find it at that particular time. And we will deal with it in the interests of Canada. The Minister of Finance has, I think, in a few brief words, made very clear what the position of the government is in this matter. Let me read what he said, emphasizing that his words express the policy of the government as a whole:

> In so far as we have a fiscal problem, our task would appear to be that of readjusting, as necessity arises, our customs tariff schedules to meet new conditions, other things being equal, of favouring those countries which favour our products. It is our desire to trade freely with any and all who are willing to trade with us. What may, or may not, be possible in this particular necessarily depends in some measure on the purchasing power and the fiscal policies of other countries. The policy of this administration is not a high tariff policy; it is a low tariff policy. Its policy is to encourage production at home and the marketing of our excess of production abroad. In applying this policy both domestic and international factors must of necessity be considered.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Is that a policy or a chart?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is both. Then after reference to the tariff changes submitted to-day, the following statement is made in regard to the advisory board on tariff and taxation:

> The board is continuing its inquiries, on which substantial progress has already been made, into several larger problems which involve the consideration of whole tariff schedules and the interrelation of many important Canadian industries. While these inquiries are being pursued, opportunity will be afforded for considering the possible effect on trade of changes being proposed in the tariff schedules of other countries, should they be implemented by legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that nothing could be clearer, nothing could be more sensible, than the statement of policy as therein made by the Minister of Finance. We will be guided in the future as we have been in the past by expert advice. We will study carefully the situation as it is and proceed in the light of conditions as we find them. What we may do may not wholly please hon. gentlemen opposite, but I venture to say it will satisfy the country.

I want to make this further position clear. Of late there has been brought into the discussion of the possible adjustments of the tariff, references to the St. Lawrence waterway. Representations have been made to the effect that in some way or other these two questions were being discussed together, that the one question was being made to relate in some measure to the other. May I say that I can conceive of no greater misfortune than that the question of the St. Lawrence waterway should be mixed up in any way with the

question of the tariff of this country or of the United States. Each question must be dealt with separately on its merits.

Mr. CAHAN: Will the Prime Minister allow a question?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With pleasure.

Mr. CAHAN: Did he not himself suggest that in his correspondence with the United States?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thought my hon. friend would interrupt me at this stage, so I brought the correspondence with me. I think it illustrates exactly what I was about to say when my hon. friend interrupted.

When it comes to the working out of any international problem, the success or the failure of the negotiations will depend more than anything else on the atmosphere of trust and of confidence and of goodwill that exists between the peoples who are interested in the particular transaction. I submit that to that extent what may develop out of discussions on one subject or occasion may come to have a bearing on the solution of other questions. For this reason I think it all-important that with respect to the tariff as with respect to everything else we should at all times seek so to conduct our discussions as not to create an atmosphere that is hostile but so far as we can, strive to preserve an atmosphere of goodwill between this country and our neighbours to the south.

Now, as to my hon. friend's interjection. On January 31 1928, a communication was addressed to the United States government by our minister at Washington, which communication was based on a communication sent by the present government, and in that communication a reference was made to the tariff. But it was made in what way? In a way which illustrates the truth of what I have been saying—the wisdom of not having steps taken with respect to one policy or one question which possibly may come to prejudice the solution of some other question. Here is the statement to which my hon. friend refers. It is the only statement touching upon the tariff in all the correspondence between this government and the United States.

Mr. CAHAN: There was only one statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just one, that is right. Let me read it to my hon. friend. But before doing so, may I point this out so as to explain the context: The United States had intimated to us that they felt their western farmers were much interested in the St. Lawrence waterway and they were hoping that our people would be equally interested, as perhaps they are. And this was what was stated in reply—the reply is to the Secretary of State of the United States:

> It will therefore be observed that the transportation situation in the two countries is not identical as to available facilities, extent of use, or rates and that the economic handicaps to which you referred in your note of April 13 appear to have more application to United States than to Canadian conditions. In this connection, it may be said that Canadian agriculture is more directly affected by the restrictions on the importation of Canadian farm products which have been imposed by the United States in recent years, with the object, it is understood, of assisting agriculture in those western states which would share so largely in the benefits of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway. This situation, and the effects upon the maritime sections of Canada of United States duties on the products of the fisheries, are among the factors which have contributed to bringing it about that public opinion in Canada has not so clearly crystallized in favour of the waterway project as appears to be the case in the United States.

In other words, this observation simply emphasizes what I would seek to emphasize to-day. I think it is advisable, so far as our international relations are concerned, that those who are most concerned should have at heart at all times the possible effect of any action of one country upon the other with which it may have any dealings.

Mr. CAHAN: Will the Prime Minister allow another question. Is not the quotation which the Prime Minister has just read and which has appeared in the press of the United States, the basis of their comments, to which my right hon. friend has referred, as to the mixing of the St. Lawrence waterway and tariff questions?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think so.

Mr. BENNETT: Absolutely.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, they have an explanation now, which perhaps will help to correct it.

I wish to repeat—and I do not think this can be made too clear—that so far as the United States tariff is concerned that is a matter which the government of that country must settle for itself in accordance with its own interest. And the United States will be the first to recognize, if in any action they take our trade with them is adversely affected, that it is our right and our duty, and should be and will be our policy to see to it that we make such arrangements with respect to our tariff as will further our interests in our own way. Having said this much may I again make clear, what I wish above all else to make clear, not only in this connec-

tion but in all others, living as we do beside the United States as near neighbours, it is in the interests alike of the United States and of this country, and in the larger interests of the British Empire, that so far as we can, with respect to all our relations, we each conduct our affairs in a spirit which will help to advance mutual interest, and which will help to avoid steps that may lead in the opposite direction.

I have spoken, Mr. Speaker, at greater length than I had intended. I shall conclude by saying, with respect to the amendments which are before the house at the present time, that I hope hon. members will feel that neither amendment is at the present time in the national interest, but that it is very much in the interests of the country to allow the government to continue to carry out the policies which in the past have made for the increased prosperity which we enjoy to-day. Let us get on with the business of this session so that when we come to parliament at another session we may again present a record of further prosperity and again bring in a budget which will disclose to the people of Canada a surplus instead of a deficit, a further reduction in the public debt, and a still further reduction in taxation.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. I. D. MACDOUGALL (Inverness): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks may I congratulate the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) who spoke so eloquently this afternoon, in what was without doubt a very masterful speech which did credit to him as the Prime Minister of this country and as the leader of one of the historic political parties of Canada. I shall not attempt to follow the argument of the right hon. gentleman; his speech was devoted to a comparison of a government, his own, exercising power in times of peace, with a government headed by a Conservative leader exercising power in time of war. I shall not attempt to follow him in his argument for the simple reason that I do not consider the Prime Minister a very good authority on the difficulties, financial and otherwise, which confront a government in this country in time of war. My reason for that statement is that during those fearful days when the people of Canada were concerned only with winning the war the right hon. gentleman who to-day criticized the war government was devoting his splendid talents to the work of ironing out difficulties for the Rockefeller Institute in the United States. Consequently I do not consider him a good authority on the difficulties confronting a government in time of war.

Since I am in a congratulatory mood, Mr. Speaker, and since I will not be in that mood long, I am reminded that it is an amenity of parliament to congratulate a minister of finance upon the presentation of his budget. Even at this late date I intend no violence to such an ancient and honourable custom, but when I congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) on the present budget I must perforce explain that it is courtesy and not reason that motivates my action. In Canada we are accustomed to consider the budget from two distinct aspects: on the one hand as a tabulation of fiscal and trade figures, and on the other as an indication of public policy. Judged from the first viewpoint the present budget is in many respects satisfactory; it records a year of abounding revenues, something like $450,000,000 having been collected. But, Mr. Speaker, estimable gentleman though the Minister of Finance may be, he is not a wizard; he does not raise these revenues by waving some magic wand. There is only one source from which they come; there is only one way in which they are derived. That source is the people of Canada and that way is taxation, and when my hon. friends make the welkin ring with references to the fact that they have collected $450,000,000 in the form of revenue from the people of this country I point out to them that 90 per cent of that money was collected from the pockets of the taxpayers, either directly or indirectly, in the form of taxation. I also point out to them that this is the first occasion since Canadian confederation was consummated on which any government, Grit or Tory, has taken such an amount of money in one fiscal year from the people by way of taxation. My hon. friends may take what comfort they can from that declaration. I do not know whether they are entitled to bouquets because of that fact; if there are any bouquets to be handed out I will allow the taxpayers to give them to the Minister of Finance.

One would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that there would be a considerable reduction in taxes in view of the revenues which have been derived; one would have expected that these revenues would have been applied in order to reduce the taxes of the poor, common people of this country. But let us see what has happened. Whatever reductions have been

made have been entirely in favour of the wealthy people of this country at the expense of the poorer people. There is a canon of taxation that has been recognized by every government in every part of the civilized world; economists term it the canon of human welfare. Briefly it means that the strongest backs shall bear the heaviest burdens, that those who can best afford to pay shall pay the most, and that where relief is to be given, it shall be given those who need it most. The Minister of Finance, in his present budget, has completely violated that ancient, honourable and most equitable canon of taxation, because whatever relief is accorded in this budget by way of reduced taxation goes to those who can best afford to pay taxes.

That has been his policy in previous years; during a former session in his budget he took off the duty on angostura bitters so that the rich men of this country might have their cocktails a little cheaper; now he has reduced the tax on pullman car tickets and on telegrams and cablegrams. All these reductions affect only the rich men who can well afford to pay and should pay these taxes, but of what assistance are they to the man on the farm, the man who works in the mine, the man who goes down to the sea in ships, the artisans and workingmen of Canada? Absolutely of no assistance whatever.

The Prime Minister has to-day repeated the claim which has been made by his supporters with regard to the prosperity of Canada. There is no doubt whatever that there is prosperity in Canada; there will be prosperity under any government, because the great natural resources with which we are endowed are of such a nature that even the government in office cannot prevent prosperity from coming to this country, much as they may try and they have been trying ever since they assumed office in 1921. We must not judge the prosperity of a country by the reported surpluses in national bookkeeping; we must not judge the prosperity of a country by the reports issued by the large financial institutions. If you desire to find out whether a country is really prosperous you must not go into the mart, to the financial institutions nor to the mansions of the rich; you must go to the homes of the common people and find out how much the sum total of the human value of happiness and contentment has been increased for them by the policies of the government in power. There is considerable philosophy in those lines of the poet Markham in which he says:

> We all are blind until we see
> That in the common plan,
> Nothing is worth the making
> That does not make the man.
> Why build these temples glorious
> If man unbuilded goes,
> We build a world in vain unless
> The builder also grows.

How have the builders of this country, our farmers, our fishermen, our miners and our labouring classes fared under the policy of this government? There are only two ways by which the policies of this government can assist the common people of Canada: one is by reducing the cost of living, and the other is by putting more money into their pay envelopes. What about the rate of wages since this government assumed office? I make the statement, and I challenge contradiction from any supporter of the government, that in every industry employing over two hundred men wages have been reduced since this government came into power in 1921. Not only have they been reduced, but in some cases the reduction has amounted to as much as fifty per cent. So far as the money which goes into their pay envelopes is concerned, the workmen are worse off under the policies of this government. But someone may reply, "They may have benefited in the matter of real wages; the money wage is not important, it is what you can buy with what you get." Well do I remember the right hon. the Prime Minister—and I do not think he mentioned it in his speech this afternoon—discussing the cost of living while he was in opposition in 1920. I heard him in one of the theatres in Halifax while he was discussing that issue with a sob in his voice and a tear in his eye. He told of how the people were being crushed by the high cost of living, and how he and his government would reduce it. He has been in power since 1921; he has been carrying on his policy of fiscal folly, and what is the result? The result is that ten years after the cessation of war the cost of living is just a little higher to-day than it was at the time he made his pathetic speech in Halifax.

Let us now consider the second phase of a budget, namely, the indication of public policy. There has been no indication of a policy of any kind so far as the fiscal condition of Canada is concerned. They do not preach free trade; they do not preach protection—they know not where they stand, but they occupy that invidious position which was so vigorously condemned by our divine Lord when he said, "So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth."

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) mentioned this fiscal question in his speech

of yesterday. At this point I might say, in common with all the members of the house, that I am glad to see him again in his place in the house. He brought out a new argument in favour of free trade, in which, by the way, he does not believe. He said that the imposition of customs duties would only mean war; that the nations which raised their tariff to protect their own people, to protect their own markets for their own products, to protect their own workmen in their jobs, were paving the way for a world war. He went further and said that the policy of high tariff was condemned at the economic conference at Geneva through a resolution which was passed there condemning the policy of tariff protection. Of course it was. Why? Because those who were assembled there knew that it was a pious resolution and one which would not amount to anything. The delegates knew that the tariff was a question of internal policy, and they knew that when they had subscribed to this pious free trade resolution they could go back, as was the case with the United States delegates, and put into effect a tariff policy which would suit the needs of their own people and protect their own markets. My hon. friend seemed to take some pride in the fact that Canada, through its delegates, had been able to announce at that Geneva conference that it was the only country in the world, with the possible exception of soviet Russia, which had reduced its tariff. Then he turned around and said in effect that because we had acted differently from every other country we must be right. He puts me in mind of the fond mother who was watching a battalion of soldiers marching by. She proudly said to one of her neighbours, "See, they are all out of step but my Johnny!" The Minister of Justice seems to think that all the other countries of the world have all been wrong, and that Canada alone has been right. I ask him to contemplate the other side of the question; perhaps the rest of the world is right and Canada is wrong.

I am one of those who believe that a country like Canada, with its great diversity of natural resources, is required to maintain definitely the protective principle in its fiscal policy. In Canada we have a country unsurpassed in natural wealth. We have the wealth of farm, forest, sea and mine. We have the potentialities of becoming a great economic and industrial people. We have the opportunities to develop a wealth sufficient to maintain a population of one hundred million people within the confines of our country. When we consider a fiscal question, we must not look through the eyes of days nor yet of years; when we are legislating in respect to a matter of policy of this kind, we must look through the eyes of centuries; we must realize that we have an obligation to those who come after us and thus be ever ready to make even a little sacrifice, if that be necessary, to apply the protective principle for the sake of developing our own industries and making us, as far as possible, independent economically of foreign powers. Hon. gentlemen may say that the application of the protective principle may raise the price. What happens, though, if you fail to protect as the government is doing in relation to the steel industry to-day? If you fail to protect, what will be the position of your industries in the future? If you allow your industries to be swamped by foreign competition, to languish and to die, what will be the position in the future? You will be handing over to a foreign power the right to fix monopolistic prices in the Dominion of Canada in regard to those commodities. Even if the application of the protective principle were to mean that we would have to make some little sacrifice in the matter of price, the result will be a continuity of employment, higher wages for Canadian workmen, and an increase in the purchasing power of the people of this country. In that way we shall have real prosperity, for increased purchasing power is the only true basis on which prosperity can be established.

I spoke of the need of protection for our basic industries. Protection may mean some sacrifice, but the principle of progress is the same principle that underlies protective philosophy. What is the principle of human progress in any form? It is merely the ability and willingness of a person, or a people, or a nation, to make present sacrifices for the purpose of securing a greater future economic good. That fact is recognized by all civilized people, and that is the principle which differentiates the civilized from the uncivilized man. We may have to make little sacrifices in order to maintain the protective principle at the present time, but we must look to the days when Canada shall be supporting 100,000,000 people. We must not sacrifice our industries now; we must be prepared to apply that principle of progress, postponing the gratification of present economic wants, and guarding against the day when Canada will become, in the matter of important industries, a vassal economic state.

The Prime Minister stated this afternoon that the trade between Canada and the United States was our greatest trade. That is quite true. It is our greatest trade, but it is

greatest for the United States. Our imports from the United States are as follows:

Year	Value
1928..	$706,289,854
1929..	840,353,000

Or an increase of $134,000,000 in one year. At the same time our exports to the United States are as follows.

Year	Value
1928..	$474,000,000
1929..	497,000,000

Leaving for Canada an adverse balance of trade of $350,000,000. A large amount of that adverse balance is made up of steel and steel products, and I wish to speak about this particularly, because it is of special interest to my province. Our imports of steel and steel products from the United States are as follows:

Year	Value
1928..	$249,145,395
1929..	330,953,000

Or an increase of about $80,000,000 in steel and steel products alone in one year. We are importing at present, under the tariff of my right hon. friend, almost $1,000,000 worth of steel and steel products a day from the United States. Yet, while that is going on, we could be producing at least 50 per cent of those commodities in Canadian mills, giving employment to Canadian workmen. But they say: This is the policy we on this side of the house intend to continue. My right hon. friend said that they were satisfied with it. For my part I will never be satisfied with a policy under any government, Grit or Tory, that allows foreigners to take our markets and drives our own men out of employment.

I wish to refer now to the steel industry in Nova Scotia. That industry, as a result of the tariff tinkering of this government for a number of years, and because we have been allowing Americans to supply markets which we should have for our own steel products, has gone into liquidation. Some time ago a commission was appointed by this government—and its appointment was due to the force of public opinion—to investigate the claims of the maritime provinces. That commission visited Nova Scotia and it made a finding. It reported that a bonus should be given on every ton of coal used in the manufacture of steel in that province. That recommendation of the Duncan report has not been implemented by this government. They put up the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) the other day to defend their action and I never before heard a more faltering more lame, more feeble, more disjointed or more illogical defence than that which the Minister of National Defence gave. It was merely the application of shrewd evasion. He was not big enough to stand up in his place and say: The government, controlled by free trade sentiment, will not do this. He was not big enough to say: The government has broken faith with the province of Nova Scotia because it has not done this. But, he said: No, the government does not implement this recommendation, the recommendation of a commission of its own creation, because there are abuses in the capitalization and there is not unification of those steel and coal industries. I want to point out to my hon. friend that if there are abuses in the capitalization of the British Empire Steel Corporation to-day, he is the last man in this parliament who should speak about them. Representatives of the British Empire Steel Corporation came to a Conservative government prior to 1921 looking for a charter of incorporation and they were refused. They went back to a Liberal government, of which the Minister of National Defence was a member, and enabling legislation was passed bringing that corporation, with whatever abuses it may have had in capitalization, into existence.

Mr. RALSTON: Just to keep the record straight, I might say that my hon. friend does me undue honour. I never was a member of that government.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I should say that my hon. friend was a supporter of that government until he was defeated in 1920. We in the province of Nova Scotia claim that the recommendations of this report, made by a commission the creation of this government, should be fulfilled. When we claim that this measure of justice which has been recommended by a commission appointed by this government should be accorded us, we are told by the Minister of Finance that we are whiners. I do not care what they call me, for as long as I am in the parliament of Canada I am going to stand for justice for the province of Nova Scotia.

There is another very important industry in the economic life of the province of Nova Scotia. It is one of the oldest industries in the province. I watched my hon. friend the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) making his speech on the budget, and just when his time was about up I saw him look first at his wrist watch and then at the clock, and then he said, "I only wish I had time to devote to agriculture in Nova Scotia and to the fishing industry, which is going ahead by leaps and bounds." Let me tell the hon. minister and this house something about how

the fishing industry in Nova Scotia is going ahead by leaps and bounds, in order that we may have a correct conception of the hon. gentleman's idea of progress, because it is perhaps this very thing that is keeping this country and keeping the government back.

In 1890 there were employed in the fishing industry in Nova Scotia 28,224 men; in 1927 there were employed 16,127. This is the industry which is going ahead, according to the Minister of National Defence, "by leaps and bounds," an industry which shows a 50 per cent reduction in employment in the period since 1890. If we take the county of Yarmouth, where my hon. friend found a political harbour of safety when all others had failed, we find that in 1890 the fishing industry in that county gave employment to 1,995 men, and in 1927 that volume of employment had shrunk to 1,076. This is the industry that is going ahead by leaps and bounds, according to the Minister of National Defence. That is what a fisherman would call lobster progress.

Conditions in the fishing industry in Nova Scotia last year were so deplorable that a meeting was held of clergymen of all denominations, and I suppose of all political affiliations, to discuss the exodus of people from the fishing villages of that province. It was pointed out in the public press, over the names of representative clergymen who lived in these fishing hamlets that the fishermen were not able to clothe their children properly, or to send them to school. As a result of the agitation conducted in the province of Nova Scotia by a number of clergymen, backed up by the shore fishermen, a recommendation was made to this government that a commission be appointed to investigate the grievances of the fishermen. That commission was appointed, and it cost the taxpayers of this country in the neighbourhood of $100,000. They made their findings to this government, but I did not hear the Minister of National Defence make one single reference to that commission or to its report, nor did I hear any reference to it by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff), who last night regaled the house with forty minutes of verbal buffoonery.

Mr. DUFF: Thank you very much. I am not a statesman like you.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Neither did the Prime Minister make any reference to that report. As a Nova Scotian, realizing the seriousness of the present situation of the fishermen, with the fishing hamlets of Nova Scotia being depleted, and the report so states, I ask the Minister of National Defence to-night, what does the government intend to do about that report? I ask him if he will stand up in justice to Nova Scotia, because we in Nova Scotia look to him as our representative in the cabinet, and tell this house if the government is going to accept the minority or the majority report of that commission. I pause for an answer.

An hon. MEMBER: Go on.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Perhaps if my hon. friend will remain quiet, someone may say something which will give the minister an opportunity to get out of his difficulty in some way. I feel that the people of Nova Scotia are entitled to know what the government is going to do about that report. So far they have done nothing at all that amounts to anything. They have given us one bill that is wholly innocuous, that does nothing, that leaves the situation exactly where it was. What is the government going to do about a minister of fisheries?

Mr. STEVENS: Ask the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: The hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough has devoted his whole life to the fishing industry in the province of Nova Scotia, and a great many of us down there, Liberals and Tories alike, consider that he would make a proper minister of fisheries. It is rumoured down there that the Minister of National Defence opposes his appointment. I hope that is not true. I would welcome the appointment of my hon. friend because I believe that he knows a great deal about the fishing industry, which he has been engaged in all his life. We need somebody at the head of that department at the present time who knows something about the fishing industry because we have before us to-day a proposal to amend the Fisheries Act, and one way in which they are going to amend it is by giving Nova Scotia a statutory lobster season. Those of you who know anything about fishing in the province of Nova Scotia know that the lobster season opens at different times in different counties on account of ice and weather conditions, and if a statutory lobster season is enacted the fishermen of my county or the county of Yarmouth or of some other county might be able to fish for only ten days while the fishermen of another county could fish for twenty-five or thirty days. I have read in ancient mythology how Ajax defied the lightning, and I have read in English history how an early English king, flattered by his followers into believing that he possessed the power to command the elements, allowed himself, in order to confound them, to be taken down to the

seashore, where he commanded the incoming tide to recede, greatly to his own discomfiture. I have heard of those things, Mr. Speaker but in no other civilized country of the world have I heard of a department trying to legislate against wind and wave and drifting ice.

Another proposal in that fisheries report was for the extension of long term loans to fishermen. That has not been carried out; in fact, none of the recommendations of that report has been carried out, and the situation is very serious. For the information of the house let me read a few extracts from that report. The commission say:

> While the figures given to us in specific localities cannot always be accepted as accurate, there is abundant proof of decline in boats, small vessels, equipment and population. There is ample evidence too on every hand that young men are not entering the shore fishing industry in large numbers. This is doubtless because of its lack of promise of an adequate livelihood, rather than because of its lack of inducement as a calling; although hazardous, in itself it should be an attractive pursuit, which offers independence in labour, and which, under more favourable conditions, should yield a fairly large return for the labour and capital invested compared with other industries. A remedy—

So the commission says.

> —must therefore speedily be found, and the remedy should be prompt and drastic.

Well, it is not very prompt; but I hope it will be drastic when it comes, if it ever does.

> In default of a remedy, it is not improbable that the fishing villages of the maritime provinces may soon be even more seriously depopulated.

Those are words from the report of commissioners appointed by this government to investigate that industry, which according to the Minister of National Defence is going ahead by leaps and bounds. Now, these men either knew their business or they did not. If they did not know their business, they ought not to have been appointed as commissioners. If they did know their business, the situation they reveal is so serious that it calls for prompt action on the part of this government, and we on this side of the house demand that such prompt action be taken.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am one of those who believe in the maintenance of the protective principle in the fiscal policy of our country. I believe that the Canadian market should be protected in so far as possible for Canadian producers; I believe that Canadian labour should be given a preference in Canada; I believe that Canadian products should be transported over Canadian railways and shipped through Canadian ports. That is the historic policy of the great party to which it is my privilege to belong, and because that is its policy I belong to it.

But there is something else needed, Mr. Speaker. We need in power to-day a government that will protect the interests of the common people and give them a chance to live; that will develop the great wealth of farm, forest, sea and mine; that will make available to our people the myriad opportunities which this great young country should present to them. We need a government that is able to take, and will take, courageous action in the defence of Canada and the Canadian people when it is needed in the matter of tariff application. But—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Time.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I thank you.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I hope my young and sympathetic friend from Inverness (Mr. Macdougall) will not think it discourteous on my part if I do not follow him in his remarks. My intention is to devote what I have to say mainly to the subamendment proposed by the member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer).

Last session, with the greatest of pleasure I supported my friends in their subamendment to the budget, but I am forced to say that on this occasion I am far away from the position they take. Let us look at their motion. It is short. It—

> —urges upon the government the consideration of an immediate and substantial increase of the British preference as a step towards freer trade relations between Canada and other nations.

Ever since this subamendment was moved I have studied it in an endeavour to find out what my friends are aiming at. Had they worded their motion in this form:

> —urges upon the government the consideration of an immediate and substantial increase of the British preference as a step towards closer trade relations between Canada and other British countries,

I could understand it. Or had they advocated a general policy of preference as a step towards freer trade relations between Canada and other nations, again I could have understood their purpose. But I think I demonstrated two years ago, and I will demonstrate this evening, that the most efficient manner in which this government can be helped or forced to adhere to a standpat attitude in tariff matters is precisely to be found in the policy advocated to-day by members in the opposite corner.

I wonder if they have ever gone over the history of the British preference policy as introduced and applied in Canada. The mem-

ber for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) made a very timely remark the other day when he said the first advocate of this policy was Sir Charles Tupper. Even before he became leader of the Tory party, when he was still High Commissioner in London, Sir Charles was actively engaged in furthering the policy launched by Joseph Chamberlain as a protective policy for the British Empire. As everybody knows, Chamberlain's dream was to organize the British Empire on the pattern of the German empire—not the liberal-minded German empire, but the Tory, Prussianized fabric which aimed at creating economic as well as military domination on the continent of Europe. Chamberlain, so aptly described by Gladstone as the first English politician of the Yankee type, wanted to induce the English people to imitate at once the Yankee policy and the Prussian policy. One of his main arguments was that the British Empire should be self-sustaining in matters economic just as was the German empire and the great American commonwealth. Sir Charles Tupper caught that idea with enthusiasm, and became an apostle of inter-imperial preferential trade as advocated by Chamberlain.

This was the position when the general election of 1896 took place. Three years before, the Liberal party, at their famous national convention held here in Ottawa, had pledged themselves to the wiping out of every vestige of protection. But when the general election came they accepted subscriptions from the manufacturers' association. Therefore once the election was over they had to make a composition between their pre-election pledges against protection and the pro-election assistance they had received from the people interested in maintaining protection. It was then that they caught up that cunning device of the British preference, which on the one hand they offered to the "free trade on principle" Liberals as a reduction of the tariff, and on the other hand to the protected manufacturers as an obstacle to any further reduction in the tariff. The difference between the preferential policy as advocated by Joseph Chamberlain and Sir Charles Tupper, and the British preference as adopted by the Liberal government of Canada in 1897 was this: The genuine article was to be a protective policy for the whole British Empire; as adopted by the Liberal government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier it was a protective policy for British capital, for British industry and for British labour, as against Canadian capital, Canadian labour and Canadian industry. As a matter of fact it worked out largely in that way, with the result that all or most of the complaints that arose from the industrial sections, at least in the province of Quebec, as against foreign competition, arose from the operation of the preferential tariff.

Mr. EVANS: Was protection in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's mind when he introduced the British preference in 1897?

Mr. BOURASSA: I cannot say. I never try to find out what is in people's minds. I simply try to put a reasonable construction upon their actions. The policy advocated by the fullfledged imperialist Tory protectionist was an all-round tariff for the whole British Empire. The policy as devised and applied by the Liberal government of 1897 was a combination of their pre-election free trade principles and of the Tory imperialist protective policy. It worked to this effect, that it not only enabled the British manufacturer to take advantage of it as against foreign competition in Canada, but also enabled some skilful English agents of continental manufacturers to have goods made in France, but more especially in Belgium, Holland and Germany, finished to about 85 or 90 per cent, brought into England, marked as British goods, and entered as such into Canada under the preferential tariff. That practice was inaugurated about 1899-1900, and it has continued ever since. So that this so-called policy tending towards freer trade resulted as a matter of fact in a measure of protection for the British manufacturer, for the British trades agent, for the Dutch manufacturer, for the Belgian manufacturer and for the French manufacturer. There is only one class of industrialists that has not benefited by it, and that is the Canadian industrialists. From the moment this was discovered there was a tendency on the part of the Liberal government of that day to revise their policy. As a matter of fact, at the imperial conference of 1902, Mr. Fielding served notice upon the British government that unless, by some measure of reciprocity, they implemented their recognition of the advances made by the Canadian parliament and the Canadian people, the Canadian government would revise their policy in favour of the Canadian producer. This was never done except in minor instances.

Then came in England the famous campaign to which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) made allusion this afternoon—the tariff revision campaign in which Mr. Joseph Chamberlain displayed, perhaps to the highest degree possible, all his political activities and, with qualification, his genius. In that campaign Mr. Asquith, later Lord Asquith, was the main political instrument which de-

feated Mr. Chamberlain's advocacy. But what really carried the day as against the Tory-Prussian-Yankee policy of Mr. Chamberlain was the common sense of the British people, who did not wish to have a new pattern imposed upon them, but preferred rather to stick to the policy which has made Great Britain what she is to-day, the mistress of industry and trade the world over. What I cannot understand is that good Canadians, whether they call themselves Liberals or Progressives, who appear to sympathize with either the fiscal or the general policy of the Liberals or the radicals of England, should cling to that so-called British preferential tariff, which is the one hope of the Tory imperialist protectionists to regain in the future what they lost in 1905.

Mr. KENNEDY: Is my hon. friend advocating the wiping out of the preference?

Mr. BOURASSA: If the hon. gentleman will allow me to proceed I will make myself clear.

The Prime Minister, in his very clever speech this afternoon, quoted Mr. Asquith in reference to the devious way in which the English protectionists are endeavouring to bring back to life the corpse which was interred in 1905 under the name of tariff reform or protection for British industry. As he said, they call it the safeguarding of industries; but by whatever term they may describe it it is the same thing. But apparently the right hon. gentleman does not realize that the policy which my excellent friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) commended so highly yesterday, the policy which hon. gentlemen to the right here would like to see carried further, is precisely one of those devices invented by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain and kept up by the English Tory imperialists, to disguise the real thing, protection, at which they have been aiming for the last twenty-five years. My position in that regard is curious. I voted in 1897 for the adoption of that British preference. I was then, as the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) was when he came into the house three years later, what might be called a moderate protectionist. I belonged to that young generation of Liberals of those days who had been more or less influenced by the appeals—the frantic appeals—of the Conservative party in favour of the national policy. I do not censure my hon. friend from South Wellington because he has gone to the logical extreme of his protectionist tendencies. I took the opposite road. Ever since the war especially, and the more I have studied the economics of all countries as connected with the general trend of policies, as connected with the great problem of international relations, the more I have become convinced that protection is a fallacy; the more convinced I am that the so-called system of preferences, whether they be between British countries or between foreign countries, is merely a disguised method of keeping up that false policy of protection. In other words, I have followed a different path, and like my friend from South Wellington I have reached its logical conclusion: And because I am opposed to protection I am opposed to the British preferential tariff.

The Minister of Justice quoted a part of the report of the Geneva conference, that part in which the reduction of tariffs is advocated and which the minister has opposed to the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Wellington. But the minister could have quoted another passage from the same report, appearing at page 22 of our reprint of it. Let me quote it:

> The experience of the years since the war proves that import and export prohibitions, and the arbitrary practices and disguised discriminations which result therefrom, together with the obstacles of all kinds placed on the circulation of goods and capital, have had deplorable results by hampering the normal play of competition, by imperilling both the essential supplies of some nations and the not less indispensable markets of others, and by bringing about an artificial organization of production, distribution and consumption.

For these reasons they have condemned all such disguised measures of discrimination which help to maintain high tariffs. But to understand the bearing of this paragraph one must know the origin of these resolutions, unanimously adopted in the month of May at Geneva. Everyone knows—that is, everyone who is sufficiently informed—that practically speaking the gist of that report was prepared six months in advance in London by that very able economist, perhaps the ablest economist to-day in the Anglo-Saxon world, Sir George Paish. He sent a precis of that report to the leading bankers and financial men of Europe, from all of whom he received replies. The report, together with the replies, was published in the Times issue of October 20, 1926. I happened to be in London at the time; it was a few days before my hon. friend arrived with the Prime Minister to take part in the imperial conference to be held very shortly. I was struck immediately with the answers of the French and the Italian bankers consulted by Sir George Paish. Here is the essential paragraph of the French answer:

> Ils pensent à cet égard, que l'élévation ou la rigidité excessives de certains systèmes tari-

faires, les exagérations directes ou indirectes de protectionisme, de discrimination ou de préférence, les obstacles apportés aux transactions internationales par des réglementations abusives des transports, doivent être condamnés.

Ils se déclarent en conséquence favorables à toutes mesures qui tendraient à la suppression de telles barrières artificielles, qui s'opposent à la libre reprise des relations économiques d'avant-guerre entre les nations.

This answer was subscribed to by such men as Horace Finaly, Directeur général de la Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, R. Laederich, Régent de la Banque de France, R. Masson, Directeur général du Crédit Lyonnais. The Italian answer was still more to the point; fortunately it was in English, so all the members of the house will be able to understand it.

Mr. JACOBS: What about the French?

Mr. BOURASSA: At least those members of this house whose education has been completed, as is the case with my hon. friend, will have the advantage of understanding both. The Italian reply was as follows:

The undersigned, whilst signifying their agreement with the spirit which has dictated the above manifesto, wish to place on record that had it been possible for them to cooperate in the framing of the document, they would have preferred to give a different and more precise form to some of its passages. Above all, they would have liked that criticism should have been exercised not only as regards the excessive height of customs tariffs and the rigidity of customs regulations in force in some countries, but also in respect of all the numerous forms of direct or indirect protection, discriminations or preferences, artificial subsidies and restrictions on emigration.

With such reservations they willingly subscribe to the manifesto.

As I have already said, I happened to be in London then and I had occasion to meet some of the men who were instrumental in preparing the program for the next Geneva economic conference. Naturally they were struck, as I was, with these replies, and saw the difficulty immediately; they realized that in order to obtain a unanimous vote at the economic conference to be held in Geneva six months later they at once had to satisfy the legitimate protests of the French and the Italians,—of the Germans also, who thought likewise but who did not care to express their views in writing,—and generally all other peoples, while at the same time avoiding the embarrassing position of antagonizing the Canadians and Australians present at that conference in order to please the foreigners. So this milder form which I read a moment ago was adopted unanimously by the conference, leaving out the word "preference" but keeping in the body of the report the protests of the French and Italians and leaving it to the intelligence of economists and statesmen to realize that by "discrimination," as a form of indirect protection, they meant such measures of preferential tariffs as we have in Canada and as they have adopted in Australia and South Africa. Once before, I compared this attitude with the truce offered by Mr. Winston Churchill, a few years before the war, when on the one hand he was proposing to the German government that Great Britain would curtail its program of shipbuilding to a certain number of ships if Germany would do likewise,—in the proportion of 16 to 10 if I remember correctly,—while at the same time he was encouraging Canada and Australia to build those ships which England would agree not to build, under the concealed condition that if war arose all the ships would be banded together and England thereby would maintain the same ratio of superiority which she agreed to reduce.

Naturally the foreigners were no more deceived in 1926 than the Germans had been in 1912; and one of the reasons why this report has not been followed up by practical action is simply because there stands to-day in the way of a general scaling down of tariffs the world over what remains of the Tory imperialistic policy fostered by Joseph Chamberlain and partly adopted by Canada and Australia. Because I have discarded all that I held in my young and crude days of faith in protection, for the last ten years I have never ceased to denounce this so-called British preference which, as I have explained, is just as much a preference in favour of the continental manufacturer and labourer as it is in favour of the British labourer and manufacturer. It is one of the obstacles to the adoption of a low tariff policy by Canada or Australia, and it is one of the foundations upon which British protectionists have laid and now maintain their hopes for the future. That is my first and main reason for not accepting the subamendment proposed by the hon. member for Battle River.

The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy) has put to me a very pertinent question; he has asked me if I would advocate the immediate wiping out of the British preference. Of course I would not. I agree fully and unreservedly with the closing words of the Prime Minister this afternoon; and once more I find myself in a more British state of mind than many of my so-called Anglo-Saxon colleagues in this house. I do not believe in a precipitous policy. I think it was wrong to adopt the British preference in the first place; we did it in good faith, but I think we must

prepare for a revision of that policy and of our whole fiscal policy as well by way of a scaling down of the tariff; but we cannot do it all at once. I think the Prime Minister struck the right note when he said that just at the time there may be a change for the better or for the worse—we do not know—in our neighbour to the south, is not the time for this government either to make or to announce any radical change in its fiscal policy. What is the use of boasting, like big children, that we can either play with the United States or quarrel with them? A tariff war as between Canada and the United States would be just as foolish, just as senseless and just as suicidal as a physical war against that great country.

We must face the facts as they are. Where can we find on the continent of America allies who will support us in either a fiscal or a physical war against the United States? Are we to apply to Senor Calles or his brigand successor to help us out against that country? Those Mexicans already are pawns in the hands of the American government. No, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is absolutely right when he says that we must frame and maintain a sensible, moderate policy according to circumstances, which will suit the requirements of the Canadian people from time to time. We need not frame our policy to suit or to antagonize the Americans or to suit or antagonize the British or any other people on earth. It was a foolish thing to introduce the factor of sentiment into our fiscal policy in 1897; it would be just as foolish to introduce another form of sentiment, wicked sentiment this time, against the United States, in any change we may make in that policy. Let us play our game according to our own situation and our own strength. If the American market is to be closed to us to a greater extent than is the case to-day, I suggest, not as a set policy but as one of the factors of our economic situation which always must be in the minds of the men who are responsible for our government, that they must prepare to find some other markets. The greater our production becomes the greater will be the necessity of going further away for markets, at least so long as that great consuming market of 120,000,000 people is closed to a large extent. Therefore again in that respect I approve of the policy generally pursued by this government in looking out for other markets for our export trade. But, just as the maintenance of the British preference is the main obstacle to the reduction of our tariff generally, as far as our internal fiscal policy is concerned, so the maintenance of that British preference is the main obstacle to our making trade relations easy with the other countries of the world. I stated a moment ago that I supported the policy thirty-two years ago; but at that time it differed very widely in principle from what it is to-day. The preferential policy adopted in 1897 was a standing offer by Canada of reciprocity with any country, British or foreign, which was prepared to trade with us on fair terms. It was first offered to Great Britain because of the trade relations with her, and there was no objection to that, although Great Britain did not give us anything in return in those days. The British treated us just as they treated the Americans or any other people, because they had the sense to frame their fiscal policies according to the needs of their economic life and not according to some foolish outburst of sentiment. Sentiment has its place, but common sense and business principles should apply where it it is a question of business. This is one of the many things we have to learn from the people on the other side.

Let us frame our policy for Canada as the British have framed their policy for Great Britain. I think that is the best tribute we can pay to British genius with regard to matters of policy or of economics, and it is a tribute they would appreciate. They do not appreciate that kind of soft water loyalty carried into the sphere of business; they simply laugh up their sleeves at us, and they are doing only what is right. They think we are still children, acting like children, shouting like children and singing like children, but not trading like men. The best manner in which to approach the British, or any other people on earth, is by taking business seriously and acting in a business-like manner when it is a question of business. When it is a question of sentiment or a display of friendship, talk and sing sentiment as much as you like, but when it is a question of business, deal with it from a business point of view. I always thought that that was the point of view of my friends from the west. I always thought that they desired a change from indirect to direct taxation; but their advocacy of the maintenance of and increase in the British preference is the most concrete obstacle they could put in the way of the carrying out of what I have always considered to be their main policy.

If we are to do something tangible towards carrying out the resolutions which were adopted at Geneva last year for the establishment of economic peace, for the elimination of obstacles to trade, the establishment of a liberty of trade which would permit

a freer exchange between producers and consumers, then we should begin in the right way. We cannot frame the policy of the Americans, nor can we frame the policies of the French, Germans, Belgians or British, but we can frame our own policy. We can put into practice one of the measures which was unanimously advocated at Geneva. The word "preferences" was left aside, as the word "protection" has been left aside as far as the amendment—which will be presented to us after we have disposed of the subamendment—is concerned. But if we are to carry out the spirit which animated that conference at Geneva, then we have one thing to do first, and that is to do away with the obstacle which we have raised—of which we are the sole masters, upon which we do not need to consult the British, Australians, Americans, Germans or the French—that is, do away with our preferential tariff; and then we will be in a position to deal with the rest of the problem on a footing of equality. The French and the Italians saw that quite clearly. Say what you like of their general policy—as far as I am concerned, I am far from being an admirer of French or Italian policies generally—although they do not command the world as do the United States or Great Britain, in the science of economics and in the keen perception of economic laws, the French and Italians can teach many lessons to our leading business men. I will admit that they would have no lessons to give as far as the actual practice goes, but it is a different thing when it comes to theory. They understood that the maintenance of this preference would be the main obstacle to the establishment of economic peace the world over and to the removal of the artificial aids which were adopted during the war or the deflation of money, but they also saw that it was the main obstacle to the general scaling down of tariffs the world over.

I can understand that sincere protectionists like the Tory party—and most of them are sincere protectionists—would advocate the maintenance of the British preference, because they always hope that their protectionist friends in Great Britain might meet them with a similar policy. I think Sir Charles Tupper was right when he said that it was undignified, that it was contrary to the principles of the national policy, as advocated by Sir John Macdonald and himself twenty years previous, for Canada to maintain that preference in the face of the refusal by the British to reciprocate. However, there is a certain logic in the Tory protectionists refusing to wipe out the British preference, but I cannot understand the Liberals or Progressives, who I believe are sincere in their advocacy of freer trade, wanting to scale down the tariff and at the same time advocating the maintenance and the increase of the main obstacle to a reduction of the tariff.

Therefore, for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I propose to vote against the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Battle River, because I believe in a real tendency towards freer trade, and I hope the time will come when it will be possible to adopt that policy.

As far as the amendment proposed by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) is concerned, I can only say that I haver heard this argument for the last fifty years. As the Prime Minister said, the only change is in the wording; it is the same old panacea of protection which is offered from time to time, from year to year, and from half century to half century. We have suffered from that delusion more than from anything else. The maintenance of this protective policy is one of the reasons why Canada has lost a large proportion of its people. But, at the same time, I do not think it would be wise to make the change all at once, to destroy all at once the evils which have grown upon us during the last fifty years and, therefore, I think the government has taken the wise position in refusing to make any substantial change in the tariff.

At the same time they must prepare for those two things: revision of the preferential tariff in order to remove that obstacle to economic progress the world over, and, second, revision of their tariff policy as soon as they can by a downward scaling of the tariff. I repeat to-night what I have said time and again, because it is very difficult to make people believe it, that in the province of Quebec, apart from a handful of men who control a few industries in Montreal and Quebec and two-thirds of the press of that province, the mass of the people, who are not impressed by the Bank of Montreal or its clients, or by the Montreal Gazette, or the Montreal Star, or L'Evénement, or La Patrie, believe to-day, as they did fifty years ago, that there may be some measure of protection to some national industries; but they have never been, never are and never will be the kind of protectionists they have been painted to be to the deluded people of the west. I repeat to my western friends: if they expect some sympathy in Quebec, they must not endeavour to undo with one hand what they are endeavouring to get with the other; and if they do not find sympathy

in Quebec and in the maritime provinces for the further and serious revision of the fiscal policy of Canada, it will surely not be in protectionist Ontario they will get it. It is this friendly advice I wanted to give them, just as I desire to repeat to the government what I have said to them for the last ten years: if they really want to revise in the future the tariff policy, they must be prepared in due time, with prudence and patience, to revise also that preferential policy which they borrowed from the Tory party in England and the Tory party in Canada.

Mr. GEORGE SPOTTON (North Huron): At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read the amendment as moved by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), because there seems to have been some misunderstanding, intentional or otherwise, in connection with this amendment. Any person who understands English and who does not wish to misrepresent matters, will find that there is not a word in this amendment regarding higher protection. In fact, if there was a syllable in it recommending higher protection for this country, I would not support the resolution either by voice or vote. It reads:

That all the words after the word "that" be stricken out and the following substituted therefor:

This house regrets that the financial proposals of the government make no provision for reasonably safeguarding and protecting—

Not industries, not the manufacturing concerns, not any great corporation, but safeguarding and protecting—

—the interests of those "engaged in agricultural pursuits—

—that means farmers—

—or in industrial" employment in Canada.

Those are the men who carry the dinner pail, who toil from early morning until late at night, and who are handed a lemon while the manufacturing corporation cuts the melon. Those who are referred to in the amendment are the agriculturists and the industrial workers. There is not in the amendment a word about high protection for any industry in the Dominion of Canada.

Since the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) referred to me last year as a Tory, I should like to make a little correction. This amendment is brought in by the Liberal-Conservative party. I am sorry the Minister of Finance is not in his seat. I suggested to him last year that I should prefer that he call me a Liberal-Conservative. We had in this country a government, the Baldwin-Lafontaine administration, which resigned in 1851, on account of the radical element in the Reform party in those days. Baldwin went into retirement; Lafontaine took a judicial position in Quebec, and they were succeeded by Morin and Hincks. After the election of 1854 that government found itself very much in the position in which the present administration found itself in 1925, in that they had not a majority in the house; that there were several groups. But unlike this administration they did not attempt to carry on. These were the groups that were elected, as laid down in history, and I am quoting from the high school history used in Ontario. It is corroborated by every other history that will be found in the public libraries of Canada:

(1) The Tories, the remnant of the Family Compact, led by Sir Allan MacNab.

(2) Moderate Tories, calling themselves Conservatives, under the rising star of Macdonald.

(3) The moderate Liberals under Hincks, who formed the largest single group.

(4) The "Clear Grits," whose early leaders had been William Lyon Mackenzie and Dr. John Rolph, two of the rebels of 1837, but who now acknowledged the leadership of Mr. George Brown, editor of the Toronto Globe. Brown (1818-1880) was a young Scotchman, who had come out in 1843, and who gave his tireless energy to fighting what he considered abuses. The Grits were the anti-privilege men; they saw that the Roman Catholic Church had certain privileges, and attacked them; they saw that the seigniors had certain privileges, and denounced them. For the same reason they denounced the clergy reserves and separate schools.

In Lower Canada (5) the so-called Liberals under Morin and (6) the "Parti Rouge", or "Reds".

(7) The English in Montreal and the eastern townships, led by Galt.

In Upper Canada, now that responsible government had become an established fact, the differences between moderate Liberals and moderate Conservatives had become very small. The way was thus cleared for the moderate men in both provinces to unite to form a new party. In 1854 Macdonald succeeded in uniting the moderate Conservatives and the moderate Liberals of both provinces under the title of Liberal-Conservatives, under the leadership of Sir John Macdonald, and he was joined by most of the Tories. This coalition was bitterly attacked by extreme men on both sides, but Robert Baldwin came out of his retirement for a moment to approve of it; it was surely time for a party which represented the views of the moderate men of both races. Of the new party the Upper Canadian leader was Sir Allan MacNab, but in the next year he was quietly shelved in favour of Macdonald.

I do not see how the Reform party can claim any connection with him: The moderate Liberals, who were the largest group, and the moderate Conservatives, who were the second largest, united under Sir John Macdonald and they were called the Liberal-Conservative party. Where the Reform party ever got a license to call themselves Liberals

is more than I can find in the pages of history. I have in my library Hansard almost from the first time it was published, and looking over all the Hansards as I have done, it seems to have been the bounden duty of every government after they have been one year in office —and it takes them about a year to get things well oiled and greased and running smoothly —to claim in every speech from the throne that the country is prosperous. The next year it is more prosperous, the third year more prosperous still, and so on. This administration is something like Doctor Coué: every day, in every way, they are growing better and better. But this seems to be a duty which followers of an administration must perform. They will admit in private that things are not prosperous in the country, but, in their public speeches they must proclaim that Canada is prosperous. In past history, when any young country was prosperous it always increased in population, yet under this administration since 1921, notwithstanding the fact that they have spent $16,000,000 on immigration, to bring in 660,000 immigrants and drive out 700,000 people, we are not keeping even our natural increase. I wonder why so many are leaving for a foreign soil when this country is so prosperous. But I will come back to that in a moment.

I should like to use as my text to-night a statement of the Hon. Thomas A. Crerar, made in Winnipeg after he had attended a convention in Regina on August 6, 1925. He says:

> In the minds of many thoughtful people the course of the present government at Ottawa on domestic affairs has been marked by inefficiency and drift.

Inefficiency and drift. Those are not my words, Mr. Speaker. They are the considered opinion of the Hon. Thomas A. Crerar. He goes on to say:

> That the King administration had largely failed to implement its platform on tariff and had largely failed to introduce economies in public expenditures that would lead to reduced taxation, which was imperative; that the financial condition of the country was extremely serious, and that as Canada could not longer support a burden of taxation such as we have at present in the face of reductions of taxation in the United States alongside of us, this condition of affairs might have very serious consequences.

If the speech made by the Prime Minister this afternoon had been made on the hustings during an election campaign, I could have congratulated him upon his excellent stump speech, but in the parliament of Canada the Prime Minister is supposed to have vision, and to lead and point the way. But I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what high-sounding note of statesmanship fell from his lips to-day? We knew nothing more about his policy, if indeed he has one, when he sat down than when he rose. I heard the Prime Minister speak in my own county, in a grove at Exeter, when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) was with him. I heard him make just as good a stump speech there as he did this afternoon, but it did not mean a thing. He advocated some kind of reform of the senate, as he has done in this house, and he had an example before him—I think he must have been a teacher at one time, because he believes in teaching by example. He had on the platform with him a senator who has since gone to his reward, and after the Prime Minister had said, "I have appointed this man with strings to him, and I can pull them at any time. He must support any legislation that I may propose for the reform of the senate," this senator got up and said, "Yes, that is correct. I was appointed under those conditions." A fine way for the members of the other chamber, who are supposed to sit as judges in the land, to be appointed, that when "Bunty pulls the strings" they will obey his order. Right in this house in 1924 the Prime Minister made a characteristic grandstand gesture in regard to reforming the senate. He told the country prior to the opening of the session that the government were considering legislation looking to a curtailment of the powers of the senate, but that the government were anxious that the country should be convinced of the necessity before pressing it on the attention of parliament. He assured the House of Commons:

> I desire to assure the house that when parliament reassembles steps will be taken by the government to obtain, if possible, means whereby bills may be enacted by and with the advice and consent of the House of Commons under conditions similar in principle to those which have been sanctioned by the parliament of the United Kingdom.

He was asked by the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen just what steps he proposed to take, and the Prime Minister declared that the government would consider the matter during the recess. Well, the recess passed, the house opened, and the Prime Minister informed the house that he proposed to call a conference with the provinces upon the question. Near the end of the session, on June 18, 1925, Mr. Meighen again asked whether the government had anything to lay before the proposed conference, and the Prime Minister replied that the government had considered no recommendations and had nothing to offer, but would take up the matter in the recess. Sir, there have been many recesses and many sessions since then, and I can only think that the gestures of the Prime Minister were made

for vote-catching purposes. I take it, sir that when I heard the Prime Minister in that grove at Exeter declare that he would reform the senate, either he meant what he said or he did not. If he meant it, what does he propose to do to-day about it? If he did not mean it, then I ask this house and this country what construction can they put upon future pledges when a pledge like this one was so solemly given and so lightly broken?

Again, speaking at Richmond Hill, and I remember that he spoke in the same way at Exeter, the Prime Minister said that he had been handicapped by lack of a majority behind him in the house. He had in the back of his head some great beneficent and benign legislation for the good of the people of this country, but he did not have the necessary majority to crystallize his ideas into legislation, and he pleaded with the people all through that campaign to send him back with a stronger following in the house, or he would refuse to carry on. Well, Mr. Speaker, he went to the country with 117 members behind him and he came back with 101 members, and still he hung on, notwithstanding that he was defeated; he tried to direct the government of this Dominion from the galleries, and he thought that I should not enter the house because I did not have a permanent leader at the time of my election.

Those were two of the promises which the Prime Minister made. He also said that he would lower the cost of farm implements to the farmers of Canada. So far as Ontario is concerned, farm implements are no cheaper to-day than the day on which the Prime Minister made that statement. He also said that he would reduce the cost of living for the common people. Yet the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) tells us that the cost of living is higher to-day than it was then. But I am not going to take up further time to enumerate further promises which this government has broken. This administration is long on promises and short on performance.

The Prime Minister said this afternoon that the government had done a great deal for the farmers of Canada. I have prepared a little budget for a 100-acre farmer in my constituency. He does not agree with me politically, but he has a good 100 acres of land, and that land with the implements and the stock on it are valued at about $10,000. I submitted this little budget which I prepared and which was approved by some of my agricultural friends. This farmer has $10,000 invested in his plant. He has as good a right to have interest on his capital investment as any business man in this land, and 7 per cent on $10,000 is $700. I know there are men in this house who think that anybody can farm at a profit. There are men who have made a success in other lines of business who think that anybody can make a success in the science of agriculture, but I want to tell you Mr. Speaker, that it takes a man of special calibre, special fitness and special training to make any kind of success in agriculture at the present time. I am also allowing in this budget a salary of $1,200, or $100 a month, or $23 a week to the farmer. Surely the man who has the ability to manage a farm and toils from the rising to the setting of the sun should be allowed $23 a week, or as much as a mechanic in a factory; that is, $1,200 a year. His taxes and insurance cost him $100; depreciation on buildings and fences $200; depreciation on implements, work horses, harness, and so on, $100. His wife is more than a housekeeper; she spends at least half her time with the poultry and the dairy, and I am allowing her the magnificent salary of $12.50 a month; that would be $150 a year. He cannot run this farm alone, he usually has a son fifteen, sixteen or seventeen years of age, who, if he were in the city would be earning some money; I am allowing that boy $7 a week—$365 a year. Then, as governments always have a place for contingencies or incidentals, I am allowing the farmer incidentals of $185. This means that on his 100 acres of land he would have to make $3,000 in order to secure a bare living. According to the Minister of Labour that would leave nothing for clothing and many other articles; it would just be a bare living and interest on his investment. Now, to make him prosperous I think he should have $1,000 a year to the good if he wishes to send his children to high school and later to university. This would give him $4,000 a year, which I think a man ought to make on 100 acres of land in my county before you can say farming there is prosperous. I leave it to the judgment of this house and, as government members say, "to the country"—they are always particular about the country—whether or not 100 acres of land should return the farmer-owner this sum of money annually.

A farmer—not of my political persuasion—has given this definition of a farm: "It is a piece of land surrounded by prosperity." Well now, if it is bounded on the east by banks and trust companies, on the north by great manufacturing and industrial concerns, on the west by brokers and so on, and on the south by departmental stores and chain stores, then I think the definition is correct.

Now, this is how prosperous the farmers are in my county. I am borne out in this statement by my colleague from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), as appears from his speech in Hansard, where he states that his constituents call him in and discuss very seriously whether they should advise their sons to stay on or to leave the farm.

There has been a revaluation of soldier lands. A soldier in one of my good townships had a loan of $4,200. The government inspector came around and allowed him $1,000 off the loan. The man thought that was not sufficient and referred the inspector to the reeve of the township. The reeve said: In our township council we passed unanimously a resolution that the farm lands in the township of Morris are to-day worth only 60 per cent of what they were worth in 1920. The assessor came around and said to the soldier: "Your farmer would not sell for more than $2,800." As against this the government inspector would knock off $1,000. In the older settled parts of Ontario almost every farm is for sale, and there are very few buyers. There are lots of farms for sale in the county of Huron, one of the best agricultural counties in the Dominion, a county where we have as intelligent farmers and as industrious farmers as are to be found in the province. If that is the case there, I ask where is the prosperity that is supposed to be enjoyed by the farming community of Ontario?

The farmer used to be able to take down a carload of hogs to Toronto and have five packing houses competing for his stock. But under this government the accumulation of capital in the hands of the big interests has resulted in four of these packing houses amalgamating. Now there is practically no competition on the live stock market, and the farmer has to sell his hogs and cattle to this combine at their own price. I saw an article the other day in the Globe stating that all the vinegar factories of Canada are uniting, and that it would place them in "an enviable position." To-day the farmer has to sell to combines and buy from combines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to be compelled to pursue this line, and I do it with no pleasure at all. We have had hon. members on the other side of the house read financial statement after financial statement to show that the country is prosperous. Why, certainly it is, and where you find these companies is the only place where there is any prosperity. Take The Robert Simpson Company in Toronto, one of the best departmental stores in the Dominion. After paying interest on their investment and putting money away to meet depreciation and contingencies, they show a profit of about two million dollars. That company may have twenty thousand employees, but they are not getting a dollar more than they did in 1921, and to-day the dollar is not going quite so far as it did then. Stockholders prosperous! Yes, one hundred stockholders probably; but the twenty thousand employees, the people who live in the cottages, the bulwark of the nation, are not as prosperous as they were. Recently a millionaire in the city of Toronto gave a million dollars to a charitable institution. God bless him. But right in his own company there are single men earning only from $12 to $16 a week, and married men earning only from $18 to $20 a week. The millionaire is more prosperous; but what about these men who are working in his institution?

A few years ago a widow showed me a letter she had received from the Toronto General Trusts Corporation, one of the best trust companies in the land—they always do what they say they will do, and do it on the minute. I am simply using this as an illustration. They told her: Money is not worth as much as it was, and we cannot pay you 5¾ per cent. If you care to leave it with us we will pay you 5½ per cent. Periodically she received similar letters until her interest had dwindled down to 5 per cent. In contrast to this, out comes a financial statement that the Toronto General Trusts Corporation have had the best year in their history. The hundred men or so who control the company are prosperous; but the fifty thousand men and women who have their money invested with the corporation have less to live on, and their dollar does not go as far as it used to. I ask you, sir, where is the much-vaunted prosperity? But I must not dwell further along this line.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that the township councils, the women's institutes, the churches, the United Farmers' clubs of my constituency have been urging upon me to ask this government to get out of the rum-running business. I trust I shall be understood. They plead with the government of Canada to get out of the rum-running business. Either we are in it or we are not. For the sake of a few millions of ill-gotten dollars it is painful to read the incidents of the rum-running business which recently have appeared in the press. Only to-day I noticed in a newspaper that fourteen rum-runners from Canada landed a cargo at Atlantic City worth a quarter of a million dollars. We in the riding of North Huron, sir, wish to dissociate ourselves from such a business, and

we call upon the government to implement the recommendations which were made by the royal commission that investigated the customs. In my county we are prepared to go further, and at any time vote for the prohibition of the importation or manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors. In this, sir, I am speaking for my county and myself but particularly I am speaking for myself.

I wish to address a few remarks to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) whom I am glad to see in his seat. The other night when the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Plunkett) was speaking about the promises which members of this cabinet made during that by-election it sounded so much like "Home Sweet Home" to me that I guess I looked pleased. And that displeased the Minister of Public Works, so that in his mind I have been guilty of a great indiscretion. When the hon. member for Victoria told how the Minister of Trade and Commerce was going to subsidize shipping, and what trade he was going to establish, the Minister of Finance said he was returning convinced that Victoria needed special consideration. And this is what the people of Victoria were told by the Minister of Trade and Commerce:

> In succeeding Dr. Tolmie as your representative at Ottawa, Dr. MacLean will possess the added advantage of supporting the government in power, an advantage so obvious that I do not need to labour it to an intelligent audience.

Let me assure hon. gentlemen opposite that they mistake the intelligence of any audience when cabinet ministers go about in by-elections promising the people everything and think they can bribe people with their own money. Sir, they were up around our harbour, and the moment the Minister of Finance landed somewhere in Quebec they rushed him on the first train just to prove that what the rest were saying was all right. The Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm), the Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon), the Minister of Labour—I will not take the time to mention the rest—were all there, and along came the Minister of Finance. I think I see him on the platform in his surplice, with his supliced ministerial choir, Leading the choir, with the treasury of Canada in one hand and the credit of Canada in the other, he led in the song.

> Were the whole realm of Nature mine,
> That were an offering far too small.
> Take my silver and my gold,
> Not a mite will I withhold.

The Minister of Finance last year, pointing his finger over this way, said that we were asking for everything and at the same time were demanding that expenditures be kept down. I wish to ask him to-night to leave me out of that, because the whole bunch of them came over to our part of the country, offering the people everything they had. But when they came back here they placed just $75,000 in the estimates for a matter of such importance as Goderich harbour, and later on they added $100,000 in the supplementary estimates. That made $175,000. But they only spent $85,000. When the hon. member for Victoria was speaking the other night he said he had expected to go back with $546,000, according to the promises that had been made to the people of his constituency, but he was afraid that he would have to accept $46,000. Then Hansard reports:

> Mr. Spotton: And see that it is expended.
> Mr. Plunkett: Surely they always spend it.
> Mr. Spotton: No, they do not.
> Mr. Elliott: That is a suggestion for the riding of North Huron.

I should like to ask the Minister of Public Works to explain to the house some time just what was in the back of his head when he made that remark. I thought that perhaps he was joking, but after he had had a night's sleep he was still in an ugly frame of mind. I will not go into details, Mr. Speaker, but at any rate I left the city for a couple of days. But I would ask the minister to explain what he meant by that statement. Is this the type of government we have to-day in Canada, that no member shall dare to suggest that the government spend the whole of an estimate without having the threat thrown out that the expenditure will be reduced, with the result that particular public works in his constituency shall suffer? Let me say that in this house, speaking in 1896, the late M. C. Cameron made the statement, as recorded in Hansard—I have not the time to read it—that in 1872 he, a Liberal member, had persuaded Sir John Macdonald to appoint a commission to go up and down that 160 miles of coast line, taking evidence and looking into the whole situation. The result was that they decided that Goderich was the only harbour of refuge from Sarnia to Tobermory. With a conservative government in power, and a Liberal —a Liberal mark you, Mr. Minister of Public Works—continuously representing from Confederation to that date, 1896, the riding in which Goderich is situated, an expenditure had been undertaken of $600,000 on that harbour. It was and is a national port. They handled 20,000,000 bushels of grain this year and, as I say, it is the only harbour of refuge on the great lakes. But because I committed the indiscretion of advising the member for Victoria to see that the government should

expend the money voted, then a threat is made. I should be pleased if the minister would assure me that he was only joking. I shall have another occasion to do justice to this great harbour, which this winter accommodated twenty-two vessels carrying five and three quarter million bushels of grain.

I should like to have said something in regard to the mail service but the minister is not in his seat. I shall leave it for another occasion. However, let me give one illustration of economy on the part of the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot). The Postmaster General has shown considerable human sympathy in my constituency and has done several things for me for which I am grateful. But consider this incident, of a rural mail carrier in the village of Auburn. Let us say the post office was where the Minister of Finance sits; they moved it down to where the Minister of Public Works sits. A distance of thirty-nine rods and a fraction was involved, and the department sent a highly paid inspector there to measure that distance. He found it to be thirty-nine rods and so they docked the man $10.48 a year. Yet this government is the friend of the working man.

This friend of the farmer has also shown its interest in agriculture. In 1912 the late government put aside $10,000,000 for agricultural instruction in the different provinces. My province was to receive $336,303.26 per annum, and with the grant they got they built the Kemptville agrricultural college, and undertook to secure agricultural representatives in the various counties. In this regard I have a statement which I will ask the privilege of putting on Hansard. It shows how the grant was apportioned in Ontario:

Ontario Agricultural College—		
Salaries and expenses		$ 9,000 00
Agricultural School and Farm—		
(a) Capital expenditure	$ 3,000	
(b) Administrative and teaching staff, and maintenance and equipment	49,000	
		52,000 00
Instruction and Demonstration—		
Agricultural representatives		136,000 00
Extension work in household science		1,500 00
Demonstrations in vegetable growing		4,000 00
Cooperation and markets		6,000 00
Short courses for winners of field crop and live stock competitions including travelling and living expenses		1,000 00
Lectures on horticulture		750 00
Demonstration work on soils		9,500 00
Drainage work		4,751 57
Fall fair and field crop judges		2,000 00
Demonstrations in live stock and poultry		3,500 00
Elementary Agricultural Education—		
To provide for and encourage the teaching of agriculture in high and public schools		24,000 00
		$254,001 57

But when this government came into power they did not know what to do. Their love for the farmer was great, but it is great only during election; and this money which was intended to assist in agricultural education they could not continue granting. They put up the sum of $200,000 for one year, and the minister said that they were going to bring in a resolution at the next session either to improve or to extend the system, or just to leave it as it was. However, the upshot of the matter was that the vote was cut off entirely, as were federal aid to the farmers for good roads and federal aid to the farmers' sons for technical education in my province of Ontario. The former administration had granted over $1,000,000 a year to my province to assist in agricultural education, to encourage good roads and to assist in technical education. They continued it during the war, but this government rudely cut it off.

Now I should like to devote a few moments to the sales tax. I think a mistake was made when the title of "doctor" was conferred upon the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) instead of the Minister of Finance. When this government came into office they found the sales tax at 3 per cent; they forthwith raised it to 5 per cent and then to 6 per cent. The consumer was carrying a bag on his back with three stones in it; this government placed three more stones in the bag and then each year took out one stone and said "What good fellows we are." They got into the elevator at the third floor; they went up to the sixth floor and then returned to the third, but in the meantime they extracted hundreds of millions of dollars from the buying public, the poorer class of people in this province. Time and again the party on this side of the house pleaded with the government to abolish that tax. They have more than abolished that tax now; when the Minister of Finance made the reduction from 6 per cent to 5 per cent he said it was a reduction of 16⅔ per cent; when he reduced it from 5 per cent to 4 per cent it was a reduction of 20 per cent; when he reduced it from 4 per cent to 3 per cent it was a reduction of 25 per cent and now that it has been reduced from 3 per cent to 2 per cent there is a further reduction of 33 per cent. If we add those together we find that already the sales tax has already been reduced by 115 per cent. If next year it is

reduced one per cent more that will be another reduction of 50 per cent, giving a total of 165 per cent, and a further one per cent reduction in another session will enable the minister to reduce the sales tax another 100 per cent making it in all 265 per cent; but the chances are that he will take it all off in one swoop before the next election. I commend him to the public; figures cannot lie.

Mr. M. F. HEPBURN (West Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is usually in order to congratulate the preceding speaker, and I desire to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my good friend from North Huron (Mr. Spotton). I am always interested in his speeches and particularly in the dramatic manner of his delivery. If one did not know the other side he probably would take a literal interpretation of his whole speech.

My hon. friend made an accusation against the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott), claiming that the minister was unfair to the constituency represented by my hon. friend. On behalf of the Minister of Public Works I want to say he is not that type of man; I think our Conservative friends are in a position to know that full well, because within one year they tried on three occasions to defeat him in his own riding. At each election he increased his majority; the last election gave him a majority of 2,660, and I think any candidate who opposes him at the next election will probably lose his deposit. I want to say that we new and inexperienced members from southern Ontario owe a great deal to the Minister of Public Works; any one of us would rise to his defence on an occasion of this kind.

The hon. member for North Huron went further and made some caustic references to the Prime Minister of this country. This afternoon we heard the Prime Minister deliver an address which in my opinion was a masterpiece; I do not think any man could add to or take away from that speech. Today, despite all the unfair criticism of the Tory press in years past, the Prime Minister stands high in the estimation of the people of Canada, and after he appeals to the country at the next general election I think our Conservative friends will be found still gazing with longing eyes at the treasury benches across the floor of the house. I think the Prime Minister has demonstrated in no uncertain way that he is well able to emulate our grand old chief, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, especially in the way he picks his cabinet, because we feel that the men who grace the treasury benches at present are the ablest and best body ever to hold office in the history of this country.

I say this government need have no fear with regard to what may happen at another general election, because they are carrying out a policy applicable to the needs of this growing young country. During the last three general elections our Conservative friends appealed on the old protectionist platform, but on each occasion they came back in the minority. The policy applicable to the needs of Canada certainly is one of trade expansion, and I want to say that that policy is being well carried out by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm). That fact is demonstrated by his successful negotiation of trade treaties with many countries throughout the world, so that now our goods are moving freely into the world markets. We do not need to go back very far in history to ascertain how the restricted trade policy brought grief to this country; each time our Conservative friends were in office they created such hard times that we had economic revolts, especially in the rural sections, as witness the formation of the Grange Patrons of Industry and the United Farmers of Ontario. In order to ascertain the effects of such a policy we need only point to the sad plight of the American farmers, due to the fact that they subscribed to the very doctrine expounded by our Conservative friends here. Because of the trade policy of this government I think we are probably the most prosperous country in the world.

But of course our Conservative friends shout hard times when in opposition; then they create hard times when they are in power. During last session I was very much interested in listening to the various members from the city of Toronto get up in this house and tell us of the terrible conditions existing in that city. I do not doubt but that some of them were wise enough to realize that such conditions did not exist, but like the little birds in the nest they all held together for fear they would all fall out. When it comes to calamity howling, however, they have to yield the laurels to the hon. member for Hamilton, because I think he may be well dubbed the "Calamity Ann" of this house. However, after listening to all this talk of the terrible conditions in Toronto I had occasion to attend a banquet in that city, at which the mayor of Toronto said that his city was the most prosperous city not only in Canada but on the North American continent. That was enough to make me gasp with amazement, but the mayor elaborated the point, quoting all the building figures and telling of the preparations they were making to provide for a population of 1,000,000 happy people.

Mr. RENNIE: There are two members from Hamilton in this house; to which one did my hon. friend refer?

Mr. HEPBURN: They are both pretty good calamity howlers but I meant the other hon. member, the one who specializes in it.

Mr. RENNIE: I am asking a question; which member did my hon. friend mean?

Mr. HEPBURN: I said I meant the other member, the one who spoke of people of Hamilton going out on the Hamilton mountain and living on the grass that grew thereon. Now that my hon. friend has brought the matter back to my mind I remember reading in the press that during the last municipal election in Hamilton there were so few unemployed that they could not find enough men to man the polling booths. I say all this talk is made for a purpose; there is no substance to it; it is just political talk, and it recalls to my mind a quotation from Shakespeare:

> All the world's a stage
> And all the men and women merely players:
> They have their exits and their entrances;
> And each man in his time plays many parts,—

It seems to me that the last part of that quotation may well apply to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and the genial doctor from Fort William (Mr. Manion), because I recall that at one time they were pretty good Laurier Liberals, although now they are gracing the front benches of the Conservative party. I recall the first political meeting I attended, at the age of five, when I heard the then brilliant orator from South Wellington expound true Liberal doctrines. Since then he has changed, but he has joined a group which also changes; in 1911 hon. gentlemen opposite told us that the American market was of no value to us at all, that we wanted no truck or trade with the Yankees. They had their poor, deluded followers throughout the country; I remember one man who got up publicly and exclaimed dramatically that he would rather have his right hand cut off than have reciprocity with United States. He happened to be a cattle drover; a little later the price of cattle rose on the Buffalo market, and he was scurrying around trying to buy up cattle to sell on that high priced market. Now, however, the situation is so serious that the red-blooded gentleman from Fort William is advocating red-blooded Canadianism—I think he got the expression from reading Andy Gump—is advocating a special session of parliament to deal with this question of retaliation. The American congress is going to be called together to enact legislation which will make the American people pay more for their necessities of life. They are going to make the consumer pay more for the bread he eats and the butter he uses; they are even going to make the baby pay more for his milk. And our Conservative friends, headed by the genial member for Fort William, wants us to call a special session of the Canadian parliament to enact similar legislation.

I am sorry the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Gott) is not in his seat, because I wanted to take his remarks as an example of the gross exaggeration which has taken place in many instances with regard to the trade of these two countries. The hon. member, speaking in this house on March 1 of last year, said that in 1924 alone $494,349,000 of farm produce and foodstuffs were imported from the United States. He said that these importations consisted of produce and foodstuffs which could and would have been produced in Canada had the proper protective policy for the farmer been in operation. Apparently he had unbounded confidence in the protective tariff, but, unfortunately, he was away out in his figures. I do not desire to blame him because I think there might be extenuating circumstances. When he came down to this house first I recall that he talked of nothing but a tariff for onions; the next year he had it as a tariff for tobacco; and the third year it was a tariff on fruits and vegetables, but I think, through his early association with onions, that he must have got some onion juice in his eye and it has prevented his having the right perspective ever since. I desire to deal with that remark of his which appears in the revised Hansard, because I believe it to be absolutely untrue. I went to the trouble of obtaining figures from the Bureau of Statistics and the Department of National Revenue, and I find that we made the following importations in that year:

Agricultural and vegetable products	$125,671,000
Animals and animal products	45,026,000
Total	$170,697,000

That figure is considerably short of the figure quoted by the hon. member in Hansard. But he also said that there were importations which could and would have been produced in Canada under a protective system. Among the many articles coming in we find the following:

Citrus fruits	$11,500,000
Currants, raisins, etc	11,500,000
Sugar	49,000,000
Tea, coffee, spices and cocoa	18,000,000

According to the statement of the hon. member, all of this stuff could and would have been produced in Canada under a protective tariff. I think the hon. member for

South Essex would be quite safe in guaranteeing to eat all the agricultural food products of a competitive nature coming into this country that year in excess of $30,000,000.

This gross exaggeration of facts is one of the difficult things we have to contend with. These statements are published throughout the country, and it is very difficult for us to get the truth before the people.

We have heard considerable about the policy of retaliation. The only products with which we are concerned are the competitive products such as dairy products, live stock, meats, potatoes, grain, vegetables and fruit. I have analyzed the trade figures and I find that we imported $28,385,000 worth of competitive products during 1928, while we exported $62,174,000 worth. These figures would show that we are not losing very much in that trade. But our Conservative friends say that we should retaliate if the Americans go on with the proposed plan and enact higher tariff legislation during the coming session of their congress. How is this going to work out in a practical way? In dairy products we imported $242,000 and exported $10,385,000. A policy of retaliation would not be very effective there. In live stock and meats we imported $5,837,000 while we exported $28,733,000. Again a policy of retaliation would not be very effective there.

I desire to call the attention of the house to another gross exaggeration which was placed on Hansard the other day by the hon. member for South Essex. During the course of his remarks he quoted a telegram which he had sent to the Prime Minister last July, wherein he stated that American potatoes were coming into Canada at the rate of 300 cars daily. I looked up the trade figures as they referred to the United States, and I find that we imported last year $798,000 worth of potatoes, while the value of the exports of potatoes was $4,593,000. The total weight of the potatoes imported into this country amounted to 300,647 hundredweight. A produce merchant has informed me that about 400 hundredweight could be placed in one car, and upon dividing that total amount it will be found that the total importation into Canada amounted to only 751 cars. If they were coming in at the rate of 300 cars per day it is certainly fortunate that the member for South Essex sent a telegram to the Prime Minister because the total importations could have come into Canada at the rate of 300 cars per day while a letter was on its way to Ottawa. Figuring it out on the basis of value quoted by him in Hansard, at $3 per bushel there were 266,000 bushels imported. At 650 bushels to the car, this would mean that only 409 cars of potatoes came in. According to the figures given by the hon. member, the total importation would have been completed in a day and a half. It is quite true that a tariff on potatoes might hold back the early importation of American potatoes, and while the farmer might expect a slight seasonal advantage in price for a week or two, that advantage would cease when the main Canadian production came on the market. What would be the inevitable result? If the farmer subscribed to this policy he could only expect to be retaliated against, and he would then lose a potential market for his entire surplus in the United States. I do not think the farmers in southern Ontario are very seriously considering increased tariff on potatoes.

I will take one concrete example to show what this retaliation would mean to the farmer. The trade figures show that we imported last year $6,425,000 worth of feed corn. This was imported very largely into southern Ontario because of our proximity to the American cornfields, the low freight rates, and our proximity to the high-priced American market for our finished products. We buy the corn, we feed it at a profit, and we sell our goods on the American market.

If the American congress should enact this legislation, which might mean that we would receive about $4,000,000 less for the $39,000,000 worth of dairy and meat products exported to that country, our Conservative friends are going to adjust this matter for us by making us pay another million dollars for the corn we have to import. I cannot see the sensible farmers of southern Ontario seriously considering a project of that kind either. Instead of turning the other cheek, as far as tariff legislation is concerned, it would be a case of going over and battering our heads against the first wall we could find, provided we could find one hard enough.

A great deal has been said about the dairy industry by men who, from their arguments, I do not believe know very much about this particular industry. I have been interested in the dairy industry for many years: I have operated a cheese factory and I have made a study of this question. I admit frankly that it is somewhat of an anomaly for a dairy country like Canada to be importing butter; but what is the cause? The cause is this that many farmers in southern Ontario and Quebec are taking full advantage of their geographical position and are shipping a perishable commodity in the form of sweet milk and cream to the United States market. Our exports of sweet milk and cream to the United States increased as follow:

Year	Value
1923	$2,300,000
1927	8,739,000

Or an increase of nearly 300 per cent. While we are diverting our milk in that way, we must of necessity import for our home consumption and so we are buying butter from our New Zealand cousin who is not so favourably situated that he can take advantage of this special market which we now enjoy in the United States. Our Conservative friends tell us that this is wrong. Here is the transaction exactly. We are selling at a high price in the United States market, and I am going to give the price because the other day I telegraphed to the manager of one of the big dairy plants in southern Ontario which is dealing particularly in this kind of business. He informed me that in the last four months they have been paying the southern Ontario farmer about 64 cents per pound of butter fat for his milk. Worked out in terms of butter that means about 75 cents per pound for butter. We are bringing in our necessary supplies for home consumption at 45 cents a pound as a maximum price. As we are selling our butter at 75 cents, on the transaction we are making a profit of 30 cents a pound. On the 16,000,000 pounds we are bringing in from Australia we are making, looking at the matter from a national standpoint, approximately $4,800,000 a year, figure it as you may. But of the brains of the Conservative party, as represented on the front benches by the very able leader (Mr. Bennett), by his first lieutenant (Mr. Guthrie) and by the distinguished accountant, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) of customs probe fame, who certainly has a nose for investigation, not one as yet has caught on to the fact that we are making a profit on the transaction. I should like to include another hon. member across the floor from Vancouver—I forget his constituency—but I am afraid he is more or less in the position of a doubting Thomas. When he is in Vancouver he supports the Australian treaty, but when he comes down to Ottawa and his mind becomes permeated with the talk of his Conservative friends, he is somewhat against it. Our Conservative friends advocate a tariff to keep out this Australian butter, but if we place a tariff on this butter, one of two things will happen: we shall have to divert milk from those high priced markets to other sources or the people of Canada will have to go back to conditions which prevailed when our Conservative friends were in power, when they had to eat oleomargarine, a mixture of intestinal fats and southern oils imported largely from the United States. It is only going to have the effect of diverting milk from high priced markets into butter production. There is no such thing as the saturation point of consumption, and when we go back into the export market with butter we shall be right where we started; the farmer will be getting the world price for butter the same as he always has, but he will be wiser in that he will have had the fallacy of protection demonstrated to him.

[Mr. Hepburn.]

On account of the grading of cheese which was brought into force by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), Canadian cheese manufacturers are getting from one and a half to five cents a pound above the world standard market price for cheese. The whole situation is summed up in this way: the Canadian cream producer who sells his product to the United States market is able to enjoy that higher price. He is in a very favourable position and if our friends across the way were to go down into the county of Elgin and visit the farms of the men who are enjoying that high priced market, they would be impressed by the fine accredited herds, the fine farms, the improved roads, the splendid schools and everything else that goes along with prosperous agricultural conditions.

My time is slipping along and I shall have to digress a little. I was very much amused —and I use the word advisedly when I received to-day a copy of the Border City Star. It tells about the very eloquent address made by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Gott) which in some way established a precedent in the house. It said:

> The South Essex member was heard with marked attention throughout, and when his forty minutes had expired, he appealed to the Speaker to be allowed a couple of minutes to submit some suggestions for the relief of the tobacco growers. Although earlier in the day members had protested against this privilege being extended to another member of the opposition and it had been refused, Mr. Gott was allowed to continue.

In this way the hon. member for South Essex was given a special privilege, and worse than that, the article goes on to say:

> When Mr. Gott sat down amidst the applause of his party and other members, Mr. Speaker Lemieux left his place and went over and congratulated him on making one of the best speeches of the session.

I do not know to whom to give credit for this publicity, whether to the hon. member for South Essex or to the reporter who signs himself E. C. Buchanan. If Ananias and Sapphira were to return from the grave I am sure they would rush up to a reporter with such a vivid imagination and grasping him by the hand would say, "Shake brother, shake!"

I find that at the time this eloquent address was delivered there were barely enough members in the house to form a quorum, and I can hardly imagine this thunderous applause described in a manner that would lead us to believe that it jarred the rafters and even shook this building to the point that the peace tower might have taken on the aspect of the leaning tower of Pisa. But as regards the Speaker leaving the chair, I know the Speaker has never left the chair to congratulate any member, much less the hon. member for South Essex.

The article goes on to tell how the hon. member made an eloquent plea for the tobacco growers. The hon. member certainly believes in a protective tariff. It reminds me of the quack doctor who stood on a soap box selling his wares to the public. He was trying to tell them that the particular pills he had would cure indigestion, and when the crowd protested that they did not have indigestion, he said: "Well, take them anyway; these pills will prevent indigestion." The hon. member goes on that principle that the tariff will prevent any ailments and cure all ailments. If an industry is prosperous and making money, then it should have more tariff; and if it is being managed in an inefficient manner and has obsolete machinery, the same principle should apply—increase the tariff and everything will be all right. The hon. member advocated an increase in the tariff on tobacco; in fact he charged that this government is not friendly to the tobacco industry in southern Ontario. As a matter of fact, that industry in southern Ontario owes its very existence to the British preference which was brought in as a policy by a Liberal government, a policy which has been maintained and strengthened by this government.

The hon. member informed us that we needed a marketing system. That is quite true, because the tobacco producer in southern Ontario is, I believe, very much in the hands of a monopoly. That is, the tobacco buyers have the situation so much in hand that there is very little competition. A sincere effort was made a year ago to form a tobacco pool, but what happened? Despite the fact that we tried to impress upon the farmer that he must show his faith in the proposed organization; that he must take the initiative; that he must organize and then come to the government with his problems; despite all the careful plans laid by officials of the Department of Agriculture, Conservative members from southern Ontario felt that there might be some political gain if this pool were made a success, and so what did they do? From every platform they told the farmers that all they needed was protection. Many farmers believed them, with the result that the pool movement was a loss and one of the contributing factors to that loss was the argument advanced by my Conservative friends that a tariff was the only thing that would help those farmers.

I want to deal with the tariff on tobacco because the hon. member for South Essex stated that an increased tariff would mean an increased price to the grower in southern Ontario. A short time ago there was a hearing before the tariff board and experts in the tobacco industry gave evidence. This very question came up as to whether or not a tariff would be of any value to the tobacco grower in southern Ontario, and Mr. Richardson, speaking on behalf of the cigar manufacturers of Canada, said:

> The issue having been raised that restoration of the 1913 28 cent leaf duties would seriously affect domestic production, we are prepared to prove that, on the contrary, it would actually benefit the grower of cigar leaf in Canada.

These men are all experts in their particular line; this question was carefully studied from all angles, and this is what they find: under the 28 cent tariff in 1919 the farmer was getting 25 cents a pound for his tobacco. The Conservatives increased the tariff to 40 cents a pound, and would you believe it, the price actually dropped to 10½ cents a pound to the farmer the following year, showing that the tobaccos that came into Canada at that time were not competitive tobaccos any more than they are to-day. The manufacturer has to import a certain amount of American tobacco, for he puts out a standardized product and he must maintain it. If a tariff did not help the farmers then, it could not help them now, and in my opinion it would injure them. I can understand the position of the manufacturer. If we further tax his raw material entering Canada that goes into the finished product, which sells at a price which does not vary, either he has to increase the price to the consumer or lower the price to the producer, and he is in a much better position to lower the price to the producer than to increase the price to the consumer.

In regard to the price of the finished product, I have a word of criticism against my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. There is only one way in which the government can help the tobacco industry in southern Ontario other than by following the trade policies now pursued, and that is to lower the excise tax on manufactured tobacco. This particular industry seems to be the subject of a very high tax. The excise tax in Canada is such that it just about equals the wholesale price in the

United States, and when a Canadian visitor in the city of Detroit for example sees there two packages of tobacco selling for 25 cents while one package of the same brand sells for 25 cents in Canada, the temptation to smuggle is almost irresistible, and under the conditions I do not blame particularly the man who smuggles. I say that this extreme tax should not be maintained. In the hearing held before the tariff board I was pleased to see that Mr. Darby of the Canadian Council of Agriculture in making his comments said:

Thanks to the returning prosperity and the general improvement of economic conditions, the national revenues are showing considerable buoyancy and several successive reductions of taxation have been possible. The prospect is that still further reductions in taxation will shortly be possible. In these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, the claims of the consumers of cigars and cigarettes to some alleviation of the taxes falling upon these commodities may properly be given careful consideration.

Another gentleman, Mr. Deachman, the Secretary of the Consumers League, had this to say before the tariff board:

I support the application on the ground of its obvious reasonableness. There appears to be every evidence in what has been submitted that the taxation is now so high as to curtail the revenue, both by restricting consumption and by encouraging smuggling. I can see no reason why a tax which is so high as to defeat its purpose should be longer retained, and it seems to me this case is so palpable as not to need further argument.

I have confidence enough in the Minister of Finance to feel that when he brings down his next budget, which I hope will be another tax reducing budget, cognizance will be taken of this inequality and that equity will be done to all parts of Canada.

There is another matter which I want to bring to the attention of the house. Our friend from South Essex referred to the fact that he did not think there was unanimity of opinion on the government benches. I would like to counter by asking how much unanimity there is on the Conservative benches with regard to a speech made a few days ago by my good friend the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Smith). Speaking on behalf of the province he represents, he was advocating an increased tariff on coal, and he said:

I know there are many difficulties in the way of the application of the tariff in its relation to the coal industry, but I am not by any means abandoning what I have always maintained to be one of the things necessary to help the industry, namely, a higher tariff on coal. I have heard the slur cast across the floor of the house many times, but I do not think there is any disagreement, so far as the members on this side of the house are concerned, with respect to properly and adequately protecting every legitimate industry in this Dominion. That has always been the stand of the Conservative party, and that policy has never been abandoned by that party so far as I am able to ascertain.

That is a very broad statement, and I watched with considerable interest to see how it would be received by members on the opposition benches. The applause was most enthusiastic. One would judge that they were sincere in leading the house and the country to believe that there was unanimity of opinion with regard to increasing the tariff on coal. Coming from the province of Ontario, where we have to import our coal and use 13,000,000 tons per year, I would like to have something more definite in the way of a policy with regard to coal from the opposition members. I would like to ask if the policy enunciated by the hon. member for Cumberland is the policy of the great Conservative party, because we who have to import coal want to know it before the next general election. In the railway committee a year ago I opposed the idea of subsidizing Alberta coal. I said that the thing was not feasible, and that has since been proved to be the case. A tariff on coal would not have the effect of making the consumer in southern Ontario use a single ton more of Alberta or Nova Scotia coal. The only effect it would have would be to increase the cost to the consumer. I would like to ask the leader of the opposition what is his policy in that regard. I do not hope to get a definite answer because I recall an answer that he made some time ago. He had been complaining loud and long about the amount of farm implements coming into this country. He did not believe in allowing farmers to buy their implements as cheaply as they could, and he said that the government had the tools in its hands to stop this importation. But when the Finance minister got up and asked him if he would stop it if he were in office by the application of a higher tariff, I was amazed at the dexterity by which the leader of the opposition evaded that question. He said that he was too old a politician to be caught by such a question. I want to tell him that he is going to be caught by these two questions when he comes to southern Ontario, because we are going to know whether he is fooling us or whether he is fooling the people of Nova Scotia in regard to coal, and we are going to know as farmers what he is going to do about the tariff on agricultural implements.

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister of National Revenue will answer that.

Mr. HEPBURN: In the few moments I have left, let me say that I am going to vote against the amendment of our Conservative friends with considerable gusto. It is just a foolish gesture intended to lead the farmers up a blind alley. I am happy to say that the Canadian farmer is the only farmer the world over who has not succumbed to the high tariff policies enunciated by so many Conservatives all over the world, policies which are restricting world trade. If any country in the world to-day needs wider markets, it is Canada, and if there is any country in the world where the policy of higher tariffs is not applicable to-day it is this Dominion.

With regard to the subamendment of the Progressives, I would like very much to support it because I believe in the principle of the British preference. I believe, further, that if by the proposed legislation of congress they make it harder for us to sell the products of this country to the United States, we shall have to market our goods in other countries, and the great field ahead of us in that respect, I believe, is in developing further the British preference. But that is the policy of this government, and I cannot for one moment see the wisdom of nullifying all the good that has been done in bringing down this budget by voting for the subamendment, although I believe in it in principle. So I shall have to vote against it and support this government, believing that in doing so I am representing the sentiments of the people of the county of Elgin, which county has returned to the Liberal fold after being for thirty years under Conservative domination.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I want to take a very few minutes of the time of the house to reply to the argument which was put forward to-night and especially directed against the amendment to the amendment by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I do not know whether we should take the arguments on the budget, the amendment, and so forth, as seriously as some of us do, particularly after what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said to-day, that this is no place for an amendment, that the only thing an amendment can possibly mean is a vote of censure on the government. Then in reply to my question, what was the use of moving an amendment, the Prime Minister informed us that there was a place for such things. I have been a member of the house for five or six years, but I have never yet discovered that place. I suppose if we were to move an amendment to any single item of the budget when it reaches committee of the whole we would be met by precisely the same argument.

However, I wish to address myself in particular to the remarks of the hon. member for Labelle. The hon. gentleman is always interesting; at times he is refreshing. His erudition is unquestioned. I always admire his wide knowledge of affairs and his great ability in presenting his views to the house. However, the interpretation which he at times put upon certain facts of history might be very sharply questioned even by gentlemen who may be equally well informed. He attacks the amendment to the amendment on the ground that it favours a protective policy, and he proceeds to prove his case on this assumption. I must say that, considering all the speeches I have listened to from the hon. gentleman, he has made a poorer job at proving his case to-night than on any other occasion that I can recall. So far as I am aware, there is only one way in which an increase of the British preference can possibly be interpreted as protection, and to that way the hon. member did not direct his argument. If in our amendment to the amendment we were to ask that the tariff be increased against all other countries in order that the British preference might be correspondingly increased, then there would be grounds for the argument that it was a method of protection. But no such thing is advocated. Our amendment to the amendment suggests a reduction of the tariff against Great Britain in order that we may increase the preference. By what manner of means the hon. member for Labelle was able to satisfy himself that this meant increased protection, I cannot understand.

The hon. gentleman proceeded to tell us that he agreed with the policy as announced by the Prime Minister this afternoon. That policy, in a word, was that Canada was from now on to adjust her fiscal policy according to circumstances. That is a new policy for the Liberal party. I have no criticism of the policy; in fact I endorse it. It is the utterance of statesmanship. It makes due allowance for that great invisible government—circumstances—which more or less controls the activities of all governments. But I do want to say that the Liberal party never won an election on a platform of that kind, and I venture to say that they never will. But that was not the only policy announced to-day by the Prime Minister. In the platform of the Liberal party I find this policy:

> That the British preference be increased to 50 per cent of the general tariff, and that the Liberal party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provisions of this resolution when returned to power.

We have heard those things somewhere before. But the point is, if the hon. member for Labelle regards the preference amendment which we have moved as equivalent to protection, and for that reason cannot support it, I am at a loss to understand how he can support the policy of the Prime Minister when to increase the British preference to 50 per cent of the general tariff is the policy of the Liberal party, and was specifically referred to by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) as being the keystone. It is moved from 50 per cent of the general tariff to be the keystone; next they will have a chart, and after that a star. You know all great mariners guide their vessels by the stars of the heavens, but they never expect to lassoo those stars and pull them down to the deck where they can look at them. So the policy of the Liberal party is very much like the star that guides the mariner; they always leave it in the heavens to guide them because next year they might need it to bring them into the port of power.

But to return to the argument of the hon. member for Labelle. He was not at all convincing in stating that the increasing of the British preference by reduction of the British tariff could by any possible means be construed as a high tariff policy. In fact he said himself that such a policy would result in bringing into this country German goods, French goods, Belgian goods and goods from every European country, which would be shipped over here from Britain with the British stamp on them. That was his argument. Well, if the policy of preference is going to result in greater importations, is that the usual result of a protective policy? Surely he is lacking in logic there. The logic of the increase of the British preference would be this, that those countries outside the preference, if they desired to trade with Canada, would have to lower their tariffs; and in such circumstances I presume we would be prepared to lower our tariffs in so far as they are concerned, and thus make a step towards the great star which guides the Liberal party.

But the platform of the Liberal party as announced to-day by the Prime Minister is not only a new policy of shaping legislation according to circumstances, but it includes also, as I have pointed out, the preference policy of increasing the British preference to 50 per cent of the general tariff. The

Liberal party has been elected on that platform on three successive occasions. Now it appears that the Prime Minister is afraid to implement it for fear of what the United States may think or may do. But in any case I would defy the hon. member for Labelle to vote against our amendment to the amendment on the basis of the argument which he advances, and at the same time still hold to his view to vote for the policy of the present government.

Now, of course, I welcome the new policy of the Liberal party—if they will only adhere to it during the next election. But let them go to the west, for instance, and say: Now, Mr. Farmer, we don't know really what we will do if we are elected. We are going to fix up our next budget according to circumstances, and all the budgets of the next parliament will be so fixed. We don't know what the United States is going to do, we don't know what anybody is going to do; therefore we don't know what we are going to do. So if you elect us, what will happen? Why, we might have to raise our tariff in order to meet circumstances, or we might have to lower it, or leave it as it is, according as circumstances might dictate. That would be precisely what the government would do in so far as their action might be concerned. But would they go to the people on that policy? I venture to say they would not. But to me the policy means to-day either that the carefully worded clauses in the budget—worded I presume by the Minister of Finance—are intended as a veiled threat of retaliation to the United States, or else that the government will wait until the American fiddle plays and then dance to its tune. It means one of these two things so far as I am able to interpret the Prime Minister's speech and the budget itself.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. member for Labelle—I hope he will read my speech to-morrow in Hansard, because I have no doubt he will make another speech on the amendment—let me ask him, I say, to tell me what he advises under the circumstances. He makes the charge that such a policy as we advocate in the amendment to the amendment involves certain sentiment, that it is not business, that it was fathered by sentiment; and he suggests that we throw all sentiment overboard so far as policy is concerned. I agree with him in that regard. But I was wondering whether there was not

a considerable amount of sentiment in his opposition to that subamendment. Are we the only people who are swayed by sentiment? Is the hon. member for Labelle absolutely void of it when he makes such a speech as he has made to-night against the amendment to the amendment? I do not wish to impute that to him, but at least it is suspicious; and if he is suspicious of our policy as being sentimental, we can at least return the possible suggestion of the same being the case with respect to himself. But let me assure the hon. gentleman that it is a matter of business with the western agriculturists; it is not a matter of sentiment. The western farmers have said again and again that they are not interested in the colour of the whiskers of any man with whom they do business; they do not care what part of the country he comes from or what country he lives in. They want to trade with him. That is not sentiment but business. But I want the hon. member for Labelle to tell us what we are going to do. The United States has shut us out of its market for farm produce. We do not wish to retaliate by asking this government to raise tariffs against that country. But at the same time we must find a market for our goods, and so we suggest that we lower the tariff to Great Britain, increasing their preference, and thereby probably finding a larger market for our produce. And it might be that such an action would have an effect upon the United States, in that if it desires to trade with Canada it might see fit not only to refrain from raising its tariff against us but to reduce it very materially. I hope therefore that if the hon. member for Labelle favours us to-morrow with another portion of his wisdom he will kindly go a little more into detail and prove not only to his own satisfaction but to the satisfaction of reasonable members of this house—and they would not be very many—that a reduction in the tariff to give a greater preference to Great Britain need not be construed as having no other meaning than an increase in tariffs.

On motion of Mr. Bock the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Wednesday, April 10, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ANNUAL REPORT TABLED BY MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): I desire to lay on the table copies in English and French of the annual report of the Canadian National railway system for the last calendar year. Copies of the report are being placed in the post office box of every member of the house.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION EXPENDITURES

Mr. SPENCER:

What has been spent in the aggregate, by the immigration department from 1881 to 1928, inclusive?

Mr. FORKE: $51,618,024.96.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—LAND BRANCHES

Mr. KENNEDY:

1. How many branches of the Department of the Interior deal with land, with the specific function in each case?

2. What is the total cost of each of these branches for the fiscal year 1927-28: (a) Ottawa service; (b) outside service?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1. The different branches of the department handling the various phases of Dominion lands administration were consolidated in the Norlite building in March, 1928. Reorganization has progressed steadily and the Civil Service Commission recently concurred in the completed departmental reorganization.

Dominion lands administration, Ottawa service—Division—Functions—Commissioner's office—Dominion lands—Deals with all matters relating to land settlement.

Mining lands—Deals with matters relating to mining, petroleum and natural gas operations.

Timber and grazing—Deals with cutting of timber and grazing leases.

Land patents—Registrations and titles.

Ordnance, admirality and public lands—Deals with ordnance, admirality, railway and escheat lands, fur farming, fractional areas and townsites.

2.

Saskatchewan	Salaries	Expenses	Total
Moose Jaw (including inspectors)	$ 46,816 69	18,820 46	65,637 15
Prince Albert (including inspectors)	46,834 48	18,744 96	65,579 44
Sub-agents	11,249 19	500 53	11,749 72
	104,900 36	38,065 95	142,966 31
Alberta			
Calgary (including inspectors)	41,954 76	11,703 71	53,658 47
Edmonton (including inspectors)	58,176 87	20,132 24	78,309 11
Grande Prairie (including inspectors)	12,986 03	4,850 03	17,836 06
Lethbridge (including inspectors)	26,464 27	6,261 42	32,725 69
Peace River (including inspectors)	13,927 89	4,049 18	17,977 07
Sub-agents	12,130 13	340 82	12,470 95
	165,639 95	47,337 40	212,977 35
British Columbia			
Kamloops (including inspectors)	10,961 15	3,012 07	13,973 22
New Westminster (including inspectors)	21,986 09	4,187 35	26,173 44
Revelstoke (including inspectors)	7,764 10	1,062 01	8,826 11
Sub-agents	1,284 68	33 01	1,317 69
	41,996 02	8,294 44	50,290 46
Northwest Territories			
Sub-agent	300 00	.....	300 00
Ordnance Lands	4,005 89	3,303 69	7,309 68

Summary

Outside Ottawa	401,799 32	128,810 79	530,610 11
Ottawa	457,910 00	6,796 41	464,706 41
Grand total	$859,709 32	$135,607 20	$995,316 52

School Lands—Deals with sales and leases of school lands and mining and timber matters affecting same.

Technical—Technical work in the Dominion lands administration, such as descriptions, maps, plans, etc.

2. (a) Ottawa Service

Division	Salaries	Expenses	Total
Commissioner's office	$ 37,260 00	$ 1,745 50	$ 39,005 50
Dominion Lands	109,800 00	.....	109,800 00
Mining Lands	39,840 00	.....	39,840 00
Timber and Grazing	60,180 00	.....	60,180 00
Lands Patents	80,500 00	.....	80,500 00
Ordnance, Admiralty and Public Lands	48,460 00	3,539 78	51,999 78
School Lands	36,360 00	1,511 13	37,871 13
Technical	45,510 00	.....	45,510 00
Total	$457,910 00	6,796 41	464,706 41

(b) Outside Service

Assistant Commissioner's (Edmonton) office	$ 17,418 00	12,855 54	30,273 54

Manitoba			
Winnipeg Land office (including inspectors)	$ 28,430 20	$ 7,341 73	$ 35,771 93
Winnipeg Crown Timber office (including inspectors)	17,039 26	7,511 69	24,550 95
Dauphin office (including inspectors)	16,814 68	3,931 57	20,746 25
The Pas office	4,774 96	145 50	4,920 46
Sub-agents	480 00	23 28	503 28
	$ 67,539 10	$ 18,953 77	$ 86,492 87

OTTAWA PROPERTY ACQUIRED BY GOVERNMENT

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. What are the names of the persons or firms who acted for the government in the acquisition of the following properties: (a) Wellington street south and Sparks street north; (b) Elgin street east; (c) Sparks street south and Queen street north (Russell House block); (d) Bate building, Canal street; (e) Birkett building, Canal street; (f) Ottawa Transportation building, Canal street; (g) International Paper Company, Sussex street?

2. What commissions were paid in each case?

3. What price was paid by the government for each of the above properties?

4. What amount was paid by the government in connection with the adjustment of leases, rentals or other claims in respect of the above properties?

Mr. RINFRET:

1 and 2. (a) and (b) Messrs. T. Foley and C. W. Ross were appointed as agents to value and negotiate with the owners, adjustment of leases with the tenants and to act as witnesses in Exchequer court, and for these services they were paid the sum of $4,000 each. Services in connection with expropriation were paid as follows: F. B. Poucher, National Trust Company, $1,026.55; H. A. Richards, $650; Farley & Cassels, $190.75; H. L. Maley, $200. The following services were engaged by the Justice department and the following payments made: Raoul Mercier, legal services, $843.55; Tilley, Johnston, Thompson & Parmenter, legal services, $2,000; Green, Johnston & Strike, legal services, $1,512.98; W. Johnstone, legal services, no payment made to date; E. J. Daly, legal services, no payment made to date; Clarkson, Gordon, Dilworth, Guilfoyle & Nash, accountants, $890.40.

(c) J. J. Leddy, A. B. McRostie, A. H. Fitzsimmons, W. E. Noffke, T. Foley and C. W. Ross were employed as real estate valuators and Harold Fisher, K.C., as counsel and legal adviser.

(d) In the case of the Bate building the lease expired on November 1, 1927, and was not renewed.

(e) The wharf lots leased to the Birkett company were cancellable on six months' notice; this notice was given by the department, effective from August 25, 1926. The Birkett warehouse lease had until 1942 to run, and contained no provision as to cancellation, as to which proceedings were taken by the Federal District Commission.

(f) The Ottawa Transportation Company held two "during pleasure" leases of property on Canal street. These were cancelled by notices, effective February 20, 1926.

(g) Engaged by Justice department: Greene, Johnston & Strike, legal services, no payment made to date; N. B. MacRostie, C.E., surveyor, $394.50.

3. (a) and (b) Ottawa Electric Company, $214,463.70; W. J. Irvine, $68,835.62; Bangs estate, no payment made to date, amount fixed by Exchequer court, $290,000 plus interest; Matthewman estate, no payment made to date, amount fixed by Exchequer court, $188,500 plus interest; (c) $1,270,831.01; (d) nil; (e) no payment yet; (f) nil; (g) Gatineau Company Limited, $525,000.

4. (a) and (b) $37,916.91; (c) $220; (d) nil; (e) nil to date; (f) nil; (g) nil.

HOUSE OF COMMONS EMPLOYEES

Mr. GEARY:

1. What number of men are employed on: (a) the elevator staff of the House of Commons; (b) the messenger staff of the House of Commons?

2. By whom are they appointed?

3. How many of these are returned soldiers?

4. What are the names of the returned soldiers?

5. How many men are temporarily employed in the House of Commons?

6. By whom are they appointed?

7. How many of them are returned soldiers?

8. What are the names of the returned soldiers?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. (a) 11; (b) 40.

2. Permanent employees appointed by the Civil Service Commission. Temporary employees appointed by His Honour the Speaker.

3. 10.

4. E. Carriere, O. Carriere, M. Sabourin, I. Trepannier, F. Fraser, E. Wittenberg, H. A. Charbonneau, A. Fairnie, W. H. Jones, L. Merriam.

5. 200—31st March, 1929.

6. By His Honour the Speaker.

7. 65.

8. C. L. Beck, G. H. Campbell, R. de la Durantaye, J. W. Gibson, W. H. Grant, H. R. Hamilton, H. A. Jarvis; R. W. Porteous, F. Aldridge, R. Alexander, E. C. Andrews, P. Banning, J. J. Barber, A. E. Booth, F. E. Brazeau, J. Carvill, T. Closs, H. N. Chretien, S. Dalton, A. Desjardins, R. Gariepy, P. Geymonet, H. Giles, H. Grayshon, A. E. Green, W. Greenwood, T. Hamilton, W. F. Henbrey, A. Hughes, J. Heaton, R. Hewitt, P. Janvenne, W. H. Jones, W. R. Little, J. Laundy, D. Madere, P. McDonald, J. McKenzie, J. McQuattie, A. L. Merriam, A. Nichol, D. O'Rourke, H. Rastrick, W. Rowley, W. Savage, J. E. Seabrook, G. St. Amand, H. Terry, R. Usher, D. Walker, H. J. Wells, A. Wheeler, J. C. Wilson, H. Gravel; J. L. Branback, H. Deledique, J. Emslie, A. Fairnie, J. Giroux, H. Levesque, L. H. Meade, A. McCracken, H. Rutledge, A. Reynolds, E. Tabor.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE—EMPLOYEES

Mr. SPENCER:

1. How many labourers are employed at Rideau Hall by the Public Works department?
2. What is the rate of pay per month?
3. How many have families dependent upon them?
4. How many years are they engaged temporarily before they are put on the permanent staff?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. Twelve.
2. $84.44 a month.
3. No information.
4. These workmen are prevailing rate employees and as such are not permanent.

NATIONAL DEFENCE STATISTICS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What number of: (a) officers; (b) non-commissioned officers; (c) other ranks; of the Department of National Defence were employed at Ottawa for the years 1912-1913 and 1927-1928?
2. What number of officers of all ranks were in civil employment in said department at Ottawa for the same periods?
3. What was the total number of all ranks in the permanent force in the years 1912-13 and 1927-1928?
4. What was the extent of military units in the years 1912-1913 and 1927-1928, as to: (a) number of units; (b) total personnel of all ranks in said units; (c) any other duties devolving upon the military and civil staffs at Ottawa?

Mr. RALSTON: I would like to direct the attention of the hon. member for Bow River to question No. 4 (c). Either there is a misprint or something has gone wrong in transcribing the question, because it is difficult to understand. Question No. 4 asks the extent of military units in two periods, the number of units and the total personnel. Then paragraph (c) reads:

Any other duties devolving upon the military and civil staffs at Ottawa.

I would ask my hon. friend if he would drop paragraph (c) and put another question on the order paper.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): As amended it carries.

Mr. RALSTON: It is a question?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes.

Question stands.

IMMIGRATION EXPENDITURE

Mr. MANION:

1. How much was expended by the Department of Immigration in the British Isles in 1928 annual year?
2. How much was expended by the same department on the continent of Europe in the same year?

Mr. FORKE:

1. $1,016,202.99.
2. $ 75,796.67.

Mr. MANION:

How much money was spent by the Department of Immigration and Colonization for the obtaining of immigrants during 1928, in the following:

(a) United States; (b) Great Britain and Ireland; (c) on the continent of Europe?

Mr. FORKE:

(a) United States, $392,157.96; (b) Great Britain and Ireland, $1,016,202.99; (c) Continent of Europe, $13,557.62.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—OFFICES OF MEMBERS

Mr. SPENCER:

1. How many rooms are there in the House of Commons used as offices by members of parliament?
2. What are the names of members and the number of the rooms in each case?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. 175

2. The information follows: Members of the House of Commons—

Adshead H B Room 618.
Allan H Room 514
Anderson A J Room 611
Anderson R K Room 669
Arthurs J Room 670
Boldwin W K Room 453
Bancroft L P Room 503
Barber H J Room 645
Beaubien A L Room 565

Bell C W Room 634
Bell L G Room 527
Bell T Room 558
Bennett Hon H B Room 301
Benoit A J Room 484
Bettez A Room 662
Bird T W Room 615
Bissett E D R Room 575
Black G Room 637
Black Hon W A Room 592
Blanchard S Room 415
Blatchford K A Room 584
Bock W G Room 574
Boivin P E Room 416
Bothwell C E Room 577
Bouchard G Room 520
Boucher A Room 477
Boulanger O L Room 416
Bourassa H Room 408
Bourgeois A E Room 414
Bowen F W Room 613
Bowman B Room 410
Boys W A Room 555
Bradette J A Room 519
Brady J C Room 649
Brown J L Room 572
Cahan C H Room 641
Cahill F S Room 232
Campbell M N Room 619
Cannon Hon L Room 373
Cantley T Room 596
Cardin Hon P J A Room 496
Carmichael A M Room 619
Casgrain P F Room 405
Casselman A C Room 656
Cayley T M Room 514
Chaplin Hon J D Room 559
Charters S Room 305
Chevrier E R E Room 406
Church T L Room 589
Clark J A Room 647
Coote G G Room 608
Cotnam I D Room 593
Cowan D J Room 643
Delisle M S Room 445
Denis J A Room 484
Desaulniers A L Room 486
Descoteaux J F Room 449
Deslauriers H Room 454
Dickie C H Room 672
Dionne G L Room 517
Donnelly T Room 574
Dubuc J E A Room 451
Duff W Room 566
Dunning Hon C A Room 570
Dussault J E Room 413
Edwards A M Room 642
Edwards G C Room 582
Edwards Hon J W Room 553
Elliott Hon J C Room 436
Embury A T Room 650
Ernst W G Room 597
Esling W K Room 646
Euler Hon W D Room 267
Evans J Room 615
Fafard J F Room 419
Fansher B W Room 617
Fansher W R Room 617
Ferland C E Room 449
Fiset Sir E Room 233
Fontaine J E Room 564
Forke Hon R. Room 501
Foster A R Room 452
Fraser J A Room 645
Gardiner R Room 610
Garland E J Room 610
Garland W F Room 595
Geary G R Room 666
Gershaw F W Room 584
Gervais T Room 486
Girouard W Room 480
Glen J A Room 503
Gott E J Room 644
Goulet A Room 485
Gray R W Room 452
Grimmer R W Room 558
Guerin J J E Room 421
Guthrie Hon H Room 387
Hall W A Room 482
Hanson R B Room 556
Harris J H Room 668
Hay F W Room 412
Heaps A A Room 618
Heenan Hon P Room 378
Hepburn M F Room 518
Hocken H C Room 636
Hodgins A K Room 644
Howard C B Room 420
Howden J P Room 586
Hubbs J Room 595
Ilsley J L Room 414
Irvine W Room 607
Jacobs S W Room 386
Jelliff L H Room 608
Jenkins R H Room 410
Johnston J F Room 205
Johnstone L W Room 599
Jones Hon G B Room 556
Kaiser T E Room 642
Kay W F Room 479
Kellner D F Room 612
Kennedy D M Room 609
King Hon J H Room 273
King Rt Hon W L Mackenzie Room 401
Lacombe L Room 456
Lacroix E Room 487
Ladner L J Room 655
Laflamme L K Room 483
Lanctot R Room 492
Langlois J V A Room 411

Lang M Room 518
Lapierre E A Room 446
Lapointe Hon E Room 383
Lavigueur H E Room 448
Lawson J E Room 589
Lemieux Hon R Room 220
Lennox T H Room 671
Letellier J E Room 480
Lovie W J Room 513
Lucas W T Room 614
Luchkovich M Room 612
MacDonald A J Room 515
MacDonald F Room 599
Macdonald Hon J A Room 561
Macdonald J A Room 598
Macdougall I D Room 598
MacLaren M Room 675
MacLean A E Room 409
MacNutt G T Room 596
Macphail A C Room 605
McDiarmid J S Room 578
McGibbon P Room 643
McGregor R H Room 648
McIntosh C R Room 581
McKenzie R Room 579
McLean M Room 575
McMillan T Room 482
McPhee G W Room 583
McPherson E A Room 586
McQuarrie W G Room 590
McRae A D Room 562
Malcolm Hon J Room 505
Maloney M J Room 593
Manion Hon R J Room 551
Marcil Hon C Room 234
Matthews R C Room 673
Maybee M E Room 654
Mercier J A Room 447
Mercier P Room 450
Millar J Room 585
Milne R Room 576
Morin G D Room 411
Morin L S R Room 444
Morrissy C J Room 415
Motherwell Hon W R Room 264
Neill A W Room 560
Odette E G Room 519
Parent G Room 488
Peck E A Room 652
Perley Hon Sir G H Room 307
Perras F W Room 481
Pettit G H Room 648
Plunket D B Room 646
Pouliot J F Room 554
Power C G Room 418
Prevost J E Room 494
Price O B Room 588
Quinn F P Room 592
Ralston Hon J L Room 381
Raymond M Room 455
Rennie G S Room 591
Rheaume J T Room 494
Rinfret Hon F Room 269
Robb Hon J A Room 201
Roberge E Room 563
Robinson S C Room 651
Robitaille C Room 477
Ross A E Room 653
Ross J G Room 658
Rowe W E Room 671
Rutherford J W Room 516
Ryckman Hon E B Room 557
Ryerson R E Room 639
St Pere E C Room 433
Sanderson F G Room 489
Seguin P A Room 493
Senn M C Room 613
Short H B Room 594
Simpson T E Room 674
Sinclair D Room 594
Sinclair Hon J E Room 512
Smith A N Room 511
Smith R K Room 597
Smoke F Room 639
Speakman A Room 614
Spence D Room 611
Spencer H E Room 609
Spotton G Room 588
Steedsman J Room 576
Stevens Hon H H Room 552
Stewart Hon C A Room 271
Stewart H A Room 653
Stinson T H Room 654
Stirling G Room 649
Sylvestre J E A Room 483
Taylor W H Room 516
Telford W P Room 412
Thompson A B Room 652
Thorson J T Room 578
Tobin E W Room 491
Totzke A F Room 571
Tummon W E Room 650
Vallance J Room 585
Veniot Hon P J Room 371
Verville J A Room 413
Ward W J Room 580
White J F Room 651
White R S Room 307
Wilson G C Room 667
Woodsworth J S Room 616
Young A MacG Room 583
Young E J Room 579
Young N M Room 673

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CIVIL SERVICE—PREMIUMS ON EMPLOYEE'S SECURITY BONDS

Mr. FRASER:

1. How much of the consolidated revenue has been paid by each of the departments of the government as premiums on security bonds of its employees, in contravention of the Public Officers' Act (R.S., chap. 164, sec. 5)?

2. Does the government propose at the present session of parliament to amend chapter 164, section 5, of the revised statutes, as indicated by the Auditor General in his 1927-8 report, vol. 1, on page XIV?

CIVIL SERVICE—PROMOTION WITHIN DEPARTMENTS

Mr. POWER:

1. In cases of promotion within the departments, is it customary for the Civil Service Commission to hold examinations when a candidate has: received from the department the highest rating; (b) has had the longest term of service; (c) has been recommended for promotion by the commission's own board of examiners?

2. If such is the case, what period of time elapses between notice thereof to the applicants and the holding of such examination?

3. Since June, 1925, in how many cases, when all the elements favourable to an applicant as outlined in question No. 1 appear on the record, has the ordinary procedure been disregarded and examinations ordered?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

CHATS FALLS POWER SITE

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all permits, correspondence, letters, telegrams, orders in council, and all other documents in relation to the issue of a permit to develop 50,000 horse-power at "Chat Falls" under the Navigable Waters Protection Act and a copy of the evidence on said hearing before the Minister of Public Works.

LOCH LOMOND POST OFFICE

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond-West Cape Breton):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, papers and other documents with reference to the closing of the post office at Loch Lomond, Richmond county.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Dunning) has just tabled the report of the Canadian National railways. May I inquire whether the report of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine will also be tabled at an early date?

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): Yes.

WATER-POWERS IN WESTERN PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): On the 6th of March the house unanimously adopted a resolution regarding the administration of the water-powers in the three prairie provinces, which resolution calls for certain legislation. I wonder if the Prime Minister or the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) can inform the house whether such legislation is in process of preparation, and when we may expect it to be introduced.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): Yes, it is in process of preparation, but we are finding it somewhat difficult to make it conform. We expect to bring it down within a few daws.

MONTREAL RAILWAY TERMINALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): May I ask when the report with regard to the Montreal terminals which has been laid upon the table of the house will be available in English and French for distribution?

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): I presume my hon. friend refers to the report of Mr. Palmer which was tabled a few weeks ago?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes.

Mr. DUNNING: I just received the printed copies this morning, and they are available now.

Mr. CAHAN: Will they be distributed to members of the house?

Mr. DUNNING: I had not considered the question of general distribution. Perhaps it would be desirable to give them a general distribution. My hon. friends and any member who is interested can secure a copy now, at all events.

Mr. CAHAN: I trust I may secure several copies because Montreal is very much interested.

Mr. DUNNING: Certainly.

PRIVILEGE—MR. GOTT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ECCLES J. GOTT (South Essex): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I wish to say that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), speaking last night in a very hysterical manner—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. GOTT: Perhaps I had better quote his words.

An hon. MEMBER: You cannot quote his manner.

Mr. GOTT: Speaking, shall I say, in a schoolboy and dramatic manner, made several references to some quotations that I had made, and used the words "gross exaggeration." I want to say to the hon. member for West Elgin—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GOTT: After quoting from the Border Cities Star—I hesitate to mention this, but nevertheless it concerns the honour of a member of the press gallery—the hon. member for West Elgin said that the Speaker did not congratulate me.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: That is not a question of privilege.

Mr. GOTT: Not a question of privilege when it concerns the honour of a member of the press gallery?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. GOTT: I desire to read what the hon. member for West Elgin said:

> I do not know to whom to give credit for this publicity, whether to the hon. member for South Essex or to the reporter who signs himself E. C. Buchanan. If Ananias and Sapphira were to return from the grave I am sure they would rush up to a reporter with such a vivid imagination and grasping him by the hand would say, "Shake brother, shake!"

I had nothing to do with that newspaper report; I had nothing to do with the words of the speaker. But may I say that the Speaker not only congratulated but commended me.

Mr. SPEAKER: As Speaker of the house I must say that I know of no Ananias amongst my friends.

[Mr. Dunning.]

PRIVILEGE—MR. HEPBURN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. F. HEPBURN (West Elgin): Speaking to a question of privilege, I want to call the attention of the house to the fact that two very definite statements appeared in the Border Cities Star. One was to the effect that a special privilege was granted by you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Gott), in extending his time limit for speaking, a privilege previously refused to another hon. member who had asked for it. I maintain that that statement is unfair to you, sir, because I do not believe that you have ever shown favouritism to any member of this house. Following that up—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. HEPBURN: I am simply claiming the same privilege that was exercised by the hon. member for South Essex. I want to read this very definite statement appearing in the Border Cities Star:

> When Mr. Gott sat down amidst the applause of his party and other members, Mr. Speaker Lemieux left his place and went over and congratulated him on making one of the best speeches of the session.

I do not think that ever in the history of this parliament has any Speaker left the chair to congratulate a member of the house, much less the hon. member for South Essex.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The house resumed from Tuesday, April 9, consideration of the motion of Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of ways and means, the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. Hugh Guthrie, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of Mr. Spencer.

Mr. W. G. BOCK (Maple Creek): In rising, Mr. Speaker, to make a few remarks in this debate I feel that the preceding speakers have so thoroughly covered and re-covered the most outstanding topics of general interest that it may be somewhat difficult for me to enlarge on many of them without being obliged to thresh considerable old straw. However, we have threshing machines out west —and I presume they may also be found in

the east—which at times "throw over" a certain amount of grain when crowded, and occasionally it is possible to find a fair amount of grain in the straw stacks, especially if too much wind is used. I am in hopes, Mr. Speaker, that I shall be able to find among the many gigantic straw stacks which have been thrown up—I had almost said blown up—in the course of the threshing of the various problems in this debate, a few kernels of some value.

I wish in the first place to offer my congratulations to the hon. members who moved and seconded the address in reply to the speech from the throne on the splendid efforts they made. I was very much impressed by the graceful and assured manner of the member for Joliette, (Mr. Ferland) who made his maiden speech on that occasion. I mention this because I have not previously had an opportunity of voicing my sentiments.

Let me also congratulate the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie).

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The house is in such a happy mood that I cannot hear the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BOCK: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to congratulate the hon. member for South Wellington, who made so fine an effort in criticizing the budget. I am sure he must have raised the spirits of the opposition members several feet. No doubt they began to think that the policies of the Conservative party if implemented would further accelerate the steadily increasing prosperity; for even the most pessimistic members opposite must admit that the financial condition of the country is in a much stronger position than when the present administration took office in 1921. Calamity howling and blue ruin rumours are not so prevalent this year as in the past, because even the most rabid disciples of high tariff must realize how ridiculous their gospel would seem, when under this administration we find reductions in taxation and in tariff and a substantial increase in the surplus, all contained in the same budget.

Now, according to the philosophy of some very prominent members opposite, a condition of this kind should be an impossibility. For here we have a very remarkable performance by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb). The other night the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Macdougall) referred to him as a financial wizard, and quite rightly too, for it was a remarkable performance. He puts his tax and tariff reductions in a hat, makes a few passes with his financial wand, reaches in and pulls out a $69,000,000 net surplus, without damaging the old hat in the slightest, and on every hand we see evidences of prosperity. On a former occasion this financial wizard also performed a remarkable miracle. It will be remembered that he mixed some automobile industries with a reduction in tariff, at a time of unemployment, and in spite of the chorus of blue ruin which was hurled at him by our friends opposite, who cried "you'll ruin the hat" he "stood by his guns" and produced the finest specimen of industrial expansion; and incidentally the old hat was better than ever.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to grasp the alleged logic of tariffs, whether they went by the name of protection or were disguised sufficiently to be called industrial "safeguards", of which, the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) as geographical conditions warrant can so tactfully take advantage; for while in the eastern industrial centres he runs with his tariff cut-out wide open and talks of protection through a megaphone, when he returns to the wide open spaces west of the Great lakes he uses his muffler, retards his spark and in the cool shades of the evening he may be heard to murmur gently something about the safeguarding of our Canadian industries.

Mr. BENNETT: I cannot permit the hon. gentleman, although it is his first speech in this house, to make such a misstatement. I made exactly the same observations in western Canada as I did in the east and I propose to do so in the future.

Mr. BOCK: Possibly the hon. leader of the opposition will forgive me for making a mistake, as I can forgive him his error in stating that this is my first speech in the house.

Mr. BENNETT: The first time I have heard the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BOCK: Speaking of prosperity, Mr. Speaker, we have the best country in the world—it is full of opportunities for those who will take advantage of them. To enumerate a few of the activities in which we are second to none, I might mention wheat exports, newsprint production and pulpwood resources, nickel and asbestos mines. Per capita we have the greatest hydro-power development of any country in the world; the greatest railroad mileage, most life insurance, largest

cooperative societies and largest grain handling system. After listening to the inspiring and masterly address of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) yesterday, I am more than ever of the opinion that the prosperous condition of Canada to-day is largely due to the clear vision and outstanding statesmanship of the present great leader of the Liberal party. Why, a reverend gentleman, in this city in the course of his remarks last Sunday, touching on the prosperity of our country, stated that in his opinion in many cases to-day blue ruin propaganda is only the reflex of a bad digestion.

The speech of the hon. member for South Wellington was I presume the most outstanding speech that has emanated from the opposition benches for some time. Many of the hon. gentlemen opposite must have been speculating on what a bear of a speech a man of his ability might have made, had he been defending the budget rather than criticizing it. Of course it is plain to anyone who has read Hansard of March 7 that his chief concern was criticism of the government whether there was any justification for it or not. He made a great fuss about a so-called unfavourable trade balance between Canada and the United States; he neglected, however, to emphasize the fact that our total foreign trade shows a balance in our favour of $154,000,000.

This so-called unfavourable trade balance is stated by the hon. member for South Wellington to be around $333,000,000 which is a large sum indeed, and he submitted that something was seriously wrong in regard to our relations with the United States and stated that he believed we were buying too much from that country year in and year out. His statement that goods purchased must be paid for is correct, but he neglected to mention that to offset this adverse balance of $333,000,000 Canada carried on a trade with the United States which, although invisible in so far as government reports were concerned, should easily wipe out this unfavourable balance about which we have heard so much. I refer to the tourist traffic, which not only consists of the money spent in Canada by tourists for the necessities of life, such as board, lodging and so forth, but includes a large amount of exports to the United States which are not found in any customs record.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BOCK: I am not referring to what hon. gentlemen have in mind. I say that these particular exports I mention are not found in any customs record, for it is well known that the majority of American tourists returning carry with them at least a fair proportion of the amount of goods, to the value of $100, which each is allowed to take into the United States free. The Department of Railways and Canals, in bulletin No. 19 I believe, refers to this matter and estimates the amount of money spent in Canada by tourists in the year 1927 at approximately $300,000,000. Taking this one item from the speech of perhaps the most outstanding critic of the government, and showing both sides of the case, it is very apparent that conditions are not nearly so bad as the hon. gentleman tried to paint them.

The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bancroft) last Thursday night referred to the results of the tariff adjustments, implemented by the United States government in the year 1921-22, and which were supposed to be of great benefit to the American farmer. With the result of those adjustments we are all familiar, and I doubt very much whether the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) will be able to fool very many of the western Canadian farmers when he baits his hook with promises of safeguarding and protecting the agricultural interests. The Canadian farmer is not going to buy flowers for his own funeral, nor is he going to make dynamite with which to blow himself off the map; and if hon. gentlemen opposite have been franking a few tons of the March 7th Hansard to the prairies it is to be hoped that they started them west on the 1st of April, because in that case the farmers out there will realize that at least they have a sense of humour. Let me tell you that the farmers of western Canada have not forgotten the Crowsnest pass agreement, the Hudson Bay railway, second homesteads or reductions in duty on over 275 items which have been made since 1921, and which I think may be found in Hansard of 1928, pages 1360 to 1373.

With regard to the tariff, there is one little matter to which I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) and that is with reference to the classification of harvester combines, which was mentioned recently by the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Fansher). This combine is a very expensive machine and it is becoming increasingly popular in western Canada. Of course, as many hon. gentlemen know, it is a combination of harvester and thresher, and a great many of these machines were in operation last fall in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. At present this machine comes into Canada under tariff item 447b, subject to a duty of 10 per cent. As harvesting machinery is subject to a duty of only 6 per cent under item 445, I think

that in view of the fact that the life of this machine is very short, and that the price is quite high, the machine should be reclassified so as to come in under item 445, carrying a 6 per cent duty instead of 10 per cent. In view of the concern which my hon. friends opposite have expressed on behalf of the agricultural interests, I do not anticipate that they would raise serious objections to such action on the part of the government.

In referring to constructive legislation, I prefer to deal with a subject, outside the tariff, which I am better qualified to discuss, a subject of vital importance to the people of my constituency, the people of western Canada, and the people of the Dominion as a whole; because we are all component parts of one great whole, and anything that tends to injure one part must reflect to the detriment of all, and vice versa. The question of grain grading is and has been the main topic of conversation in the prairies since October last. When reports on car shipments of wheat came in from inspection points, in many cases it was found that the wheat was one to two grades lower than anticipated by the producers. In spite of the fact that the bulk of last year's crop was to a considerable extent injured by frost, it was nevertheless very apparent that there had been a tightening of grades by the inspectors, which resulted in widespread dissatisfaction and a feeling on the part of the producer that something was wrong with our system of inspection of grain. In consequence of this discontent, which had assumed alarming proportions, the Saskatchewan government appointed a commission to inquire into the whole matter and to endeavour to discover some means whereby this condition might be remedied. This commission has been devoting its best efforts to the study of the problem, and I am satisfied that it will be in a position to supply us with an interim report of its findings before this house prorogues, so that legislation may be framed to remedy some of the evils which at present exist. Many farm organizations have been giving considerable study to the problem and many resolutions have been passed by these bodies and referred to hon. members representing western constituencies.

Three remedies in particular have been suggested by various local lodges of the Saskatchewan section of the United Farmers of Canada, which asks that the Canada Grain Act be so amended as to prohibit the mixing of grain in all private as well as at present in public terminal elevators, and to establish the protein content as one of the basic factors to be given consideration in the grading of wheat. Other resolutions have come to hand from similar bodies asking that the Canada Grain Act be administered by the Department of Agriculture, rather than by the Department of Trade and Commerce, in view of the mass of evidence that has been made available both by the Saskatchewan commission and the committee on agriculture, I am inclined to think that this practice of mixing is more or less responsible for a great deal of the dissatisfaction at present existing.

The constituency of Maple Creek, which I have the honour to represent, comprises a large area which produces wheat of high protein content and naturally the producers are keenly interested in securing legislation which would recognize this quality as a factor in grading. Located as we are, immediately north of the Montana line, where the farmers of that state are able to secure premiums of 30 to 40 cents per bushel at times on the Minneapolis market for wheat showing a high percentage of protein, our farmers are naturally bound to be dissatisfied, as the Saskatchewan farmer in the southwest part of the province is growing exactly the same quality and variety of wheat, under the same climatic conditions as they are in Montana, and it is very hard to understand why the 49th parallel, which is only an imaginary line, should account for this disparity in values. These men are neighbours though living in different countries, and visit back and forward and discuss these matters.

I think it is generally conceded that the value of our wheat on both the domestic and foreign markets is determined largely by its baking strength, and baking strength is easily determined by checking up the quantity and quality of its protein. It should follow, then, that protein, gluten, or baking strength, which mean practically the same thing, should be given consideration in the fixing of grade standards so that the producer would be paid on the same basis as that which determines its value from the buyer's viewpoint.

In connection with the strength of wheat, or wheat with strong protein or gluten content, in the Financial Post of Toronto under date of March 1, I notice a reference by Professor James E. Boyle, who is professor of agricultural economics at Cornell university. This gentleman is considered a world authority on grain marketing problems, and in referring to the strength of wheat he says:

> . . . . to get both strength and colour in the flours in Europe, blending of wheats is required. The strong wheat, wheat with the strong gluten, makes flour, the dough of which will absorb much water. When the dough is baked much of this water remains in it. The baker finds

it to his advantage to sell as much water in this way as he can, as long as the quality of his bread remains uniformly good and satisfactory to his customers. He aims to produce 380 pounds of bread from 280 pounds of flour, after adding the water, salt, yeast and so on. He can do this if he has strong gluten—otherwise he cannot.

I think it is a well known fact that Canadian and American millers take advantage of the fact that the protein content of wheat can be easily determined by chemical analysis; the millers continually make tests at inspection points and divert cars showing a high protein content to their own mills. This practice has been referred to by the trade as skimming, but from the standpoint of the farmers it might be classified as "skinning", since only on rare occasions is a premium received by the producer. This skimming or skinning might be compared to a man selling milk; in the process of delivery of the milk a third party takes the cream. So the consumer receives only skim milk, the man who takes the cream gets it at the price of skim milk and the producer receives only the skim milk price for both milk and cream. In other words the man who gets the skim milk is the man who sets the price, just as the old country buyer sets the price of wheat. Therefore it will be seen that this skimming is an expensive process from the farmer's view point.

The committee on agriculture devoted considerable time and study last session to this question of protein content and from the evidence submitted it was shown that the costs of making protein tests or the time required would not be serious obstacles in the way of giving protein a place as one of the factors in our grading regulations as far as carload lots were concerned. Street wheat, however, which probably constitutes 50 per cent of the volume handled, would involve difficulties which, however, I think, might be overcome. While the committee looked with favour on this matter, they deemed it advisable to secure more information and recommended that the national council on industrial and scientific research make further inquiries into the matter. I trust that when these requests are dealt with in committee there will be sufficient evidence submitted to warrant their adoption, and I hope this house may see fit so to amend the grain act as to give protein content the recognition it deserves.

In connection with the question of protein content, Mr. Speaker, I feel that a great deal of credit is due the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) for the time and energy he has devoted to the study of this important matter, and I sincerely trust that his efforts will bear fruit in the near future.

The question of mixing has been discussed at considerable length, but since the committee on agriculture no doubt will make an intensive study of this matter before the House adjourns and will hear considerable evidence both for and against this practice, I have no desire to enlarge on it at the present time. However, as I see it at present, I am strongly of the opinion that mixing is a practice which is of no benefit to the producer, more particularly when it makes possible the mixture of American soft wheats with our better varieties and permits them to go to the old country markets under Canadian Government certificates of grade.

In this connection I would refer to an editorial published in the Ottawa Journal of April 3, 1929. It comments on evidence taken before the royal commisison at Winnipeg, and reads as follows:

> The marketing of Canada's wheat crop, one of our greatest sources of wealth, is a matter so vital to the country's prosperity that it cannot be left to incompetent or haphazard methods. Yet, unless a great deal of evidence recently taken before a number of commissions is untrustworthy, that is the condition that exists. Take, as an illustration, this despatch that came over the wires the other day from Winnipeg:—
>
> "Canadian wheat, mixed with soft grain from the United States at Montreal, is being shipped out to world markets as Canadian government-inspected wheat, it was declared at to-day's session of the Royal Grain Commision here by James D. Fraser, chief government grain inspector. Mixing of western hard wheat with low-grade American grain is a common practice of the transfer houses in Montreal, the commissioners were informed, and Mr. Fraser thought this practice had been going on for a number of years, certainly since he was made department head in 1925.
>
> "That no authority for a mixture of Canadian and United States grain exists was admitted by the chief inspector, who added that there is nothing on the inspection certificate to show that the grain is a mixture.
>
> "Canadian grain passing through the United States to American ports also was being mixed with American, the witness thought. He contended these facts were the real reason why foreign millers had expressed dissatisfaction with the Canadian grain they had been receiving.
>
> "Nor was that all. A few days later a number of technical witnesses, testifying before this same commission, admitted that they did not know just upon what basis Canadian wheat was graded. They were the people supposed to be charged with that very important duty, yet they were unable to explain to the commission just how grading was arrived at."

The fact that such practice prevails is sufficient to give Canadian wheat a bad name in

foreign markets, and now that the condition is known suitable steps must be taken not only to see that the practice of mixing shall not only be discontinued but that it shall be made impossible for such a condition of affairs to exist in future.

With regard to the hybrid ticket, which occasioned some controversy in this house, to my mind this question, while important, is not so vital as the question of mixing and grading. While I do not uphold the board in allowing this ticket to be used, we should not lose sight of the fact that the last threshing season was probably the most outstanding one in years with regard to uninterrupted fine weather, and grain was rushed to the railroads faster than ever before, owing to the more general use of the motor truck. Possibly the board had visions of the pool terminals blocked up and the private houses not operating up to capacity, and no doubt the question of congested terminals may have been a factor considered when allowing this innovation. I trust, Mr. Speaker, when the Hudson Bay railway is in operation we may provide that only public terminal elevators will be used at Fort Churchill, and that no mixing of grades will be allowed therein. This should give us a splendid opportunity of ascertaining the real value of our grain, as the attitude of old country buyers would be reflected in prices offered.

And speaking of Churchill I feel proud to associate myself with a government which has brought to realization a dream nurtured by the pioneers of Canada's great west for forty years. During the Easter recess I read with pleasure press despatches to the effect that the steel had entered Fort Churchill. Until the recent advent of the aeroplane, few Canadians or as a matter of fact few citizens of the world realized the untapped resources of mineral wealth which are now known to exist within reach of the Hudson Bay railway. With the enormous mining development which is taking place in Canada and the interest this development has awakened, it is realized now that instead of merely being an artery for the transportation of grain and other commodities to Europe by the northern route, the railway taps the vast precambrian shield, which is the repository of untold mineral wealth, and in addition opens up to commercial development large areas of pulpwood. Now that this road is nearing completion the insistence of its promoters is seen to be justified, and I look back with wonder at the sarcastic remarks of certain hon. members of this house who referred to the whole venture as a fantastic and impossible dream which could only end in adding to the country another burden of debt, and who damned this enterprise from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Speaking in all seriousness, it looks as if these disciples of despair—I almost said disciples of "damnation"—will be confounded, and the so-called gold brick, represented by the railway, will turn out to be twenty-four carat throughout.

On the way east recently I fell in with a young man who has been working for the Department of Railways during the past five years in the vicinity of Nelson and Churchill, and who had spent last winter at Churchill. What impressed me most, Mr. Speaker, was his great enthusiasm over the possibilities of that northern route, and it was very evident that his whole heart was bound up in the project. He seemed very anxious to hustle back with his steel workers and get on the job again. I have often heard it said that the government employees are inclined to loaf on the job, but it is evident that condition is not prevalent at Churchill. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) is to be congratulated not only on the aggressive manner in which he has been rushing this project through, but on his ability to select men of the proper calibre and who are able to measure up to jobs of those dimensions.

There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to refer to briefly, in connection with a request from Mr. Jack Miner of Kingsville, Ontario, for an annual contribution of $5,000 from the federal government to help him in providing feed for the birds taking refuge at his sanctuary. It appears to me that this matter should be considered from a national viewpoint, as the migratory bird life from all over the continent receives protection there. Provincial or boundary lines have no meaning to our wild fowl, and I am sure that Mr. Miner and his sanctuary at Kingsville have become national in prominence. It is not necessary for me to attempt to enlarge on the benefits that we as Canadians derive from an establishment of that kind, for while its value may not be estimated in dollars and cents, yet true lovers of nature realize the importance of protecting our bird life, and its educational and scientific value should be readily apparent. In view of the fact that the United States government in the Norbeck bill, which was passed last February, has set aside $8,000,000 for the establishment of similar sanctuaries over a ten-year period, I do not think that the Canadian government should hesitate over the comparatively small annual grant of $5,000 to provide food for our feathered

friends. Of course there is the possibility that some hon. members opposite will take advantage of an opportunity to justify their accusation that this government is throwing money to the birds, because we have frequently heard that statement from across the floor of the house. Possibly the hon. member for Toronto Northwest (Mr. Church) could support this expenditure. He so frequently talks about the government spending money like water or like drunken sailors when he is not eulogizing the late Sir Adam Beck and the Ontario Hydro-Electric, or worrying about some marine garage down at Halifax. He would be able honestly to add another phrase to his repertoire of critical expressions when referring to expenditures and conscientiously accuse this government of "throwing money to the birds."

Speaking of extravagance, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite criticize right and left the expenditures of the government. Many of them referred to the embassy at Washington and deplored the fact that this government had supplied our ambassador with a residence and offices in keeping with our national needs and dignity. One would almost have inferred from their remarks that our ambassador should have hired a room at the Y.M.C.A. or built a shack outside the city limits and used a second hand Ford by which to travel to and from his office.

As my time is rapidly slipping by, Mr. Speaker, I must hurry to a conclusion. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in his amendment regrets that the financial proposals of the government make no provision for safeguarding and protecting the interests of those engaged in agricultural or industrial pursuits, but I am satisfied that the farmers of western Canada at least will have little faith in a policy which involves a protective tariff. While I cannot support his amendment, I must say that he has made it abundantly clear that, should the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) step into higher and wider fields of political activities, or should he be prematurely harvested by the grim reaper which we sincerely trust will not occur, hon. members opposite would not have far to seek for another Moses to lead them through the wilderness. I am sure that he could even outclass that famous leader of the children of Israel when it came to making bricks without straw.

With the subamendment of the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer) I have no quarrel, for I have always been in favour of greater freedom of trade within the British Empire and of further increasing the British preference. But as the policy of the government has been to develop and foster inter-imperial trade, and in view of the fact that consideration is being given to this matter at the present time, I consider these sufficient reasons for my not registering my vote for what is really a want of confidence motion.

Hon. W. A. BLACK (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, this debate has been a very interesting and instructive one. We have had the pleasure of hearing many excellent speakers, including the hon. acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Guthrie), who delivered an address which brought forth eulogies from friend and foe alike. I do not intend to detain the house in repeating what has been said many times with regard to the items in the budget. The budget speaks for itself, and I am at a loss to understand just what benefit my province is to receive therefrom.

I would like to refer to the speech of the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff), delivered during the evening of April 8. I am sure the house has by this time digested the supposed facts which the hon. gentleman presented. I think it would be interesting to know just what his colleagues from Nova Scotia, the hon. Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) and the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley), think of the statements made by the hon. member. My opinion is that this house has never before had placed before it such a large number of statements, all of which were alleged to be in accordance with the facts but none of which indicated the true state of affairs as shown by the records of the house. It would take quite a long time to deal with the various topics which he discussed, and I will refer only to one of them, the port of Halifax. The hon. member's words are:

> Let us compare the record of the Liberal party with regard to the port of Halifax with the record of the Conservative party. We do not hear anything about what was done for the port of Halifax between the years 1911 and 1921, the ten years during which our Conservative friends were in power. But what did they really do for that port? Practically nothing.

There is a supposed statement of fact, but what does Hansard show? It shows that during 1912, 1913 and 1914 the Conservative government spent $6,760,000 in the development of the port of Halifax. Why was that expenditure made? It was made to carry out, not only the terms of the British North America Act, but more particularly the conditions upon which the Transcontinental railway was built. Why was that railway built? To carry the traffic of Canada through Canadian ports.

That could not be done until the terminals were provided whereby the ships would find accommodation and the traffic could be handled. That was carrying out by the Liberal-Conservative government the terms upon which the Transcontinental railway was built. Had the Conservatives remained in power, the development would have been completed by this time and we would have had, instead of, I shall not say a paltry amount of business, many, many times the present business in the port of Halifax during the winter season and perhaps during the summer. This government has been in power since 1922; this is 1929, but it is only this year that they are beginning to handle any traffic through that port, and the amount is very small.

Mr. DUFF: Did my hon. friend say that $6,000,000 was spent by the Conservative government between 1911 and 1914?

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): I gave the amount as $6,760,000, as shown by the records.

Mr. DUFF: My hon. friend is mistaken. The amount was $16,000,000, which was wasted on the terminals, and not $6,000,000.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): I will add that during the Liberal-Conservative regime there was in all $17,000,000 spent on facilities for handling Canadian traffic through Canadian ports.

Mr. DUFF: Money which was wasted. It will ruin the whole city.

Mr. QUINN: That will sound good down there.

Mr. DUFF: It cuts the whole city in two.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): My hon. friend says that it will ruin the whole city. Sir Robert Borden's government sent engineers to Halifax to report on the best location for terminals for the great Transcontinental railway. Those men visited Halifax and brought back their report. The terminals were located in accordance with their report, and on looking over the harbour, studying the depth of water and so on, although I was a sufferer personally because my property alongside those terminals is not as valuable as it would have been had the terminals not been put there, I believe the choice was the proper one and never before in the history of a government were plans made and carried out so advantageously as were the plans on which work was commenced in connection with those terminals. The plans were comprehensive and so laid out that as pier after pier was required because of the development of the traffic through that port, they could be added without any disturbance of traffic, buying of additional property, removal of buildings or anything of that kind. It was the most comprehensive and businesslike proposition that was ever put on paper by any government. It may be said; why were the terminals not put further north? I will not waste time going into that. Had the terminals, at the time that those plans were ready, been extended as some people contended they should have been, there would not have been a private wharf left in Halifax harbour. We have facilities for eight big wharves capable of accommodating twenty to thirty steamers at a time, and not a piece of private business property is interfered with. I might have added that in 1914 the work was considerably curtailed because of the war. But for the war I believe, as I said before, Halifax to-day would be enjoying a vast traffic which at the present time she is not receiving.

This free trade government, as is well known, is crippling the industries of the country. Many, perhaps all of the members are aware of interference with, crippling and closing up of industries in their constituencies or near thereto. In Halifax, having lost many industries because of the tariff policy of this government, we are now threatened with, I might almost say the destruction of another very important industry. I refer to the Acadia sugar refinery, located in Dartmouth, and I do not omit the Atlantic sugar refinery in St. John. These institutions employ many people, and the closing of them, if it takes place, will be a serious matter. For some time refined Cuban sugar has been entering the Dominion of Canada on favoured terms, greatly of course to the injury of those refineries which, under existing conditions, are not able to earn dividends for their shareholders. What will be the probable result if such conditions continue? In my judgment those industries will close because people do not as a rule employ their capital in industries which make no return to them. With the closing of those industries, what happens? Not only is a large body of our people thrown out of employment, but we lose the money that would be distributed in connection with the industries in handling the sugar and other materials that are brought in, storing them, and so on. Where will those people seek employment? Across the border in a foreign country. May I make a suggestion to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) that he soften his heart; that he confer with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb), urging that some consideration be given to his fellow manufacturers, permitting them to enjoy some of the advantages of the

protective tariff which he so extensively enjoys. What has built up the great nation to the south of us? It is the protection necessary to industries that keeps their people at home—the policy of America for the Americans, not America for the Canadians. The French do not leave their homes. Why? Because they find employment at home. Their industries, being protected, are in a position to thrive and grow and employ the people.

Our people have been hearing a great deal for some time past of the trade treaty made by this government with the West Indies. It would appear to me that the more treaties these gentlemen make, the deeper they get into the mire. Probably hon. gentlemen of this house, especially those from the prairie provinces, are not aware of the contribution which they make to the West Indies through this much discussed treaty. Take sugar, for instance. The quantity of sugar imported into the country is about 800,000,000 pounds, half of which comes from the British West Indies. On that 400,000,000 pounds coming from the West Indies the duty would be $4,000,000, but under the treaty a return of ninety per cent, or $3,600,000, is made to the West Indies interests. In other words, out of that $4,000,000 which is supposed to be collected on the importation of sugar from the West Indies, we return to the West Indies planters and growers $3,600,000, and yet nobody in this country is buying sugar any cheaper than had that sugar come from a foreign country. That $3,600,000 which is returned to the growers and planters of sugar in the West Indies represents, on a basis of 9,000,000 people in Canada, about 40 cents per head that we are contributing to the sugar producers in the West Indies. If Canada is willing to contribute the large sum of $3,600,000 to the British West Indies sugar industry, surely she has similar obligations to the home industries which are now suffering.

A great deal has also been said about butter. I wish to endorse what has been said as to the harmful effects on our farmers of the New Zealand treaty, and I would like to give the house a few figures on the importation of New Zealand butter. There has been landed during the three months of this year at one port alone in Canada, Halifax, 16,000,000 pounds of New Zealand butter, and in addition 100,000 carcasses of lamb and mutton and about 6,000 carcasses of beef. It is for the government to decide what effect their policy is having upon the struggling farmers of Canada. May we not ask, is Canada an agricultural country, and is this government striving to make it such?

[Mr. W. A. Black.]

We have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite of the prosperity throughout Canada. I am free to admit that Canada has been prosperous and is prosperous to-day in spots, but prosperity is not general. Whilst the banks and the large corporations no doubt show satisfactory returns and profits to their shareholders, prosperity is not general throughout this country. It is difficult to find a farmer who can show a profit, who can perhaps do more than enough to keep himself and his family alive and clothed.

The hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) referred to the prosperity in Halifax and the money that is being spent there. I admit that Halifax is prosperous, although not wholly so. The waterfront of Halifax is very busy at the present time, and there is a large amount of money circulating from week to week amongst the labourers and longshoremen and those who work on the steamers entering the port. But on the other hand, if you talk with the workers of the welfare bureau, as I have done, you will find, and I have been told by these workers, that this winter is the worst that they have had for years. These welfare workers are not working among the labourers and longshoremen who are earning money on the waterfront, but in other sections of the city, and they say this is the worst year that they have had for many years past. One reason for the prosperity amongst the labourers on the waterfront is this: I admit at the outset that the British preference has had something to do with it, inasmuch as there is a certain amount of cargo being landed in the port of Halifax from Great Britain; but the tonnage which is entering the port of Halifax from week to week is coming there not because of any action on the part of this government, but because of the position Halifax occupies, a position not occupied by any other port on this side of the Atlantic. We have a magnificent harbour, and we are on the trade route between the American ports and the ports of Great Britain and Europe. What brings the ships there? Some are coming with the mails, as they always have done, and with passengers. The others come simply because these steamship lines are in competition, and when one line makes Halifax or any other port a port of call, its competitors do the same. The foreign boats entering the port—and we have some of the finest vessels of the Scandinavian Baltic-American, Hamburg-American and other lines calling—do not bring British goods; they come to land passengers and to continue in their business. So it is not due to any of the policies of this government that Halifax is so prosperous along the waterfront and has so

much shipping coming and going. We have as a rule as many as seven large ships entering the port between Saturday night and Monday noon during the winter months, and, as I say, I believe one-half of the tonnage is foreign tonnage—not brought into Halifax because of any British preference or any action of the government, but by reason of the competition among the shipping companies.

The Liberal-Conservative party is charged by hon. gentlemen opposite with continually preaching blue ruin, depression, unemployment, and always singing "hard times." Let me say to these hon. gentlemen that had the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party been followed by them Canada to-day would be enjoying far greater general prosperity than now prevails. It is not the Liberal-Conservative party alone which is said to be "whining," and in confirmation of this let me quote what leaders of the Liberal party in Nova Scotia are saying. In the Nova Scotia Legislature which is at present in session, and in which the Liberals are on the left of the Speaker, there has been on their part a good deal of wailing over bad business conditions in the province. They have been demanding what they describe as "an economic commission" to ascertain, as they say, "what is wrong with Nova Scotia and its business affairs."

One of the Liberal members, Mr. Wishart Robertson, who represents Shelburne county —and Shelburne county is a part of the federal district represented by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston)—drew a very dark picture of the financial and economic conditions as between the central provinces and Nova Scotia. Here is what he said, among other things, and it is taken from a verbatim report which appeared in the Halifax Chronicle of March 2, 1929:

> Duties and taxes paid to the Dominion are entirely out of proportion with what we receive in any form of benefits, and we must find out more details before finding a suitable end to our problems.

Again, referring to the number of new automobiles and trucks in Nova Scotia and their cost, Mr. Robertson claimed that on an average these were costing the people of the province more than the same article cost in the United States, and then he concluded with this assertion, which I am also quoting from the Halifax Chronicle, the leading Liberal paper in the province. He said:

> We in Nova Scotia in that one item alone contributed $1,926,000 in excess of what we should have paid as our contribution to the maintenance and success of the industrial structure of central Canada.

Mr. Robertson went on to refer to the refusal of the Dominion government to provide protection for the steel industry of Nova Scotia, and said:

> When the Dominion Iron and Steel Company sought protection at Ottawa, its opposition, in part, consisted of an argument that such protection would increase the cost of producing automobiles to the extent of $1.45 each.

These gentlemen, I repeat, are demanding what they describe as an "economic commission" to ascertain, as they say, "what is wrong with Nova Scotia and its business." Mr. Robertson continued:

> We are asked to contribute from our meagre resources towards the maintenance of the financial and industrial structure of central Canada, yet so soon as they are asked to contribute to assist our industry, we are told it is not sound business, that we should go to the markets of the world.
>
> We are contributing from $20,000,000 to $25,000,000 each year as a constant stream because of our economic handicap, and now is the time to take some action to inquire into the causes and remedies.

Another of the Liberal members of the legislature, who spent over three hours in an attempt to show that Nova Scotia is going to the dogs, is Mr. A. S. MacMillan, who was a member of the Armstrong government which was defeated in 1925, and who is not bashful in stating that he expects to be a member of any future Liberal government in the province. He represents Digby county. He takes a very gloomy view of two of the fundamental industries of the province, namely, agriculture and lumbering.

Mr. BENNETT: But contracting is bright with him.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): Mr. Robertson was in a very despairing mood in regard to the great steel industry of the province, and when he and his colleague, Mr. MacMillan, unite in describing the steel industry, the farming industry and the mining industry as not making any progress, their views are in striking contrast with those of hon. gentlemen in the federal government who declare that Nova Scotia is humming with prosperity. This is what Mr. MacMillan said:

> The farmers of Nova Scotia were not prospering. Fifty per cent were sliding back each year, twenty-five per cent were holding their ground, and twenty-five per cent, favourably situated were making a little progress.

Those are the words of Mr. MacMillan, a member of the legislature of Nova Scotia, and an aspirant to the provincial leadership of the Liberal party. There seems to be keen rivalry as to who should be the leader. This gentleman was a member of the late Armstrong

government, whose financial characteristics were a surprise to the whole province, in fact to the Dominion, falsified accounts having been presented showing a shortage of a few thousand dollars when in fact there was a deficit of several millions. Then in regard to the lumbering industry what does Mr. MacMillan say? He dismisses it with a few words, as follows:

The lumbering industry is suffering from heavy depression and the people of the province did not know the policy of the present government with regard to the forest wealth. It was time for a show-down on this matter.

The Halifax Chronicle, for many years the leading Liberal newspaper of Nova Scotia, vigorously backs up the Liberal members in the legislature in their determination to show that Nova Scotia is staggering along under almost desperate industrial and economic conditions. It has been commending, I say, the stand taken by those Liberal members. Another text has been supplied by the report of the commissioner on old age pensions, whom the Rhodes government appointed for the purpose of ascertaining the probable cost to the province, if adopted, of the Dominion government system of old age pensions. We find the Chronicle making this startling remark:

The result of the investigation shows the prevailing economic condition to be immeasurably worse than even the best informed had ever dreamed.

In another place, following the lead of Mr. Robertson, the Chronicle has a slap at the central provinces in this language:

She—

Meaning Nova Scotia.

—is contributing annually vast sums for the upbuilding of the economic fabric of central Canada, without any commensurate return to herself. It leaves her yearly more impoverished than she was before.

Further on the Chronicle emphasizes Mr. Robertson's complaint about the steel industry and the argument with which the Dominion government met the request for protection of the steel industry of Nova Scotia, and the Chronicle remarks that when demand was made for aid to the steel industry:

It was met with the argument that it would increase the price of the automobile by $1.45 each. Just imagine it.

And still further on the Chronicle speaks about the need for action on behalf of Nova Scotia to—

remedy the disastrous economic condition into which it has fallen.

On another day during the present month the same leading newspaper refers to a report of the Halifax county council to the effect that it has discovered reasons for believing that Nova Scotia is in a terribly bad way. This is the blue ruin statement which the Chronicle makes on the subject.

The reports just made to the county council do not tell a happy story so far as the county is concerned. Instead of an increase in assessment values, there is an actual decrease, and a decrease in a single year amounting to $61,000. This is anything but reassuring. It indicates that the country section of the metropolitan county of Halifax is sliding backward. The reasons given in the council for the fall in assessment values were mainly that people had moved away and the assessment values of the property had dropped.

The Chronicle moralizes in this language:

With people moving away and with idle property the state of Halifax county conjures up the pension commissioner's report on Hants, where he found things going to the dogs.

This leading Nova Scotia Liberal paper finds further reason, as late as the 9th of March of this year, to add to its lamentations in regard to the desperate condition of the province. It would appear that the commissioner who was sent out by the Rhodes government to examine into the possible cost of old age pensions in Nova Scotia, found, as might be expected, that a great many of the younger people had left the province, and that in large part the country districts were inhabited by older people. This is how the Chronicle viewed the situation:

He did not know that economic conditions were bad. He had not the remotest idea that they had reached such an intolerable situation as this. If only one out of every five have any assurance of being able to provide for old age, then it is little wonder that the boys and girls are leaving this province in their earning years.

In another place on the same day the Chronicle emphasizes its despair on the subject in these words:

There are not many factories in the east. There are a few in Nova Scotia. Factories want young men in them. When a man begins to go over 40, hard sledding starts for many of them. If for the next thirty years of his life he has trouble to get work and pay and save, what is he to do when he gets to 70? The commissioner's report goes to show that in our basic industries—agriculture, lumbering, fishing, etc.,—something is fundamentally out of joint, because it is in these occupations where our poor people must be largely found.

If these, and such other lamentations, are really true, and the representatives of Liberalism in the Nova Scotia legislature and this leading Liberal newspaper in the province aver that they are true, what are we to think and say when we find members of the federal cabinet, even from the province of Nova Scotia, declaring that the whole of the province of Nova Scotia was never before in such a period of widespread prosperity?

Still further, I picked up another Liberal paper, the oldest in Halifax, the Acadian Recorder, and this is what I find. An advertisement of the city collector's office, dated Halifax, March 1, 1929, stating that fourteen properties would be offered for sale at auction on April 2 for unpaid taxes. No work, no money to pay taxes.

My time is about up, although I should like to say a word or two further with regard to the province. There is one matter that vitally interests Nova Scotia, and I will say this, that the people of that province will never be satisfied until their demand is granted. I refer to the entry of the Canadian Pacific Railway into the province. Every province of the Dominion enjoys the advantages of that company's enterprise; why should Nova Scotia stand alone, deprived of that which all other provinces enjoy? At this date not a yard of transcontinental railway has been constructed in Nova Scotia. Surely, in view of our large contributions to railways and canals all over Canada, we are entitled to consideration.

Mr. W. A. BOYS (North Simcoe): Up to two or three hours ago it had not been my intention to take part in this debate, but a very recent resolution passed in the legislature of Quebec has been brought to my attention, and it is in that connection that I should like to engage the attention of the house for just a few moments. I wish at once to allay the fears of hon. members if they have any idea that I intend to try to interfere with the vote which we are all contemplating this afternoon.

I am glad to see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) in his place, and I should like to prelude my remarks by a reference to his speech on April 8, quoting from Hansard at page 1335, where he referred to the economic conference which sat in Geneva on May 4, 1927. He referred to the fact that certain representatives from the United States had taken part in that conference, and also certain representatives from Canada. He pointed out that the conference had divided itself into committees, the three main committees being on agriculture, commerce and industry; and it is in connection with agriculture that I wish to engage the attention of the house. At page 1335-6 of Hansard we find the following paragraphs quoted from the report:

> In view of the fact that harmful effects upon production and trade result from the high and constantly changing tariffs which are applied in many countries;
>
> And in view of the fact that some of the causes which have resulted in the increase of tariffs and in other trade barriers since the war have largely disappeared and others are diminishing;
>
> The conference declares that the time has come to put an end to the increase in tariffs and to move in the opposite direction.

Lower down on the same page we find this paragraph:

> It is desirable that all hindrances to the free circulation of and trade in agricultural products should be removed, in so far as their removal does not endanger the vital interests of the different countries and their workers.
>
> In those states in which customs protection is maintained, it should be reduced, both for industry and agriculture, to the lowest possible point indispensable to production.

The final recommendation is:

> That the governments and peoples of the countries here represented should together give continuous attention to this aspect of the economic problem, and looks forward to the establishment of recognized principles designed to eliminate those economic difficulties which cause friction and misunderstanding in a world which has everything to gain from peaceful and harmonious progress.

I take it for granted that the Minister of Justice, in giving these quotations, approved of them himself. While he was speaking he did not venture to suggest that any country in the world had implemented these suggestions by legislation, with the exception of Canada, and Canada's part in implementing them is so infinitesimal that I should think it would afford vain glory to the Minister of Justice, because we have been told during this debate that from 1921 to the present time the Liberal government has not reduced the tariff by even one per cent. Now we are awaiting the action of congress which is to meet on the 15th of this month; we all know perfectly well that during this session the United States tariff dealing with agricultural products will certainly be raised, so we see that there is not the slightest tendency on the part of the nations of the world to implement the recommendations quoted by the Minister of Justice.

Before coming to the resolution to which I have referred it might not be amiss to place on Hansard some of the recommendations made by the National Dairy Council of Canada to the Prime Minister and five or six other members of the cabinet on November 29, 1927. These recommendations were presented by Mr. Alex. Smith, solicitor for the council, and in part were as follows:

> To the Right Honourable the President and other members of the Privy Council.
>
> The National Dairy Council of Canada desires respectfully to present some observations and requests on the Australian trade agreement.
>
> 1. That on the 27th day of June, 1925, the Australian trade agreement act received Royal

Assent and by order in council was made applicable on and after the first day of October, 1925;

2. That the said trade agreement is subject to the Canadian Customs Tariff 1907;

3. That the producers of butter in Australia have what is known as the Paterson scheme, whereby they pool all their product and pay three cents to the pool on each pound of butter produced. The pool paying to the exporter six cents a pound on all butter exported. This common fund is to encourage and enlarge the export trade;

4. That the effect of the Paterson scheme is to render Australian butter subject to dumping duty. This duty is in the first clause of section 6 of the Customs Tariff 1907, defined as follows:—

I need not trouble the house with the next part, but the recommendations proceed:

6. That previous to October 1, 1925, the duty on Australian butter was four cents per pound;

7. That the order in council applying schedule 2 of the Australian trade agreement to New Zealand enables New Zealand to export butter into Canada on payment of customs in Canada of one cent a pound, instead of the British preference rate of three cents a pound;

8. That the Canadian customs tariff 1907, at present provides duties on butter as follows: British preferential 3 cents per pound, Intermediate tariff 4 cents, general tariff 4 cents, and (as per treaty) Australian and New Zealand, one cent;

12. That in consequence of the Australian trade agreement the dairy industry of Canada suffers.

13. At the annual meeting of the National Dairy Council of Canada, held in the city of Toronto the 21st and 22nd of November, 1927, the effect of the Australian treaty agreement and its extension to New Zealand was fully discussed by the members of the said council.

The result of these deliberations was that the executive committee was unanimously instructed to make representations to the government along certain lines.

The executive therefore respectfully requests as follows:—

1. That the order in council applying schedule 2 of the Australian trade agreement to New Zealand be rescinded at once;

2. That the dumping clause be immediately applied on all butter sent from Australia to Canada on consignment as well as on direct sale;

3. That the Australian trade agreement be terminated as provided in the Australian Trade Agreement Act 1925.

The concluding recommendation is as follows:

We trust that our petition, which is backed by every important dairy producing organization in Canada, will be given early and sympathetic consideration by the government, so that our own dairying industry may flourish and be able to participate in the profits that will accrue from the splendid industrial development that seems to be ahead of us.

We have the government faced with this recommendation and with the contemplated action of the United States, yet the Minister of Justice suggests to the house that we should have lower duties. I would like to find out whether or not he is familiar with what the legislature of his own province has been doing. I hold in my hand a copy of the votes and proceedings of the legislative assembly of the province of Quebec dated Wednesday, March 27, 1929, in which I find the following:

Mr. Sauvé moved:

That in view of the fact that it is necessary (a) to take all reasonable means to protect agriculture; (b) to secure for farmers markets where they can obtain better prices and prices more in proportion with the cost of production; (c) to encourage inasmuch as possible the best methods of cultivation, particularly market gardening and the canning industry, as well as the best methods of classification; (d) to make the subsidies granted to agricultural enterprises more profitable and to secure for our province greater prosperity in general;

This house invites the government to use its influence so that our produce may be sufficiently protected against competition coming from countries having a better climate than ours.

Before that resolution was put, the Premier of Quebec had something to say upon it. I took the trouble to secure a Quebec paper, the Chronicle-Telegraph of March 25, in which the Premier of Quebec is quoted as follows:

Premier Taschereau admitted this would be a very good motion but it was not the time to bring it forward because if adopted it would cancel the motion to go into supply. However he would withdraw his motion to go into supply if the leader of the opposition would make a regular motion of his amendment. The premier expressed the opinion that it was the best proposal the leader had ever introduced in the house.

With that the motion was put; I understand that the Quebec legislature is composed of eighty-five members, and with about fifty members present this resolution was carried unanimously. Not only was that the case, but the premier himself was so anxious to have it dealt with that he withdrew his motion to go into supply in order to permit this resolution to be proceeded with, and as I have said it was carried unanimously. This action was taken by the legislature of the province of Quebec, yet we find the Minister of Justice, coming from that province, advocating in this house a proposal absolutely in opposition to the unanimous proposition of his own province.

I am glad to see that both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice are in their seats, and I would like to ask them three questions. First, is the government aware of this resolution; second, have appropriate representations been made to them by the government of Quebec; third, what, if anything, does the government intend to do to give effect to the unanimous request of the

legislature of Quebec? I would be only too glad now to yield the floor to either of the hon. gentlemen if they see fit to answer these questions or any one of them, and I wonder if the Minister of Justice would accommodate me to the extent of answering this question: Have representations been made to the government by the province of Quebec?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know of any, but if my hon. friend wants me to finish my speech, which I could not conclude the other day because of the forty-minute rule, I am quite willing to do so, but I will make my speech in my own way.

Mr. BOYS: I do not suppose the Minister of Justice could conclude in another forty minutes, so it would not do much good to give him thirty minutes now. I take it for granted, since the Minister of Justice says he knows of no such representations from the government of Quebec, that these representations have not been made, because I am quite confident the minister would have heard of them otherwise. Let us hope that they will be made, but whether or not that is done there is the resolution; we find the great province of Quebec, which undoubtedly is a protective province, agreeing with the Conservative party and with the Dairy Council of Canada in this connection.

While I am on my feet I want to make an observation with regard to our farming communities. I have listened to a good many speeches with regard to farmers and to labour generally and I have also listened to a good many speeches with regard to prosperity in Canada. By nature I do not think I am pessimistic; I think I am inclined to be optimistic and I do not want to preach blue ruin. At the same time, however, I do not want to be optimistic without reason. Having practised law in my county for over thirty-five years, I speak with some knowledge when I say that I have never known the farming community in my county to be as hard up as they have been during this last season, and I doubt very much if the conditions which prevail there, are any different from those prevailing in other counties in Ontario. There has been great difficulty in the payment of principal and interest upon farm mortgages, and the farmers of Ontario have had a very hard time during the last two years. In many cases they have not been able to make both ends meet, and in other cases they have been unable to pay their obligations. I do not believe there is a member of the house representing a rural riding in the province of Ontario who will contradict my statements. I do not attempt to speak for the west or for Quebec, because I do not know of the conditions prevailing there. The county of Simcoe is one of the best counties in Ontario, but the conditions there, so far as prosperity is concerned, are no different from the conditions which prevail in other counties. We all know how important the farming industry is to the country, and I regret to say that from their standpoint there is no prosperity at the present time.

I am glad to see that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) has taken his seat in the house. No doubt he has heard of the resolution which has been passed by the legislature of Quebec, but if not I ask that he do me the honour of reading it in Hansard to-morrow. I am curious to see how he can maintain the position which he proclaims in the house, and at the same time keep in harmony with the views of the members of the legislature of his own province.

Mr. LESLIE G. BELL (St. Antoine): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can add a great deal to the remarks of the many speakers who have preceded me, but to put hon. gentlemen opposite in good humour, I take this occasion to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on the very able address which he presented to this house yesterday afternoon. I do not know that I have ever seen the Prime Minister in better fettle, and I am sure that all of us who sit on this side of the house appreciated the fact that he handled his subject matter in a very admirable way. I only wish that he could in a like manner be congratulated by us upon the principles underlying the subject matter of his speech.

The most notable feature of this budget debate, as pointed out by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb), is that we find our hon. friends opposite strong in their advocacy of a low tariff policy. We on this side of the house have listened to them in previous years when the policy of the Liberal party was that of free trade, tariff for revenue and freer trade, but to-day we find that the flag under which they are sailing is the flag of a low tariff. It is rather strange to find hon. gentlemen opposite criticizing the members on this side of the house flying a flag other than that of protection. They may find it a hard problem to solve, but it is much more difficult for us on this side of the house to discover which flag they are flying, especially with regard to their tariff policy. It has always been a question of expediency with them, and particularly so at this session.

I think they must admit that the articles covered in the proposed tariff changes are very minor ones. I am sure the Conservative party would be just as willing as they to give encouragement to the mining industry by means of a reduction of the tariff as it applies to mining machinery.

But they seem unable to formulate a tariff policy for the Dominion of Canada. Why? Because they are waiting to see just what action will be taken by our neighbours to the south. That is not the policy of the Conservative party. We do not wait to see what foreigners will do with regard to their tariff policies; we do not legislate against foreigners or their tariff policies, but we do endeavour to formulate policies for the people of our own country. Speaking for myself, and I am sure for other Conservative members, I can only say that we intend always to have our tariff formulated under the word "protection." The protectionist policy of the United States has stood them in good stead. The United States is a very prosperous country and has grown steadily under the protectionist flag. The latest general election in the United States resulted in the president being endorsed by the people in all sections of that country, and he preached but one policy, the policy of protection. The candidate of the Democratic party came out openly for the first time in the history of the United States and stated that protection was going to be the policy of his party. Our hon. friends come to us to tell us that the word "protection" forms no part of their political creed, and they chide us for trying to get away from the protective principle. I am a protectionist, but I am not a "spotty" protectionist. I do not stand for protection in one section of the country and then advocate free trade in another. I believe in protection for western Canada as well as protection for eastern Canada. The policy of the Conservative party has always been, despite what the hon. members opposite may say, a policy of protection throughout the length and breadth of Canada.

The protectionist policy is not a hard one to understand. Our hon. friends believe in the principle of importing into Canada goods which have been made by foreign manufacturers. They believe in taking goods, whether they are manufactured in Germany, or in free trade England, or in the United States, or in whatever country they may choose, and as long as they can get those goods delivered in Canada and given to the consumer, as they state, cheap, then they believe in that policy. We on this side of the house do not believe in such a policy. No matter how cheaply goods made by foreign manufacturers and workmen can be sold in Canada, I believe the Canadian workman, although he is able to secure those goods at one cent or two or five cents cheaper, is the person who loses in the long run, and I make no exception with respect to the machinery referred to in the budget, because I have enough faith in Canadian workmen and Canadian manufacturers to believe Canada can make just as good mining machinery in this country as can be made in the United States.

Let us take a concrete example: Suppose a man working in a furniture factory buys a chair made in the United States and delivered in Canada for fifty cents less than one made in Canada, who suffers? The workman is the man who suffers. Why? If he is unemployed for a day, even if he can walk into a store and buy a chair made by foreign labour fifty cents cheaper than one made in Canada, how much does he lose on account of that one day's unemployment? How much does his family lose? The question is only a simple one of economics. Not only does it involve the larger question of opening factories in the United States or in any other country, or the question of giving employment to the people in that foreign country, but it comes right back to our own homes, our own firesides, our own unemployment situation. When the government has faith enough in Canada to realize that we can establish factories in Canada to manufacture our own goods with Canadian workmen; when, instead of sending to the United States for safety lanterns made by a foreign workmen—as they propose to do under the present budget—it finds that we can manufacture those same miners' safety lanterns by Canadian labour, thus giving employment to our own people, and that it is better for our own mining concerns to use our own safety lanterns, it will be coming into line with what is known as the Conservative doctrine of protection.

The great republic to the south of us is accustomed to ascribe its liberties and economic development to their Declaration of Independence. That is only partly true. It is true that under the declaration of independence the people of the United States, achieved liberty, but one thing which I think established more than anything else the greatness of the United States of America was when Madison, a young man, was appointed secretary of that country at thirty-two years of age and drafted the first protective tariff law. We talk about national status and last year we had a division on the question of national status. Is Canada a nation to-day? Have we the fundamentals which make for national life? If we have, times have changed. In the war of 1812 the United States learned for the first time that they were not a nation. Why? Because they could not make up their national life within their own borders; they were dependent upon England and other

foreign countries. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) the other day quoted some prominent English free traders, what they believed in and their policy regarding England. Let me for a minute quote what Lord Lyndhurst said in 1838 regarding the United States of America:

> The United States of America was always considered our own special market. "The extent and swift, regular progress of the American market for English goods," said Henry (afterward Lord Brougham) in 1813, "we can easily account for . . . . America is an immense agricultural country, where land is plentiful and cheap; men and labour, though quickly increasing, are yet still scarce and dear when compared with the boundless regions which they occupy and cultivate. In such a country manufactures do not naturally thrive; every exertion, if matters be left to themselves, goes into other channels. This people is connected with England by origin, language, manners, and institutions; their tastes go along with their convenience, and they come to us, as a matter of course, for the articles they do not make themselves."

What do we find? We find the United States of America with their ports blockaded first by England during the war with France, and then by France. Where could they get their merchandise? They discovered that they were solely dependent upon other foreign nations. To explain that, I will read another short section:

> What did we discover in our war of 1812 but that we had nothing to equip the war? Having no woollen manufacture, we could not clothe our soldiers: we could not even make a blanket. We had been free traders, buying all such things because we could buy them cheaper; but we now discovered that we might better have been making blankets at double the cost for the last fifty years. The same was true of saltpetre for gunpowder, of guns and canon and swords, and iron and steel out of which to make them. . . . We also began to discover that the very insignificant article of salt, coming short in the supply, was nearly a dead necessity, one of the munitions of war, and that manufacturing it for ourselves at double the cost would have been a true advantage. . . . We very soon discovered in the facts referred to the lowness of our organization, and the very incomplete scope of our industrial equipments. Our products were not various enough to make a complete nation.

This is what one Englishman said regarding the crop of the United States at this very period:

> On the breaking out of the war the crops of the United States would be devoured by vermin because there was not enough skill in America to make a mousetrap.

One of the fundamental things which we have to bear in mind when we are endeavouring to make a nation is to take account of Canadian workmanship. Are we building up our factories? Are we making the necessary strides in manufacturing so that when we get into trouble with any foreign nation our workmen will be so well equipped that they will have at hand the articles we require and we may not be dependent upon foreign nations? I would stress that point to hon. members opposite. When you have cheap goods, which my hon. friends opposite are always talking about, you have cheap labour and a cheap policy. What we want to have in Canada is a policy whereby the Canadian workman will be supported just as much as the foreign workman—in fact, the Canadian workman first, the foreigner comes next. Like the Americans discovered they must become more Americanized, we must discover, sooner or later, we have to become more Canadianized. Would any man with common sense argue in this house that Canadians can compete with the cheap labour of China or Japan, or of England and other countries where labourers are paid only from one-half to one-third the wages that Canadian labour receives? Are we going to bring Canadian labour down to the standards of living in the Orient? The United States of America year by year are enlarging their factories, increasing their production, equipping their shops with more efficient machinery, and engaging in mass production to a greater extent than ever before. How can we expect that Canada, which comparatively speaking is only a young country, can compete with the manufacturing industry in the United States, a country sixteen times as large? Is there any common sense in expecting us to be able to do it? Yet the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is to put Canadian industry on an equal basis with that of the United States, to allow our smaller factories to be subject to competition with the huge factories across the line, and to expect them to pay the same wages that are paid to American workmen and to produce goods at the same cost.

I do not wish in any way to belittle the great industry of agriculture, because it is one of our basic industries. But surely the farmer must realize that when he buys machinery or farm implements made in other countries he is buying articles of foreign manufacture, and that that is an unpatriotic move so far as Canada is concerned. When will he come to realize that the cheapness he demands is not calculated to build up the factories of the east and provide for the population that is coming in? When will he realize that in this country we are crying for immigrants? We are having immigration committees inquire into the question why immigrants are not coming into Canada in greater numbers. If we feel that something is wrong we have only to turn our eyes southwards, where under protection the

factories of the neighbouring republic are booming, and thousands of Canadians are going thence to seek work. Our hon. friends opposite accuse us of always talking blue ruin and of decrying the principles which make for the upbuilding of a country. I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that we are far from being blue ruinists. We believe in a policy which has built up another nation, and into whose markets we are now clamoring for admission. We believe in looking into the past and learning from it, and following those same principles which have built up the neighbouring republic. We are not blind to what is going on round about us. It is only a matter of common sense to determine what the future policy of this country should be.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are now waiting to find out what the United States are going to do at the next session of congress. Why wait to see what they are going to do? Why not put into force in this country now a tariff which will provide work for Canadian workmen, build up our own factories, and make this young country a prosperous nation? When hon. gentlemen opposite have waited and have seen what the United States is going to do, are they going to come back to the House of Commons next session and say: We cannot do anything with regard to the tariff this year because we are waiting to see what Germany is going to do? And the following year they may be waiting to see what France is going to do. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the tariff policy of the Liberal party is to make a tariff against a foreign country, while the policy of the Conservative party is to make a tariff, not against any foreign country, but for the benefit of Canada.

The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) emphasized the word "retaliation" in connection with the tariff. He said: Our friends opposite are urging that we retaliate. Where in the world did he ever hear us use that word? The word "retaliation" has nothing whatever to do with the policy of the Conservative party. It is quite unnecessary; our tariff policy is not one which calls for retaliation against any foreign country. We make our tariff policy on the same principle on which the United States make theirs, and retaliation does not enter into it at all. It is my hon. friend himself who has interjected that word into the discussion. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) spoke of what the United States had agreed to at Geneva. But congress says, No, the protective principle is good enough for us; it has stood us in good stead and we will stick to it. Is there anything wrong in that? A protective policy which has been good enough for the United States in all these years of prosperity which it has enjoyed should certainly be good enough for a few more years to come. When congress meets and decides upon its tariff policy—and their ways and means committee is meeting to-day and discussing means of building up their own manufacturing, agricultural and mining industries —is there any reason why we, who are a foreign country to them, should exercise the threat of retaliation? The idea is ridiculous. These retaliatory measures which our friends opposite apparently intend to follow are the very measures which lead to international complications. Retaliation is a policy which should form no part of our national life, living as we do side by side with a friendly nation. We are supposed to be the binding link between the English-speaking nations of the world. We are a small nation with a great responsibility when we assume that role but I hope that we shall always be capable of that responsibility. We shall never maintain it, however, if my hon. friends opposite have nothing to offer to this country but a policy which calls for retaliation, and which seems a direct threat against the United States. My hon. friend from West Elgin mentioned nothing which would justify his charging hon. gentlemen on this side with being advocates of retaliation, because there is nothing in our policy, and especially in our tariff policy to suggest it.

What have we been buying from the United States? What have been our trade relations with them? Why are we on this side of the house objecting to the so-called tariff policy of hon. gentlemen opposite? I am afraid the Minister of Finance, who comes from the good old province of Quebec, must have found some difficulty in sliding over to the low tariff policy, because that is not the policy of the province of Quebec. The words "low tariff" are something new, I think, in the annals of the Liberal party from that province, and I for one am interested in finding out just how low they will go in their tariff policy. They are preaching low tariff this year, but next year, when they find they have to protect Canadian industry and Canadian goods, they will be the very ones to use the word "protection." They will not come to the house then with a low tariff policy, but they will say: "We will have to build up our tariff to protect Canadian industry." In other words, there will be a change of front on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, what have been our imports from the United States? These are startling figures, Mr.

Speaker, and show the value of our imports from the United States in excess of the value of our exports to that country.

1921	$217,568,000
1922	158,338,000
1923	177,484,000
1924	101,519,000
1925	97,430,000
1926	190,855,000
1927	215,719,000
1928	312,049,000

Or a grand total in nine years of $1,470,960,000. Now, sir, in nine years this nation of 9,000,000 people bought from the neighbouring republic of 120,000,000 people $1,470,960,000 worth of goods in excess of the value of the goods we exported to them. Apparently we believe in supporting the American working man, we believe in supporting the American factory, we believe in our people going to the United States to build up that country. And yet my hon. friends opposite say that theirs is the right policy. How long are they going to persist in this disastrous policy? How long have we to stand idly by, with our population fixed at 9,000,000, losing hundreds of thousands of our best citizens, our artisans, to the United States every year? How long are we to continue educating our boys and girls to equip them to build up a foreign country? Yet this is the policy of our friends opposite. Would that policy be continued if we had the Conservative party in power? Certainly not. Under a Conservative administration would our young people be seeking work in a foreign country? Undoubtedly not. Is Canada such a poor place to live in that they would leave their native land to make their home in the United States? Not at all. And my hon. friends opposite know it.

Now let me take a few of our imports. We buy from the United States canned soups to a value that I am sure would surprise the house. I suppose hon. members opposite will say that Canadians are not capable of making good soups, that we cannot grow vegetables of a sufficiently high quality for the production of good soups. What is the value of our soup imports from the United States? These are the figures:

1923	$ 923,973
1924	1,122,079

And this under the Liberal policy which is supposed to bring about such great prosperity at home.

1925	$1,141,271
1926	1,236,793
1927	1,400,264

Of course, we collected a little duty on these soup imports. Now, what were our exports of soups to the United States? This is very interesting because it shows the commercial ingenuity of the Americans engaged in the soup industry. In 1923 we did not export one tin of soup; in 1924, likewise; in 1925, likewise; in 1926, $64 worth. In 1927 we did a big soup business, we shipped $6 to the United States and $10 worth to Alaska. That is one of the results of the policy of my hon. friends opposite. We buy American soups, made by American workmen, paid for in the United States, and—

Mr. STEVENS: Give them free advertising.

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine): Yes. Meanwhile our farmers complain that they cannot sell their vegetables. Under the policy of this administration there is no place in Canada for a soup factory and our farmers suffer; on the contrary the United States government protect their soup manufacturers and their farmers.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine): I hope my hon. friends get a lot of satisfaction from their merriment, but it is ill timed. We as the representatives of the people of the Dominion are supposed to be legislating for their benefit, we are supposed to be building up the industries of Canada, we are supposed to be looking after the workingmen of Canada, and yet we enact legislation that tends to build up industry in the United States, apparently oblivious of the fact that the time will come when we shall be called to account for our failure to discharge our responsibilities and do something for the benefit of Canadians.

Now, sir, let me turn to a different subject. This government is always telling us about the wonderful trade treaties it has negotiated with other countries. We have trade treaties with France and a dozen other nations. About the last to be negotiated was the treaty known as the West Indies Trade Agreement Act, dated July 6, 1925. Under this treaty we have entered into an agreement which will benefit the West Indies as well as Canada. We have a merchant marine with a deficit last year of about $6,000,000. One of the principle clauses of this agreement provides for the importation of bananas from the West Indies. Where are we getting our banana supplies to-day? We are giving Jamaica, Trinidad and the other West Indian islands a steamship service for which we have built several 6,000-ton ocean liners, which are provided with special refrigerator accommodation to bring bananas to our doors at a cheaper rate. But bananas are still coming into Canada duty free. No preference has been given the West Indies under this trade arrangement, and will not be given until, as the Liberal government says, " the service is com-

pleted." When will that service be complete? In the meantime where are we buying our bananas? We are buying them from the United States. And they do not grow bananas in the United States because that country imports them. We poor Canadians will allow American ships to bring in bananas from the very people with whom we have a trade agreement, delivering those bananas at New York or in some other American port, shipping them over American railroads to Buffalo or some other American port, and then into Canada. And we purchase them. This is taking place under the trade arrangement which this government made with the British West Indies. How do hon. gentlemen opposite explain it. Where is the benefit to Canadians? Have the Canadians paid less for bananas since the treaty went into force? Not at all. We are still buying bananas shipped from America and I presume we shall continue to buy them for several years. I cannot understand the principles underlying trade treaties that operate in this way. I should think that the Canadian government merchant marine ought to get the advantage of the freight in connection with bananas coming from Trinidad and Jamaica. As a matter of fact, this was understood when the treaty was under discussion in this house; the house understood that the treaty was being made including other things for the benefit of the banana trade in the West Indies. Read the trade agreement and you will find that accommodation is made for 70,000 bunches of bananas on every ship. But if you look at our imports from the West Indies you will find only a few dozen bunches of bananas coming up the Atlantic in some ocean greyhound bound for Canada.

As I stated in the beginning, I am a protectionist. As for the Conservative party, at the masthead of its ship of state flies the protectionist flag. It has in the past and it may again go down into the surging waters of defeat. But the ship will be raised by the wise foresight of a great people, having faith in their principles. And, sir, as the protectionist flag was the last thing to go under, it also will be the first thing to come up, flying more boldly than ever at the masthead, because of the renewed confidence of a common sense electorate believing in Canada first, last and always.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Toronto Northwest): I wish to say a few words regarding the subamendment moved on March 14 by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer). That subamendment reads:

[Mr. L. G. Bell.]

That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after "house" and substituting therefor the following:

"urges upon the government the consideration of an immediate and substantial increase of the British preference as a step towards freer trade relations between Canada and other nations."

This subamendment brings up the whole question of the British preference. The government have done nothing definite with regard to British preference, for they have on the tariff been everything by fits and starts and nothing for long and have no economic principles.

It was proposed two or three years ago to adopt a national coal policy so that every pound of coal would be mined and coked under the British flag, whether from Wales, Nova Scotia or Alberta. Such a policy would in the coal industry establish a real British preference. That was intended to implement the British preference policy and the government after a great many days adopted the resolution and then refused to carry it out. At the same time the question was discussed of affording protection to the coal and steel industries of the maritime provinces, and for three or four years this was delayed also pending the completion of the Duncan report.

That policy was one of protection namely a system of bonuses, subventions and subsidies for the maritimes with respect to coal and steel.

But the government pooh-poohed the idea, declaring that it was not a suitable policy for this country. No; they were content to have this country send $56,000,000 a year over to Pennsylvania to help the mining industry there at the expense of the Welsh miners. The government have simply dilly-dallied with the whole problem from 1922 to the present time, and they have failed to put into effect the report of the Duncan commission, or adopt a national coal supply which would be equivalent to a British preference.

We are willing to consider what should be done to assist the motherland in a large way in order to encourage trade and industry within the empire, because trade should follow the flag; it should follow lines of national defence. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been talking a good deal about the British preference, quoting Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding as pioneers in this regard. But Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding were not the pioneers of the British preference movement; Hon. Joseph Chamberlain and Sir Charles Tupper and the late Colonel George T. Denison were

the pioneers or authors of the whole movement. England to-day finds herself, a free trade country, shut out of the markets of the world. She has lost her shipbuilding orders to the Hamburg yards and she is losing her supremacy in coal, as the result of the failure of the colonies to come to her support in her hour of economic trial. After all, it is just as necesary in time of peace as it is in time of war for the country to mobilize all its resources, to keep its workmen employed, to preserve its own markets and to repel the foreign invader. It is just as necessary for Canada to mobilize in time of peace, to resist the economic invader at her door as it is for her in war to repel that invader. In war we mobilize our transportation facilities and all the natural and other resources of the country for the purposes of defence, and the same thing should apply in time of peace. What do we find in the mother country to-day? Thousands of men are starving in Wales and while this government can send millions to Japan and other countries to relieve distress from floods and famine, when they are asked to do something to bring relief to the Welsh miners they refuse to take action or to vote a copper. They simply make a football of the whole question; they say that they can do nothing because they have not been asked by the British government. Had this government been sincere they would have done something, sitting at the round table of the colonial conference and planning for a real British preference and cooperating with the overseas dominions, Australia and New Zealand, to work out a solution of the three major problems of the British empire defence, trade and immigration. The keynote of the empire trade problem is the extension of the British preference doctrine, bringing it up to date, and not relying upon the principle as it stood twenty or twenty-five years ago, when we had a lop-sided preference which was not a real preference at all. The British preference has been meddled with by the government, who have tried to introduce free trade piecemeal with the world at large.

We have entered into free trade arrangements with every country under the sun except such regions as Patagonia, to which the government have not as yet extended their free trade principles. Small "five, ten and fifteen cent" countries have been given preferences in our market and our tariff has been amended to give them free trade piecemeal, at the expense of the Canadian working man and in discrimination against the working man of the old land. There are over a million and a half men out of work in England now, which shows that this present so-called British preference is of very little practical value in providing work there for our own kith and kin. If the government meant business at all, instead of saying at the last colonial conference that they were quite satisfied and had nothing at all to propose for the relief of unemployment in the old land or anything else, they would have sat around a table and done something to relieve the coal industry in Wales, for example, where there are millions of tons of coal which could be utilized in Canada to-day. The government have a merchant marine, although they sold some of the ships without public tender for $50,000; these ships could have been utilized to put the British preference into effect in a proper way in respect to coal and other products. Are we to continue to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the people of the United States while hundreds of thousands of our young people go to that country to live? Are we to be forever an adjunct to the United States in a trade sense? We buy from the United States every year $900,000,000 worth of high priced manufactured goods. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Macdougall) said last night that 50 per cent of those goods could be manufactured in Canada, but in my opinion almost 70 per cent of the manufactured goods we import from the United States could be produced in this country. So I say the time has gone when the government can fool the people with their lopsided British preference and their pro-American tariff which operates against the unemployed in the old country. When we buy goods from the United States we pay for them with our raw materials, and we cannot continue to do that much longer under such an absurd system of reciprocity. A special session of the United States congress has been called to meet this month to consider farm relief; I think a special session of this house should be called before the general election in England in order to see what we can do to relieve the unemployment in the old country and to adopt a real British preference. England is paying millions of dollars a day to the United States on account of the war debt, but England did the bulk of the fighting during the war and carried the financial burdens of most of the European countries as well. No one knows what England is going through to-day in an industrial way, but a rich dominion like Canada does nothing to

assist the mother country. A proper British preference which would protect British goods would do much in this direction.

Conditions have changed greatly in the old country during the past years. At one time England was a free trade country, the United States was a free trade country and so was Germany. The great German economist List has given a magnificent description of these countries years ago, when they all supported the free trade policy. The United States was invaded every year by an army of English commercial travellers until the great work of Horace Greeley, the founder of the New York Tribune, converted the people of the United States to protection, and to-day it is the highest protected country in the world. In 1849 the Germans were so poor that they had to wear wooden shoes; that was under free trade, but later Germany adopted the principle of protection and became prosperous. The result was that in 1914 England had to ask the help of the United States to save her from the invader. We have a free trade government in Canada now; they are talking of low tariffs. At the special session of the United States congress to be held this month the question of farm relief is to be taken up, but on that question this government is a ship without a rudder; they have no farm relief policy at all. It is all very well to talk farm relief when the election is coming on, but with the Liberal party, platforms are made to get in on and not to stand on. They have no proper or adequate policy with regard to British preference and they will do nothing to help the Welsh miners. They even say that they have nothing to do with unemployment in Canada, that it is a matter for the provinces and the municipalities. The government have charge of the tariff, of trade and commerce and of the banking and immigration laws; they could make that British preference effective in two or three days if they wished to do so, but they refuse to take any action.

This is also the case in connection with empire marketing. At the Toronto exhibition the empire marketing board had a large exhibit which included some of the articles mentioned in the budget. The British preference on those articles amounts to only five cents or one cent, and a lopsided preference such as that is no good at all; it is less than we are giving small European and South American countries. That is not the kind of British preference we want here. Welsh coal has been tried out in Canada and has been proved a superior brand of fuel, but nothing is done to further its sale in this country on a preferential basis.

[Mr. Church.]

In my opinion the overseas dominions are partly to blame for the condition of British industry to-day; as far as Canada is concerned, we are buying too much from the people of the United States. Loyalty in Canada seems to be largely lip loyalty, when you get down to brass tacks. We bought more goods from the United States than England bought, with four times our population; we bought twice as much as Germany, with six times our population, and we bought twice as much as France, which has five times our population. In 1928 Canada spent $3,000,000 per day across the line, largely for clothing, boots, shoes and many other articles on this list of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb), when a large part of this trade could have been carried on with the motherland. Are you content to continue this policy? If you are, then the British Empire must fail because trade follows the flag. Are you content to spend $400,000,000 to-day, when in 1896, with a population of only a few million less, we were spending only $36,000,000? We should give the motherland preference in our market by a real reciprocal preference tariff and not a lopsided one.

The government is doing very little for the people of the old land with its immigration policy. Immigration is related to the tariff; the two are interlocked and correlated; one cannot exist without the other and the immigration question is also related to that of the British preference. There can be no immigration as long as the present free trade pan-American tariff policy is in force. What is the use of putting 10,000 more immigrants into the west, when there is no work for them and when you cannot market your crops properly. The grain growers of the west are suffering untold hardships, not only with regard to transportation facilities, but in an economic way. These hardships are brought about by the competition they have to meet from across the border. I might quote the great German economist List, who described England about 1840 as:

> Supreme in every branch of manufacture, as a world's metropolis which supplies all nations with manufactured goods, a treasure house of all great capital, a banking establishment for all nations, which controls the circulating medium of the whole world, and by loans and the receipt of interest on them makes all the peoples of the earth her tributaries. In vain did the Germans humble themselves to the position of hewers of wood and drawers of water to the Britons; the latter treated them worse than a subject people.

Then we should see the United States at that same time, in 1840, invaded every year by an army of British commercial travellers. We should then have a picture of a com-

parative situation of the three countries at the outbreak of the war, Germany producing twice as much steel and iron as England, the United States with an even vaster production, the two countries towering in their industrial strength above the nation which had once supplied both with everything they required except food and timber. These comparative diagrams might be accompanied by others to show how national power was a reflection of industrial power, and how free trade England which, as a protected country, had once ruled the world, was compelled to invoke the aid of one great protected country, the United States, to assist her in repelling the attack of another.

At six o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, April 11, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGES PARENT (Quebec West) presented the third report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills, as follows:

Your committee recommend that it be given leave to sit while the house is sitting; and also that its quorum be twelve members instead of fifteen, and that subsection (c) of section 1 of standing order 63 be suspended in relation thereto.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I move that the report be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the house.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

ANNUAL REPORT TABLED BY MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): I desire to table the tenth annual report, in English and French, of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. Copies are being distributed to all members this afternoon through the post office.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT—UNFORESEEN EXPENSES

Mr. FRASER:

What are the details of the vote "Unforeseen expenses" found on page 36, Vol I, of the Auditor General's report for 1927-8, under the headings: (a) External Affairs, $20,297.60; (b) National Defence, $84,959.96; (c) Privy Council, $9,675.99; (d) Public Works, $7,325.62?

Mr. RINFRET: All details of this vote are printed in the Auditor General's report, Voll II: (a) Part E-8; (b) Part Q-73; (c) Part U-3; and (d) Part V-30.

NATIONAL REVENUE—APPRAISAL SERVICE

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What is the number of appointments made by the Minister of National Revenue (formerly Minister of Customs) to the appraiser service from April 1, 1927, under authority of the exemption from the provisions of the Civil Service Act as provided in the estimates and in chapter 37 (18-19) George V?

2. What are the names of those who were subsequently dismissed and the reasons for dismissal in each case?

3. What are the names of those appointed during the said periods, and who are still in the employ of the Department of National Revenue?

4. What is the nature of the inquiry or extent of the test applied in the selection of the appraisers above mentioned, as to physical fitness, intelligence and integrity?

5. In the case of dismissals for cause, what are the names of the person or persons recommending such persons for employment in the government service?

Mr. EULER:

1. 17.

2. None of the persons appointed as appraisers were dismissed.

3. 16: Thomas Costello, H. F. W. Funston, Sidney Jones, S. J. Kelly, E. A. Cook, Chow T. Tong, Gaston Pelletier, C. H. Richardson, F. A. McCann, F. T. Curley, T. C. Rubbra, W. G. Stamp, George Chapman, William Patterson, L. M. Major, Thomas Smith.

4. All applicants were personally interviewed by a board and in each case the report of the board was accepted.

5. Answered by No. 2.

DISMISSAL OF PREVENTIVE OFFICERS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

In regard to sessional papers No. 307 (Return to an order of the House of Commons, dated April 25, 1928), setting forth that 114 persons were employed as preventive officers under authority for exemption from the Civil Service Act, of whom 46 were dismissed for cause:—

1. What was the nature of the offence or cause of dissatisfaction in the case of 33 of the said employees who were dismissed; "service terminated, recommended by chief, preventive service"?

2. What was the nature of the inquiry or extent of the test applied in the selection of the 114 members of this staff as to physical, mental and moral capacities?

3. From whom were recommendations received for the employment of the 46 members of the staff who were dismissed for irregularities or on recommendation of the chief preventive officer?

Mr. EULER:

1. 24 positions abolished.
.5 Unsatisfactory—poor results.
1 Did not devote full time to service.
1 Charter of vessel, commanded by officer, expired.
2 Accepted appointment by the Civil Service Commission to port staff.

33

2 and 3. No information.

IMPORTATIONS OF MOTOR CARS

Mr. CANTLEY:

1. What was the number of motor cars imported into Canada during the calendar year 1928?

2. What was the invoice value of such cars?

3. What was the total amount paid by way of duty and sales tax on such motor cars during the year 1928?

Mr. EULER:

1, 2, 3. Statement of imports of automobiles entered for consumption in Canada during the calendar year 1928, showing number and value of cars and the amount of import duties collected:

Item	No.	Value	Duty collected
Automobiles, freight..	7,182	$ 8,305,235	$1,644,166 95
Automobiles for conveying passengers only, valued at retail, when new, with standard equipment complete at not more than $1,200 each..	27,957	15,998,828	3,365,800 88
Automobiles, passenger, n.o.p..	12,269	16,528,813	4,365,421 76

3. Sales tax collections are not recorded as applied to separate commodities and figures are not available therefore, of sales taxes collected on imports of automobiles.

DEPUTY MINISTERS—SALARIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): May I refer the government to questions Nos. 7 and 8 on to-day's order paper? They were placed on the order paper on March 21, and it is now the 11th of April. The questions are very simple, and I do not think it should take very long to answer them.

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): These two questions relate to all departments, and the various answers are assembled by my department. The replies, however, were not all made in the same spirit. In certain cases the salaries of the deputy ministers were given as they existed last year, and in other cases the increases in the main estimates for the current year were taken into account. I am endeavouring to have the replies coordinated, and the answers to the questions should be available very soon.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. E. MAYBEE (Northumberland, Ont.): On March 13th last a question which I had on the order paper concerning the Customs department was passed as an order for a return. I should like to know when I may expect the return to be brought down.

[M. E. J. Garland.]

Hon. W. D. EULER (Minister of National Revenue): I shall make inquiries and give my hon. friend an answer to-morrow.

Mr. E. A. PECK (Peterborough): I would like to remind the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) of an order of the house which was passed on March 11th last for the return of correspondence relating to repairs to the Lindsay arsenal. The return has not yet been brought down.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): I shall make inquiries. I feel sure that the return will be brought down immediately.

VESSELS CARRYING LIQUOR TO UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister a question which I intimated I would ask him to-day, namely, whether any correspondence has taken place between the United States and Canada with respect to the clearance of vessels laden wholly or partly with alcoholic liquors for transport to the ports of the United States of America.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): There has been correspondence with reference to the clearance of vessels. It would be proper, I think, that any correspondence brought down should be brought down simultaneously here and in the United States. I will take steps to arrange to try and have the correspondence brought down at an early date.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The house resumed from Wednesday, April 10, consideration of the motion of Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Finance), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of ways and means, the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. Hugh Guthrie, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of Mr. Spencer.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Toronto Northwest): The subamendment which has been moved to the budget brings up the whole question of better trade relations between this country and the motherland, and concerns both British preferential trade and inter-imperial trade. With all due respect to the government, I would ask if they think the people of this country are satisfied to allow the present condition of affairs to continue and for us to go on importing from the United States every year $900,000,000 worth of high-priced manufactured goods, while our own sons and daughters have to leave our shores in large numbers to seek employment in the United States. Conditions in the old land are very similar.

The subamendment urges upon the consideration of the government an immediate and substantial increase in the British preference. The subamendment reads:

> That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after "house" and substituting therefor the following:
>
> "urges upon the government the consideration of an immediate and substantial increase of the British preference as a step towards freer trade relations between Canada and other nations."

In other words, the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer), who has moved this amendment, is following the line which was suggested by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), that when we are shut out from the United States market we should look elsewhere. The hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer) referred to Russia as a country to which we might look for increased trade when we are virtually kicked out of the United States by the new tariff changes and he also spoke about Great Britain. The tariff policy of the United States is based on the principle that charity begins at home. That principle in fiscal matters has been enunciated by all the great presidents of the United States from Lincoln down to Roosevelt and Hoover. They have always taken the stand that in matters of tariff charity begins at home, that the home market belongs to their own manufacturers and working men. But unfortunately for this country the government at Ottawa seems to be asleep. It has given preferential treatment to twenty-eight countries bordering on the seven seas; but when it comes to the motherland, oh, what a difference. If Canada is to be a self-respecting country the government should write an economic note instead of a peace note to the government of the United States to the effect that we can no longer continue—the present one-sided reciprocity under which we buy nine hundred million dollars' worth of high-priced manufactured goods from our neighbours and pay for them with our raw materials; that we can no longer squander the capital and labour of future generations in this manner; that if the United States government desires to enter into an equitable reciprocity arrangement with us, it must do so with all convenient speed, otherwise we shall take immediate steps to put in operation such a national policy as will conserve our raw materials for our own manufacturers and our own workmen and to deal with the United States as they deal with us by making our duties the equal of theirs and intimating to them that we will have a proper reciprocity or none.

A few days ago the Prime Minister said that in dealing with the United States we must keep cool heads. Well, it seems to me that the government has not only a cool head, it has got cold feet too. No self-respecting country in the world would tolerate what Canada has had to put up with in the past in the shape of the various tariff barriers which have been erected by our neighbours. The government of the United States is well able to take care of the economic and other interests of its own people. Would that we had a government as fully alive to the interests, economic and otherwise, of the Canadian people; then our working men would be more fairly dealt with. This government turns a deaf ear to any proposal to give really preferential treatment to Great Britain. Within the confines of the British Empire there are several hundred millions of people, and we should put into force a system of inter-imperial trade. That day cannot come too soon. The Prime Minister may know Ottawa, he may know the White House; but the leader of the opposition knows all Canada and all England, he knows what Canada and the empire need—an economic tariff. He knows that in an imperial fiscal sense charity begins at home. Instead of the Prime Minister talking about our keeping cool heads and giving the United States a chance, why does he not take steps to give Canada a

chance, the British Empire a chance, inter-imperial trade a chance? We have had too much government from Washington and altogether too little from Ottawa in a fiscal sense.

This government has established a Canadian embassy at Washington. It would seem to me, judging from the speeches delivered in the United States by our splendid minister extraordinary—and I say he is extraordinary—that our embassy is just an agency for boosting pan-American trade at the expense of the British Empire. Only the other day this extraordinary plenipotentiary took the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) in hand—a minister who is the "glass of fashion"—and walked him up to the White House to see President Hoover. It was also announced that our minister plenipotentiary down there would be happy to introduce any other member of the House of Commons to Washington and to the present occupant of the White House. I do not know if I am likely to be in Washington any time this year, but if I am our minister extraordinary will not have an opportunity of walking me up to the White House. Of course, I may not be the "glass of fashion" like some hon. gentlemen who are driven around in ten-thousand-dollar high-powered cars. In 1925 I accompanied Mr. Hoover and his friends over the Welland canal and St. Lawrence waterway for two days and gave a banquet in Toronto to him and about two hundred other people in connection with the harbour development there.

From my contact with him then I became convinced that he is a man of exceptional ability, and I am sure he will prove himself to be one of the greatest presidents that the United States has ever had. But besides his intimate knowledge of his own country he knows the British Empire as no other American knows it. He lived for 23 years in the British Empire. Of course, he recognizes the right of every country to shape its own fiscal policy so as to ensure markets for its own people and work for its own working men. I know he is very friendly in his attitude towards the British Empire and wishes to see it become even more abundantly prosperous.

Last year we were visited by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Baldwin, by Mr. Amery, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and last but not least, by Mr. Chamberlain, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and by Sir William Clark. Each of them urged Canada to stay within the British Empire to foster inter-imperial trade, and to buy in other parts of the empire such products as she did not produce herself. No one can take exception to their advice. It is good Conservative doctrine. But what can we expect from this government? In reply to the kid-glove platitudes of the hon. Minister of Justice, I submit that we are not retaliating against the United States if we keep on buying nine hundred million dollars' worth of goods, notwithstanding the avowed purpose of the United States government still further to raise its tariff barriers against Canada. The policy of this government seems to be, if they smite you on the left cheek, turn to them your right. Talk about keeping cool heads! Every member of the government from the Prime Minister downwards seems to have cold feet. They refuse to do anything for the motherland in the way of an adequate British preference that would expand our trade with the British people and would mean diverting to them the thirty or forty per cent of trade and of money that is now going to the United States for high-priced goods. The policy of the government has made us hewers of wood and drawers of water for the United States. What does this government care about a proper British preference which will assist the motherland? Hon. gentlemen opposite care nothing about it. They are indifferent to farm relief and rural depopulation in this country, indifferent to unemployment so long as they can continue their policy of semi-free trade with the United States. They have simply pursued a policy of laissez faire towards the British Empire and the motherland and the British preference. The next general election cannot come too soon in the interests of this country; it will, I believe, put an end to this policy on the part of the government. Tens of thousands of tons of Welsh coal could be brought to this country, providing employment for the miners in the old country, and thus implementing the British preference; but instead of that the government are content to have this country send millions of dollars over to the United States to provide employment for the miners of Pennsylvania. It was not free trade and Cobdenism that made England the great country she became; it was the union of coal and steel one hundred and fifty years ago. That was what made England great, and if the government in office here have the interests of the Canadian people at heart they will inaugurate a policy which will have for its object the development of the coal and steel industry of this Dominion and the encouragement of preferential inter-imperial trade. The government do not seem to realize that this country is a heritage which must be safeguarded for those who are to follow. Mussolini, the great leader of Italy,

speaking of a country, says: A country does not belong to those who inhabit it to-day; it is an inheritance from the past, a possession for the present, and a trust for the future. The same thing applies to Canada. But what do hon. gentlemen opposite care about the future prosperity of Canada or the trust they hold to-day to foster inter-imperial trade and advance our empire.

The policy of this government, in their attitude towards Canadian development and Canada's relations with the motherland and with the British Empire generally, seems to be twofold: First, that nothing that can be bought in the United States should be made in Canada, especially in eastern Canada; and, secondly, that everything that cannot be bought in the United States shall be imported from continental Europe, preferably Germany and not from England. That is the preferential policy of the present government. The Conservative party on the other hand believes in a tariff which will, in the first place, develop the industries of this country and, after that, promote trade within the empire. The government are wasting a lot of money on research. The first thing is to search and research for a proper tariff policy and dig up a policy that will help the British Empire, preserve our markets and our work for our own people, and encourage the manufacturing industries of Canada. So far as encouraging trade within the empire is concerned, and particularly assisting the mother country, this government's policy may be called "I'm alone." The Prime Minister talks about keeping a cool head; he says we must have a cool-headed policy with the United States. That is a favourite expression of the Prime Minister's. His policy is full of doubts and fears and "ifs" and "buts," provisos and whereases and wherefores, and that he calls keeping a cool head. Well, the government's policy towards the mother country has been very cool; the mother country has always got a very cool reception from this government.

The house divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Spencer) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Bird,
Campbell,
Carmichael,
Coote,
Evans,
Fansher (Last Mountain),
Fansher (Lambton East),
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Heaps,
Irvine,
Jelliff,
Kennedy,
Lucas,
Luchkovich,
Macphail (Miss),
Speakman,
Spencer,
Woodsworth.—19.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead,
Allan,
Baldwin,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Bell (St. John-Albert),
Bennett,
Benoit,
Bettez,
Black (Halifax),
Blanchard,
Blatchford,
Bock,
Bothwell,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Boulanger,
Bourassa,
Bourgeois,
Bowen,
Boys,
Bradette,
Brady,
Brown,
Cahan,
Cahill,
Cannon,
Casgrain,
Cayley,
Charters,
Church,
Clark,
Cowan,
Delisle,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Dionne,
Dubuc,
Duff,
Dunning,
Edwards (Frontenac-Addington),
Edwards (Waterloo South),
Elliott,
Embury,
Esling,
Euler,
Fafard,
Ferland,
Fiset (Sir Eugene),
Forke,
Foster,
Fraser,
Geary,
Gershaw,
Gervais,
Girouard,
Goulet,
Gray,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Hall,
Harris,
Hay,
Hepburn,
Howden,
Hubbs,
Jacobs,
Jenkins,
Johnston (Long Lake),
Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria),
Jones,
Kaiser,
King (Kootenay East),
King, Mackenzie (Prince Albert),
Lacombe,
Lacroix,
Ladner,
Laflamme,
Langlois,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Lawson,
Lennox,
Letellier de St. Just,
Lovie,
Macdonald (Glengarry),
Macdonald (Kings),
MacLaren,
MacLean (Prince),
McLean (Melfort),
McDiarmid,
McGregor,
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McMillan,
McPhee,
McPherson,
McQuarrie,
Malcolm,
Marcil,
Maybee,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Millar,
Morin (Bagot),
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Neill,
Parent,
Perley (Sir George),
Perras,
Pettit,
Pouliot,
Power,
Prévost,
Ralston,
Rennie,
Rhéaume,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robitaille,
Ross (Kingston City),
Rowe,
St-Père,
Sanderson,
Séguin,
Senn,
Short,
Sinclair (Queens),
Smith (Cumberland),
Smith (Stormont),
Smoke,
Spence,
Spotton,
Steedsman,
Stevens,

Stewart (Edmonton West),	Tobin,
Stewart (Leeds),	Totzke,
Stinson,	Vallance,
Stirling,	Verville,
Sylvestre,	Ward,
Telford,	White (London),
Thompson,	Young (Saskatoon),
Thorson,	Young (Weyburn).—155.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Donnelly,	Quinn,
Glen,	Kellner,
Mercier (St. Henri),	Bell (Hamilton),
Taylor,	Ryerson,
Howard,	Casselman,
Heenan,	Black (Yukon),
Cardin,	Cantley,
Bowman,	Hodgins,
Chevrier,	Anderson (High Park),
Boivin,	Hocken,
Raymond,	Bell (St. Antoine),
Fontaine,	Anderson (Halton),
Lanctôt,	White (Mount Royal),
Rutherford,	Gott,
Odette,	Robinson,
Ross (Moose Jaw),	Plunkett,
Milne,	Barber,
Lang,	Young (Toronto),
Veniot,	Hanson,
Ilsley,	MacNutt,
Dussault,	Cotnam,
Edwards (Ottawa),	Garland (Carleton),
Morin (St. Hyacinthe),	Ryckman,
Guérin,	Maloney,
Kay,	Wilson (Wentworth),
Bissett,	MacDonald (Cape Breton South).

Mr. GOTT: Before the vote is announced I would like to ask if the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Dunning) voted?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, I voted.

Mr. HEENAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black). Had I voted I would have voted against the subamendment.

Mr. CARDIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Cantley). Had I voted I would have voted against the subamendment.

Mr. DONNELLY: I was paired with the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn). Had I voted I would have voted against the subamendment.

Mr. GLENN: I was paired with the hon. member for North Athabaska (Mr. Kellner). Had I voted I would have voted against the subamendment.

Mr. BOWMAN: I was paired with the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Hodgins). Had I voted I would have voted against the subamendment.

Mr. VENIOT: I was paired with the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). Had I voted I would have voted against the subamendment.

Mr. RYERSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Norfolk-Elgin (Mr. Taylor). Had I voted I would have voted against the subamendment.

Mr. LANG: I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto North East (Mr. Young). Had I voted I would have voted against the subamendment.

Mr. HOWARD: I was paired with the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Casselman). Had I voted I would have voted against the subamendment.

Mr. BOIVIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto West Centre (Mr. Hocken). Had I voted I would have voted against the subamendment.

Mr. ILSLEY: I was paired with the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. MacNutt). Had I voted I would have voted against the subamendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question now is on the amendment.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on the amendment, which reads as follows:

> That all the words after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—
>
> "this house regrets that the financial proposals of the government make no provision for reasonably safeguarding and protecting the interests of those engaged in agricultural pursuits or in industrial employment in Canada."

One of the difficulties in connection with an amendment of this kind, in common with all amendments proposed in this house, is that everyone uses his own method of interpreting it. The other day the Prime Minister referred to this amendment rather extensively, and I think he told the house that it meant more protection, which I understand to mean increases in the tariff. He went on to say that in 1921 the Conservatives appealed to the country on protection and were defeated; that they appealed again in 1925 and in 1926 and got what he said was a knock-out blow somewhat similar to the blow that was given protection in Great Britain about 1905.

The Prime Minister then went on to say that since 1926 protection had been creeping about in Canada under "modest and belittling pseudonyms," and he instanced this amendment which used the participle "protecting" instead of the substantive word "protection". However, I think the Prime Minister forgot one

or two other pseudonyms such as "freer trade" and "lower tariff" which have been applied by himself and his own party to what we have in Canada to-day, which without question is a protective policy. If protection received a knock-out blow in the election of 1926, in my judgment there has been no evidence of it in the three budgets which have been presented in this house since that election.

Does the Conservative policy mean, or has it always meant, increasing the tariff? I know it is possible to quote some Conservatives in the affirmative on that question. The Prime Minister referred the other day to the great increase in agricultural production in Canada during the past few years, the increase in acreage and the increase in yield. I believe that the Conservative government, or the Union government, was responsible to a large extent for encouraging that increase in production when some years ago it took the duty of small farm tractors. I do not believe any one reduction in the duty on agricultural machinery has done more to increase production in western Canada than the removal of the duty on small tractors.

I do not wish to take up the time of the house by quoting the speech of the hon. member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. Edwards), who placed on Hansard at page 955 a list of some reductions brought into effect by the Conservatives. While I am not willing to accept the statement of the Prime Minister the other day as being the correct interpretation of this policy, or the extreme statements made on the other side as to what the Liberal policy means, I think we should remember that the policy of the Conservatives has been followed very closely by the Liberals during the last seven years. I think that is a safer guide than the interpretation given by some Liberals and even by some Conservatives as to the meaning of this amendment. After all, is there any harm in a party which says "if we must protect certain individuals in Canada we must protect everyone"? Surely that is the only logical position for any party to take that adopts protection as a policy if they undertake to protect some people they should go the whole way and protect everyone, as far as that can be done. That is much more logical than promising to abolish protection while giving protection to some and not giving it to others.

The farmers of Canada has not been greatly benefited either by increases or reductions in the tariff. To-day in Canada there are some farmers who believe that the tariff should be increased; they want it increased on their goods because they believe it will mean increased prices to them. On the other hand there are some farmers who have taken the other view; they want to reduce the tariff. They take that position because they think protection cannot be applied to their industry and they say if that is so it should not be applied to any other industry. However, both groups realize the inequality of the present situation; they desire equality whether it is brought about by increases or decreases in the tariff. In Canada the low, or lower, tariff party, the free traders, or whatever you wish to call them, have been in the ascendancy so far as organized agriculture is concerned, and across the line the farm bloc has been and is protectionist. I want to remind hon. members on both sides of the house that increases in the tariff on agricultural products either in the United States or in Canada do not mean real protection to agriculture. The reason for that, of course, is the impossibility of organized agriculture, to-day taking advantage of a protective tariff. At one time I believe we had a situation in Canada under which a protective tariff on wheat could be taken advantage of; that was when the wheat board was organized in 1919 and if I remember correctly the government of the day passed an order in council compelling the board to sell wheat to the Canadian miller at a price equivalent to that obtained elsewhere less transportation costs. The farm bloc in the United States were successful in 1922 in getting the Fordney-McCumber tariff passed. In the main, this was a farmers' tariff, and as I do not wish to delay the house longer than necessary, I will not discuss that tariff in detail. I think all the members of the house are sufficiently familiar with the details of that tariff to know that it was chiefly a farmers' tariff. Before it was passed, wheat, cattle and a few other commodities were on the free list, but a duty of 1½ to 2 cents per pound was placed against cattle, and a duty of 30 cents per bushel was placed against wheat; by a proclamation of the president, the duty on wheat has since been raised to 42 cents per bushel.

What has been the result in the United States of the application of this increase in duty? I have in my hand a volume entitled Farm Relief, the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, which summarizes the conditions existing in U.S. agriculture between the years 1920 and 1925, and refers in a general way to the conditions prevailing in later years. I would like to quote a few passages from this volume, beginning with a passage entitled "Farm Prices," which is as follows:

When price data are used, we find an appearance of a depressed condition to-day in the business of farming, as compared with pre-war

years. The index number of the price of farm products averaged 131 in 1927 and varied from 134 to 148 during 1928 on a basis of the pre-war half decade as 100. On the same basis the prices paid by farmers varied from 154 to 157. Thus the purchasing power of farm products, at the farm has recently varied from 85 to 95, using the pre-war half decade as a basis of 100.

Another article dealing with mortgage indebtedness, reads as follows:

The total amount of mortgage indebtedness for the country as a whole increased about 13 per cent in the five years ending in 1925. This increase is significant when it is considered that the percentage of the total number of owner-operated farms mortgaged decreased slightly, that a certain amount of indebtedness was wiped out by foreclosure, and that the value of farm real estate decreased nearly 25 per cent.

Naturally, there was a large increase in per cent of mortgage debt to value of farm real estate reporting mortgage, for the United States as a whole from 29.1 per cent in 1920 to 41.9 per cent in 1925. This is indeed a startling change. Moreover, it was marked in every geographic section, even in New England and the middle Atlantic states. In the northwest central group the percentage increased from 26.5 to 44.9; in the single state of Iowa, from 27 per cent to 49.2 per cent.

Thus, while the percentage of farms operated by owners decreased considerably in the major farming areas, the decrease in the percentage of equity owned by the farmers was very much more significant.

The farmers in the United States have an organization known as the American Farm Bureau Federation, and I would like to quote a few remarks by Mr. Thompson, the president, as follows:

An analysis of the present situation shows that not more than eight hundred thousand farms in this country are being operated to-day at a profit; eight hundred thousand out of six and a half million.

Full realization of the program of the farm bureau will mean that four and a half million or 80 per cent will be operating at a profit;

That is based on the assumption that the program of the bureau is adopted. In the November Current History is an article entitled "The Farm Problem Made Clear," and I would like to read one or two paragraphs, as follows:

Prices for Farm Products—Taking as a basis of 100 all prices averaged for the five years, 1909-14, the prices for agricultural commodities at the farms which reached a peak of 209 in 1919, dropped to 116 in 1921, and since then have averaged around 130. But prices are relative. The wholesale prices of non-agricultural commodities, on the same basis, reached their peak in 1920 at 241, and since then have been in the neighbourhood of 160 until 1927. For the past year and a half they have been about 152. Thus, the purchasing power of farm products, 100 in 1909-14, reached 107 in 1918, went to 69 in 1921, and has since ranged around 75 to 85, being now about 92. If the comparison is made for a period of nearly thirty years, with the prices of 1913 as the basis, it is found that prices for farm products have been lower than those for non-agricultural products for most of the years during the entire period.

The article goes on to deal with the costs of production, which have been increased on the farm, and also deals with the increase in the prices for farm requirements. Another paragraph entitled "Taxes" reads:

Taxes on farm property increased in the ratio of 100 in 1914 to 250 in 1927, while farm prices increased only to 130. The total amount of the taxes paid on farm property increased during this period from $340,000,000 to $870,000,000. In recent years taxes have taken one-third of the net property income of farmers, and in some areas one-half.

Another paragraph entitled "Debt" reads:

Between 1910 and 1925 the amount of mortgage debt on owner-operated farms increased from $1,726,000,000 to $4,517,000,000; and the ration of debt to value, from 27.3 per cent to 41.9 per cent.

The last paragraph I desire to quote, entitled "Share of National wealth" reads as follows:

The wealth of the nation was perhaps $175,000,000,000 in 1910 and is now possibly $400,000,000,000; farm wealth was $40,000,000,000 in 1910 and is now $60,000,000,000, a drop from nearly $80,000,000,000 in 1920. Twenty years ago our farmers possessed nearly one-fourth of the national wealth, whereas to-day they have less than one-sixth of it. Moreover, the purchasing power of the farm wealth of the United States is 15 per cent less than it was fifteen years ago.

The United States has evidently gone considerably farther than we have in Canada in the tabulating of the relation between the prices at which the farmer sells his produce and the prices which he has to pay for the different articles he requires. I hope we will have in Canada some day as complete a knowledge of the conditions which prevail here. All the indications we have, however, show that the conditions prevailing in Canada with respect to the relation between the agricultural industries and the other industries are similar to what they are in the United States, and these conditions have not been altered in any substantial degree by any changes which have been made during the last few years in the tariff.

This is a problem for both Canada and the United States and it cannot be solved merely by raising or lowering the tariff one per cent. I think the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) in her speech the other day, showed pretty conclusively that, so far as we have information, conditions in Canada are very similar and anybody who has lived for a while in a city and for a while amongst the farmers and new

settlers in the west, knows that living conditions amongst the farmers are very far from what they ought to be, judged by the standard of even the common people in the towns and cities.

The United States farmers have been attempting to solve the problem of making protection apply to United States agriculture. A great deal of the talk in this house regarding the possible action of the United States at the special session of congress called to deal with farm relief does not, in my judgment, mean very much. I do not believe there is in Canada anyone who is going to criticize seriously the president of the United States for calling a session of congress to deal with the pressing problems confronting that country, or congress for doing anything it feels it must do in order to put the farmers of that country on a parity with the manufacturers and other classes who are getting the benefit of a protective policy. How can we criticize them? They know they have a problem to deal with and surely their responsibility is to their own people, just as ours is to our people in this country. If they feel that is what they must do, we cannot criticize them. If the United States people, by experiment, can find a method of farm relief that will solve the problem over there and will demonstrate that the protective policy can apply to the farmers as well as to the rest, any temporary disadvantage the farmers of Canada might suffer might well be borne if a real solution of the problem could be found. But I doubt it. The people of the United States are carrying on their experiment apparently in a sincere and determined manner, and we will watch the result with much interest.

But what are they asking? Just a few increases in the tariff? Oh, no. The McNary-Haugen bill, as I understand it, is a bill to give the farmers a board and government money to enable them to sell the produce that will be absorbed by the home market in the United States, and to prevent the surplus that they might sell abroad from depressing the price, thus enabling the board which is selling that produce in the United States, to take advantage of any tariff protection or increase in the tariff that is granted. The Conservative party has stated on various occasions that its policy is to prevent people who are getting protection from taking advantage of the consumer, and this is one way whereby we might get equality or something nearer equality than we have to-day. The farmers in the United States and those who are supporting them in congress and elsewhere, are taking the view that the manufacturers take advantage of the tariff, and while they are not trying to stop them, they simply say that the government, having done that for the manufacturers, is in duty bound to turn around and give the farmers an organization which will enable them to do the same thing in the sale of their products.

In regard to the problem of the export surplus, they are asking for export debentures which amount to a bonus. They are asking also for a readjustment of the taxation burden as between the rural districts and the cities, reducing the farmers' taxes. They are asking for lower interest rates. They are also asking for very much reduced freight rates, and I am sure the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) will be interested in that.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend will permit me to say that they can stand a great deal of reduction before they are down to our level.

Mr. KENNEDY: About ten cents on a bushel of wheat. They are also asking for control of production and that no more land be brought under cultivation by irrigation or drainage or any other method until such time as they have this problem solved. They are asking for increases in the tariff. These are the things which the farmers in the United States have laid down as being the protective policy that, in their judgment, is necessary to put agriculture on a par with the other organizations that have been enjoying protection in that country.

They are also taking the view—and they have expressed it—that unless they can get protection for all, so far as they are concerned there must be protection for none. I think I can submit this to both parties; certainly the budget we have to-day is a protective budget. Our policy has been protection for our manufacturers, and if hon. members will examine closely the schedule in the present budget there are no substantial changes downward at all. Of course if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) shows us afterwards that there are, and that it means anything to the ultimate consumer, I shall be only too pleased.

The farmers in the United States are also asking for tremendous assistance to their cooperative organizations. This has to do with the organization for the marketing of their produce. While it has been stated time and again that the policy of the government across the way is to help farmers in connection with marketing their crops, there is in the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) one statement which I cannot quite understand. He said, as re-

ported in Hansard of March 14, 1929, at page 948 near the top of the second column:

The Department of Trade and Commerce is not exercised over the sale of such commodities as wheat, because those commodities find their own markets; but we are interested in assisting the sale of manufactured products.

The farmers in Canada will have to raise their voice still louder in order that both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Trade and Commerce may grasp more thoroughly the fact that while the problems of production are great, a solution of them will not mean very much to our farmers unless along with it we have a real solution of the problem of marketing. While I do not believe the pool or cooperative marketing is going to solve all our problems, it is possibly the biggest thing we can do in the near future to help agriculture in the Dominion of Canada. The wheat pools are well organized, but I think it is generally recognized that the marketing organizations in connection with cattle, which may be affected by an increase in the United States tariff, are in a very poor condition as compared with the wheat organizations. We certainly need to pay a great deal of attention to marketing, and I hope that as a result of the investigation made by the agriculture and colonization committee some arrangement will be come to that will impress upon the government and the department the need for greater marketing opportunities, and that it will never be possible again for a minister to stand up in the House of Commons and make such a statement.

I shall refer to the main motion before I conclude, because I do not wish to make another speech. I for one cannot vote for the budget. If I voted for it I feel that I would be declaring that my votes on the budgets of the last two years were wrong. If I felt that I was wrong in 1927 and 1928, I would get up here and frankly say so, but I still feel that I was right, because we were working on a policy of lowering the tariffs, and we were advocating at least the collection of our revenue by direct rather than indirect taxation, and in that respect the budgets of 1927 and 1928 both moved in the wrong direction. An amendment was moved by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) to the budget of 1927 to this effect:

Whilst recognizing the advisability of certain minor changes proposed, this house regrets that the budget as presented by the hon. minister of Finance contains no effective provision for the reducing of the high cost of living, in so far as it is due to the protective tariff;

[Mr. Kennedy.]

That the budget shows a further departure from the principle of direct and visible taxation based on ability to pay;

And further, that no systematic effort is being made to reduce our national debt, the interest on which absorbs so large a proportion of the revenues of the Dominion.

Then last year I supported an amendment to the budget moved by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Fansher), reading as follows:

That all the words after the word "regrets" in the amendment be struck out and the following substituted therefor;

That the government proposes further reductions in the income tax, this making a serious departure from the principle of direct taxation;

That the proposed revision of the customs tariff is inadequate to bring effective relief to the consuming public, and that the sales tax on the necessaries of life has not been eliminated.

I still believe, Mr. Speaker, that we were right in advocating that the income tax should not have been reduced, and right also in the position we took on the tariff. Therefore I intend to cast a vote along the same lines this year, and it must be against the budget.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Rosetown): I would not get up at this time, Mr. Speaker, but for the fact that I would like to clarify somewhat the statement that has been made and reiterated so often in this debate regarding prosperity, which has been so vulgarly flaunted in the face of our farmers and agriculturists both in the speech from the throne and the budget debate.

The amendment which we are considering is a camouflaged pronouncement on the principle of protection and is meant to catch the unwary agriculturist. I do not think that any debate in any session of parliament since confederation has been equalled by this one for dissimulation or duplicity in argument. From the time the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) spoke, every member on the Tory side of this house has advocated protection as the one thing needful, and has also in argument spoken of the Liberals as a free trade party and treated the government as though it had presented a free trade budget this year. They say that this budget is going to bring ruin to the industries of Canada. The truth is that both Liberal and Conservative parties in this house are high protectionists, and while both parties express concern for the agriculturists and for the industry of agriculture, not one of them cares one iota for the welfare of the farmer to-day, further than to trap him into asking for protection so that a valid excuse may be found, if possible, to increase the tariff on manufactured goods. Both parties know that

agriculture in the United States to-day has been reduced to a state of penury through protection, which is the ideal to be attained here—a state in which those in control of manufacturing, distribution, and the credit of the nation will have the rest of the population at their mercy.

The Prime Minister declared that there was truth in the statement of the hon. member for South Wellington when he said that there was unbounded prosperity in this country. I want to say that both hon. gentlemen were wrong. Either they made the statement in complete ignorance or with a desire to create a wrong impression. I received a letter from an old friend in Saskatchewan the other day, from the constituency of my hon. friend the member for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell), which well clarifies the situation so far as prosperity for the working farmer in western Canada to-day is concerned. He says:

> During the twenty-five years I have lived here, I do not think I have seen so many foreclosures and hardships. The oldtimers are nearly all losing their land. If I were to draw a plan of my township, I believe seventy-five per cent of the land has changed hands in the last year or so. In some cases the wife acquired the property from the mortgage company, and now it is the wife's turn to move. Yet we have never had a crop failure in the district. This year, of course, frost hit most pretty hard. How it is in some districts where they are subject to hail, drought, and so forth, it is hard to imagine.

Saskatchewan to-day, Mr. Speaker, is in just the same position that compelled the government to appoint the Duncan commission to inquire into conditions in the maritime provinces. We need a Duncan commission to-day to inquire into conditions in agriculture in the west just as much as a commission was needed to inquire into conditions in the maritime provinces. The one concern of the government and of all protectionist interests throughout the country is to bring in from Europe and other parts of the world those who will take the place of the old settlers in this country, knowing that they can be more easily brought to accept a lower standard of living than is possible on the farms of Canada to-day. The statement that there is unbounded prosperity is reiterated for the purpose of trying to hide the iniquitous system of the concentrating of the earnings of the nation in the pockets of those who profit by acts of legislation giving a privilege to filch the earnings of the workers and agriculturists from their very pockets. Prosperity as boasted of in the budget is the result of the legalized brigandism for which both the government and the opposition are noted.

I was much struck with the speech of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe). He struck a high note in the debate. He showed that wars were due to false trade policies. I am sure we are all glad to know of the nations' outlawing war by any and all means whatsoever. The hon. gentleman said that world peace will now depend on the subsequent actions of those nations who have put their names to the Kellogg treaty. He believed that trade restrictions and tariffs were the greatest cause of enmity between nations. Now, to hear a member of the government give utterance to such sentiments is in itself very gratifying. But at the time I could not help wondering how soon we could bring about world peace at the rate the Liberal government is moving towards free trade to-day.

The hon. gentleman said that Canada is competing and can compete with the world. The facts do not bear out his statement as far as urban industry goes. Not one industry in Canada to-day outside of agriculture has been able to stand on its own feet. Because of this system of protection the manufacturing industry and exchange of Canada are centred in the hands of a ring, and no business man who may be willing to come here and establish business on his own account, depending on his own industry and ability, has the slightest prospect of success unless he first of all links up with the politicians, or what may be termed the legislative faculty of the ring. If he does not do so, sooner or later he is put out of business. I can refer to several incidents to show that this is the case, and I do not need to tax my memory very far back. I have only to recall some incidents in our distributing system and our co-operative efforts and enterprises in western Canada to confirm my statement. I can remember when we intended opening a big wholesale house in Regina to supply our own needs; but we found out there and then that through the protectionist system of Canada we could not buy one dollar's worth of the commodities we needed, we could not under any circumstances enter the wholesale business in the city of Regina.

Mr. BRADETTE: Is the hon. gentleman able to point to any legislation by the federal parliament which would prevent a man starting up a wholesale business anywhere in the Dominion? I think he has made an incorrect statement.

Mr. EVANS: When we failed in Regina we thought we could open up a wholesale establishment in the great distributing centre of Winnipeg. We did so. How? We had to get another concern to buy for us. Both that

concern and our own have been out of business for some years. This happened to Saskatchewan Grain Growers in their cooperative work.

Then what happened to the farmers of Ontario in their efforts along the same lines when they did not take care first of all to link up with the politicians in this house? When they could save two or three cents a pound on binder twine by getting it from Belfast they sent an order there. The shipment was held up in Montreal, and $30,000 was seized—all done with the idea of reducing the agriculturists of this country to a dependent state. That twine was afterwards released by the customs on payment of $6,000 in cash—stolen from the farmers of Ontario. Twine is on the free list. I want to show how free it is. Last year the consumers of Canada paid at least $555,000,000 because of this tariff system to put $185,000,000 into the Dominion treasury.

The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) says that by half a dozen strokes of the pen the Minister of Finance can cure the problem of unemployment. Like the member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie), he would stop the export of raw material. I am sure he would not dare to put such a policy into force were he in power. But he made the statement, forgetting that the class for whom last year this nation sweated to the extent of $555,000,000 because of the tariff do not even believe in their own policy of protection. I know what would cure unemployment in this country—the investment of capital for the exploitation of our natural resources. I obtained from the Bureau of Statistics figures showing that in 1927 our Canadian capitalists invested in foreign countries $1,330,586,000. This large sum of the people's earnings was invested abroad by a class who claim to have a monopoly of Canadian patriotism. Well, the hon. gentleman said nothing about patriotism. I find from the magazine published by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that those foreign investments increased during 1928 by over $330,000,000. The investment of this huge sum in the development of our resources would cure unemployment. But I say again, as I have said before when speaking for the farmers of Canada, the Canadian capitalists care nothing for the working men of their native country as long as they have a hungry crowd around the factory doors each morning seeking jobs. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) declared that our workers are living better than are the workers of any other country. This is not true. The average wage paid to our workers last year was $920—a wage far below the living line to-day.

[Mr. Evans.]

The conditions of life on our Canadian farms are also of a very low standard, with heavy mortgages on the self-imposed slaves, and the landlord and tenant system with all its evils increasing each year. During the war the farmer's produce was commandeered at a price representing about 50 per cent of its value—less than 50 per cent compared with the sky-rocketed prices of those for whom our war debt was borrowed. Yet the government can relieve that class from payment of their just share of the national debt by making two successive reductions in the income tax in 1927 and 1928. If this boasted prosperity is so prevalent throughout the country, why does not the government now increase the income tax by making a sharper graduation in the scale?

The 1929 budget to my mind is simply a call for tenders in preparation for the next election. The slogan of the whole fiscal horoscope appears to be "For manufacturers' use only." The consumer is not relieved of any corresponding amount of the penalty he has to pay if he imports any goods made from the articles now placed on the free list or on the drawback list, which is increased again this year. No; this vulgar boast of prosperity, flaunted in the speech from the throne and now again in the budget speech, has reference only to the tariff filching propensities of this government, who are directing things at present. The government may well feel satisfied with its tariff filching propensities, but I would issue the warning: Don't call it prosperity. Surely there are means of finding revenue without putting the burden on the worker and his family—and the bigger the family the heavier the tariff penalty imposed is felt.

I would suggest to the government to-day to consider a sharp graduation in the income tax, and particularly should this be done to meet our war debt by the class for whom the war debt was incurred. We could meet our war debt to-day in an easy manner if all classes were taxed equitably, if an equitable method of taxation were found as between one class and another. Those who are making excess profits should pay a greater share than they are paying. We are allowing watered stock to be added to the capitalization of our concerns on which interest is expected to be paid, and a greater burden than ever is placed on the worker. Again, all unearned increment belongs to the community. I think a more sharply graduated inheritance tax would also furnish a good part of the revenue. While this is used to some extent by the provinces it is not used in Canada as it should be. The

most prolific means of taxation in Canada today is practically untouched, and that is land values, which would beyond any doubt furnish a large portion of our revenue. But as yet we prefer to follow the uncivilized method of taxing the food and clothing of the worker instead of the land of the rich which the worker has made valuable. Some reforms are needed along these lines, and I could not let this opportunity go without showing some of the abuses laid upon certain classes by other classes in the country, with the consent of this government.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Guthrie), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Arthurs,
Bell (St. John-Albert),
Bennett,
Black (Halifax),
Bowen,
Boys,
Brady,
Cahan,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Church,
Clark,
Cowan,
Dickie,
Edwards (Frontenac-Addington),
Edwards (Waterloo South),
Embury,
Ernst,
Esling,
Fraser,
Geary,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Harris,
Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria),
Jones,
Kaiser,
Ladner,
Lawson,
Lennox,
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdonald (Richmond-West Cape Breton),
Macdougall,
MacLaren,
McGibbon,
McGregor,
McQuarrie,
McRae,
Manion,
Matthews,
Maybee,
Peck,
Perley (Sir George),
Pettit,
Price,
Quinn,
Rennie,
Ross (Kingston City),
Rowe,
Senn,
Short,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Wellington North),
Smith (Cumberland),
Smoke,
Spence,
Spotton,
Stevens,
Stewart (Leeds),
Stinson,
Stirling,
Thompson,
Tummon,
White (London),
Young (Toronto Northeast).—65.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead,
Allan,
Baldwin,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Benoit,
Bettez,
Bird,
Blanchard,
Blatchford,
Bock,
Bothwell,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Boulanger,
Bourassa,
Bourgeois,
Bradette,
Brown,
Cahill,
Campbell,
Cannon,
Carmichael,
Casgrain,
Cayley,
Coote,
Delisle,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Dionne,
Donnelly,
Dubuc,
Duff,
Dunning,
Elliott,
Euler,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fansher (Last Mountain),
Fansher (Lambton East),
Ferland,
Fiset (Sir Eugene),
Forke,
Foster,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Gershaw,
Gervais,
Girouard,
Goulet,
Gray,
Hall,
Hay,
Heaps,
Hepburn,
Howden,
Irvine,
Jacobs,
Jelliff,
Jenkins,
Johnston (Long Lake),
Kennedy,
King (Kootenay East),
King, Mackenzie (Prince Albert),
Lacombe,
Lacroix,
Laflamme,
Langlois,
Lang,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Letellier de St. Just,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Luchkovich,
Macdonald (Glengarry),
MacLean (Prince),
McLean (Melfort),
Macphail (Miss),
McDiarmid,
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McMillan,
McPhee,
McPherson,
Malcolm,
Marcil,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Millar,
Morin (Bagot),
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Neill,
Parent,
Perras,
Pouliot,
Power,
Prévost,
Ralston,
Rhéaume,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robitaille,
St-Père,
Sanderson,
Séguin,
Sinclair (Queens),
Smith (Stormont),
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Edmonton West),
Sylvestre,
Telford,
Thorson,
Tobin,
Totzke,
Vallance,
Verville,
Ward,
Woodsworth,
Young (Saskatoon),
Young (Weyburn).—127.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Guérin,
Morin (St. Hyacinthe),
Taylor,
Glen,
Veniot,
Heenan,
Edwards (Ottawa),
Boivin,
Raymond,
Cardin,
Lanctôt,
Kay,
Bowman,
Chevrier,
Fontaine,
Milne.
Bissett,
Maloney,
Ryckman,
Ryerson,
Kellner,
Hanson,
Black (Yukon),
Garland (Carleton),
Hocken,
Bell (St. Antoine),
Cantley,
White (Mount Royal),
Wilson,
Hodgins,
Anderson (High Park),
Anderson (Halton),
Barber,
MacDonald (Cape Breton South),

Ross (Moose Jaw),	Plunkett,
Odette,	Robinson,
Rutherford,	Gott,
Dussault,	Cotnam,
Howard,	Casselman,
Mercier (St. Henri),	Bell (Hamilton),
Ilsley,	MacNutt.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Morin). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Rutherford). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): I was paired with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Edwards). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): I was paired with the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fontaine). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MALONEY: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Ann (Mr. Guerin). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. RYERSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Norfolk-Elgin (Mr. Taylor). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. VENIOT: I was paired with the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BOWMAN: I was paired with the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Hodgins). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. HEENAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): I was paired with the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Bell). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. GLEN: I was paired with the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Kellner). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BOIVIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto West Centre (Mr. Hocken). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

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

[Mr. Evans.]

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, at this late stage of the debate I regret that I should be compelled to take a further part in it than I have taken already.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MANION: I am very much pleased to be able to say something which draws applause from my hon. friends; I hope they may applaud me when I sit down.

My reason for presuming upon the indulgence of the house for a very few minutes, Mr. Speaker, is because I feel that there were many questions dealt with in this debate and many attitudes taken, particularly by the members of the government, which should be drawn to the attention of the people of this country. I think it is time the people of Canada should learn the policy of this government, or the lack of policy of this government, however we may put it, because at times it is difficult to know just for what policy this government stands.

I listened with a great deal of attention to previous speakers in this debate and particularly to the speeches of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister; I hoped that perhaps they might give us something constructive and might offer something in the shape of a real Canadian policy which would be of benefit to this country in the days to come. But, Sir, I listened in vain; I heard nothing from any of the speakers on the other side of the house but vain boastings of a prosperity which is at least doubtful and certainly spotty. Certainly for such prosperity as does exist this government is no more responsible than I am responsible for the revolution of the planets.

Of course, at this late hour I do not intend to take very much time to deal with the remarks of the other speakers in this debate, but just for a few moments I wish to deal with one or two parts of the speech of the Prime Minister which illustrate the difficulty of depending very much upon that speech. My right hon. friend started off by pointing out that this country was very prosperous and he gave many figures to support that statement. Among the first figures he gave was the acreage under field crops in Canada; he said that in 1928 the acreage amounted to 59,351,000, or 3,000,000 acres more than in 1927. With that statement I shall not quarrel, but I would like to point out to the right hon. gentleman that if the acreage in field crops is a typical criterion of the prosperity of our country, then our country has not been prosperous since this government came into power. The Canada Year Book shows that the acreage in field crops in 1921 amounted to 59,635,000 or 300,000 acres,

in round figures, more than the total acreage of last year, 1928. The figures in the Canada Year Book show that there have never since been as many acres in field crops as there were in 1921.

The right hon. gentleman used the word "deception" a number of times. He is usually very courteous, but I must confess that I thought he would be called to order by Your Honour. He used that word in referring to a number of speeches on this side of the house, and I think he came pretty close to political juggling if not deception when he gave the figures which he gave.

He also mentioned that this side of the house had thrown overboard the word "protection," but in the amendment upon which we voted a few moments ago there appear the words "safeguard and protect." It is quite true that the word "safeguard" is not used very much in Canada, but I would like to know just when it has become a crime to use a good British word here in Canada. While we may have neglected on some occasions to put in the word "protection" we have always advocated protection and, when we were in power we always lived up to the principle of protection; but what must we think of a party which when in or out of office have preached a policy of free trade and ever afterwards practise protection?

The right hon. gentleman said, as he has said before, that we should have conscripted the wealth of the country. That may be a little touch of demagogism, but he pointed out in his speech, as he has in many others, that we did not put on sufficient taxes during the war. I would like to quote three or four lines from a little book I have in my hand entitled English Public Finances. This was published in 1920 by the Bankers Trust Company of New York City, so I hardly think the right hon. gentleman can object to it. This book deals with the public finances of Britain from the early days of the Norman conquest right up to the present time. In dealing with Great Britain in particular, the article says:

> For the active war period covering the five fiscal years ending March 31, 1919, from 22½ per cent to 34½ per cent of the expenditure was raised from taxation, other revenue collections, and war contributions.

In referring to the dominions, it says:

> The dominions have made an equally good or even better showing. Canada has taxed herself for nearly fifty per cent (48.10) of her total war time expenditure; Australia raised 40 per cent from taxation and New Zealand appears to have raised 57 per cent from taxation.

In view of those figures I hope the right hon. gentleman will hesitate about making similar statements in the future.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Who is the author of that?

Mr. MANION: The Bankers Trust Company.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I would like to know the author of that publication, not the publishing company.

Mr. MANION: Harvey E. Fisk, of the Bankers Trust Company, New York.

The right hon. gentleman regretted that there was a tendency in some parts of this country to mix up the tariff with the development of the St. Lawrence waterway. That was a most extraordinary statement for him to make, because, in replying to a question by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan), he turned right around and mixed up the two things himself, proving that he was the first one in this country to mix them. He quoted from a letter which had been sent to the Secretary of State of the United States, and I would like to quote from that letter which is a part of the official correspondence tabled in the house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friends seem to be cheering me as easily as they cheered some of their own speakers. The right hon. gentleman said in his speech:

> May I say that I can conceive of no greater misfortune than that the question of the St. Lawrence waterway should be mixed up in any way with the question of the tariff of this country or of the United States. Each question must be dealt with separately on its merits.

In replying to a question of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) he proceeded to read the letter which had been forwarded to the government of the United States. In part, this letter reads:

> In this connection, it may be said that Canadian agriculture is more directly affected by the restrictions on the importation of Canadian farm products, which have been imposed by the United States in recent years, with the object, it is understood, of assisting agriculture in those western states which would share so largely in the benefits of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway. This situation, and the effects upon the maritime sections of Canada of United States duties on the products of the fisheries, are among the factors which have contributed to bringing it about that public opinion in Canada has not so clearly crystallized in favour of the waterway project as appears to be the case in the United States.

I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if that is a species of self-hypnotism.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That was not mixing them up; that was keeping them separate.

Mr. MANION: All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that if the Prime Minister was in a hypnotic trance when he quoted that letter, he certainly has not come out of that trance yet. If that was not self-hypnotism, then it was self-deception; it was sophistry of the worst kind, if it was not just ordinary political humbug. What attention will the people of this country pay to the words of the right hon. gentleman when he contradicts himself like that?

Then he said that we should conscript the wealth of this country in the next war, not only conscript the wealth but conscript all other things.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. CASGRAIN: He did not say that.

Mr. MANION: I have not the time to look it up, but I remember the expression very well. I am very glad the right hon. gentleman has a policy for the next war, because he did not have very much of a policy for the last one. The trouble with the Prime Minister is that he becomes too enthusiastic after an event, rather than before. I do not like that expression of conscripting the wealth, and I do not think it would be feasible, but so far as the conscripting of the services of all our people is concerned, if another war should unhappily come upon us, I am just as strong for that as is the right hon. the Prime Minister. I feel that all people should serve, but when the Prime Minister sets a course like that I am afraid he is likely to steer away from that chart when the time comes.

Mr. VALLANCE: What about the conscripting of wheat in the last war?

Mr. MANION: I will let my hon. friend deal with that next year. I have enough points against the government; in fact, I have so many I cannot begin to exhaust them all in fifteen or twenty minutes and I do not intend to speak any longer.

A couple of words which I used in my speech seem to have caused a good deal of antagonism on the part of my hon. friends. I do not know why they should have taken umbrage as they did, but I used the words "red-blooded Canadian policy." I did not assail the United States, and I do not assail the United States now. I like the United States, but I love Canada. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), in dealing with that—and I found myself laughing a little when he came to the words "red-blooded," because I thought he would not conclude his speech without referring to them—said that it was not "red blood" we needed but "cool heads". The difficulty with the Prime Minister is that he has his extremities mixed. It is not a cool head that is troubling this government; it is cold feet that is troubling them, and if he had studied physiology in his youth as I did, he would realize that in both matters, not only to warm up the feet, but to cool down the head, you need red blood anyhow, and they need it on both counts.

My hon. friends from the prairies will remember there are trains out there that go out empty in order to come back full. They are what we call deadhead trains. I would like to remind the Prime Minister that the coolest kind of a head is a deadhead, and the trouble with the government is that it is a deadhead government—nothing but platitudes and no policies.

I listened with great attention to both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) who usually make interesting speeches. I have heard the Minister of Justice making what I consider witty and brilliant speeches in the house, but his last speech was not up to the mark. Yesterday in reply to one of my friends, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Boys), the Minister of Justice suggested that he would like to have finished his speech. We all realize that he had not finished it, because when he was talking, he did not get anywhere; he did not have any terminal facilities. The hon. gentleman, in coming to a lot of theoretical conclusions and getting nowhere practically, made me think of a remark of the Hon. Mr. Harcourt who, speaking of one of his colleagues, said that the trouble was he was a brilliant enough fellow but he lacked that vulgar quality of common sense. I am afraid that is what the speech of the Minister of Justice lacked the other day.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MANION: I do not say that with any disrespect. What was the gist of the speech of the Minister of Justice? The entire speech was that an abstract resolution carried by a group of men at Geneva a couple of years ago, should be the whole basis of policy in the Dominion of Canada. He forgot, for example, that the whole United States press—and I read much of it at the time—criticized their representatives for having put their names to such a resolution. He also forgot, when he read the names of the five members who represented Canada, that not one of those members had ever been, so far as I know,

elected to a representative body in this country. I am not saying this in disrespect of their capabilities; but they had not been up against practical problems; they had been dealing with theoretical questions all their lives. They agreed to a theoretical proposition, and now the Minister of Justice says that his complaint against us is that we do not agree with this resolution; that we have not put this into force to a greater extent. As a matter of fact, he pointed out himself that the only country in the world that had put this into force was Canada. Even free trade England never put it into force. Since the war, free-trade England, the only country that for a hundred years has practised free trade, has been putting up tariff barriers under the term of safeguarding industries. We have been the only country who have dared to reduce our tariffs to any extent at all, thereby killing our own trade and increasing that of the United States. This reminds me of the story of the old mother who was watching a regiment passing and who said: "They are all out of step but our Jimmy."

An hon. MEMBER: That is not new.

Mr. MANION: I know, but I want to use it with relation to the members of the Liberal party. They think all the ministers of finance throughout the world are out of step except their Jim. They forget that the tariff is a weapon by which we can negotiate with other countries for trade favours, and we alone have thrown away our weapons. It is a weapon which has been used by all countries in the world. But it has not been used by this country because in practically every trade treaty we have made with other countries, we have suffered. The strange thing of it all is that the Minister of Justice, who is a pet son of the province of Quebec—and I have no complaint in that regard—who has always been a favourite son of Quebec, is so indifferent to that province that loves him so much that he prefers Geneva to Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MANION: Why, the hon. member for North Simcoe yesterday in the house, in a very able speech, read a resolution which was passed unanimously on March 27 in the provincial legislature of Quebec, after Mr. Taschereau agreed to withdraw his motion to go into committee of supply. That resolution which they agreed to unanimously was entirely a protective resolution; every word of it was protective.

And, how did the Prime Minister deal with the speech of the Minister of Justice? How did he take this attitude on trade policies? He left Geneva and, by the way, this was a great government to travel. If they cannot travel in private cars or trains, they travel in automobiles all over Europe, and when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) is taunted with it, he says: "What have you got to say about it?" That is his attitude. But the Prime Minister left Geneva and went across to Washington for his policy. He says: "We have to be very careful in regard to our whole policy at the present time or we will provoke Washington." That is a sort of policy whereby we must not do anything; we must take an attitude whereby by no word of ours should we seem to have any opinions of our own at all. I have heard a great deal of abuse of the word "retaliation," I do not know why; it seems a good enough word, but I am not using it because some hon. members do not seem to like it. But the Prime Minister seemed to think that if anybody used the word "retaliation," it was almost a crime, rendering one liable to go to gaol; that if anybody talked about British preference, there was a danger of provoking Washington; that we should have a sort of "sit quiet, hush-hush" policy. The trouble with this government has been that it has been a "hush-hush" government with regard to any policy that would build up Canada. Since 1925 there have been travelling throughout the country the leader of the opposition—

An hon. MEMBER: The leader of the government.

Mr. MANION: The leader of the government. It is only a little time until the leader of the opposition will be leader of the government, so my mistake is one only of time and not of intent. The leader of the government and the Minister of Justice have been travelling from end to end of Canada, talking about this magnificent status to which we have attained, this wonderful status of Canada. They say that they have broadened out our whole status; that we have become a real nation. What kind of a status is it when we do not even dare to call our souls our own? What kind of status have we attained when we do not dare to do anything but practise a "hush-hush" policy, no matter what the United States says or does. We are a proud nation, it seems to me, but under the leadership of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice we have attained to that great position where it is advocated by the Minister of Justice that we take our policies from Geneva and by the Prime Minister that we take our policies from Washington. Mr. Speaker, the members on this side of the house believe in taking their policies from Ottawa. Canada.

I would like to quote to the Prime Minister a statement which he has no doubt read that appeared in this morning's Ottawa Journal, a statement by Senator Borah, one of the outstanding men of the United States:

Washington, D.C., April 10. Replying to an inquiry from the Canadian chamber of commerce in the United States, Senator Borah, Republican, Idaho, declared to-day he would support "reasonable" tariff increases on agricultural products—"not that I love Canada less, but that I love the United States more."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend used the same expression as his own a moment ago.

Mr. MANION: Yes, I do love Canada more and the United States less. Do I take it from the Prime Minister that he loves the United States more and Canada less?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend took his words from Senator Borah.

Mr. MANION: I do not know what the right hon. gentleman is referring to. Senator Borah may come out and give an interview saying that he is going to look after the interests of the United States, and that is all right, but if we dare to pass any opinion like that about Canada we are provoking Washington, the Prime Minister says. We should not dare to take any attitude at all with regard to Canada's policies. I wonder if that is why in the Easter recess the Prime Minister and so many of his cabinet spent the recess down in the United States. The Prime Minister himself was down there, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) was down there, and so was the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Dunning), with the emphasis on the canals because we are going to deal with a canal question shortly with the United States. Were they down there learning the attitude that we should take on such a question?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They accompanied my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Sir George Perley).

Mr. MANION: Then I would say they were in good company, but the hon. member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley), let me point out, is not handling the affairs of this country at the present time, unfortunately for the country.

The trouble at the present time is that we have no leadership of any kind in this country, and that at the very time when we need leadership as we never needed it before. What kind of leadership is it, I would ask this house, that brings in old age pensions one day, and brands it as a vicious principle the next?

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I take direct issue with my hon. friend on the statement which he has just made. I let it pass when made by some of the back-benchers, but he is a front-bencher, and I do not propose to let him get away with it.

Mr. MANION: My leader made the same statement, and he is no back-bencher, and the Prime Minister stood for that. Not only that, but I heard the right hon. gentleman himself make the statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I say that I never made a statement of the kind, and I ask my hon. friend to give the house his authority now.

Mr. MANION: Of course, the right hon. gentleman is very clever in getting up and asking me to give the authority just when I do not happen to have it. I did not think his politics would make him deny such a statement.

An hon. MEMBER: Where is your authority?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Give the authority.

Mr. MANION: I will read it.

Mr. DUNNING: Read it all.

Mr. MANION: I will read it all. The statement of the Prime Minister has just been handed to me, and I am handing it to the Prime Minister now. The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) was speaking, and he said:

But something still more significant was the attitude of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) a few days ago when we were discussing the question of federal grants to the provinces for highway construction. Referring to that system of federal assistance to the provincial governments, the Prime Minister stated:

It is a bad system, a thoroughly vicious system, and that is the reason why the present administration has been seeking to put an end to a system that grew up at a time when the country was in the throes of war or had to meet a post war situation.

I asked the Prime Minister:

What about old age pensions?

He replied:

I am glad my hon. friend speaks of that. There is another case where we are giving to the provinces a lot of money in addition to what they are raising.

Mr. Ladner: Is that vicious?

Mr. Mackenzie King: I think it is, yes;

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MANION: Let me finish the quotation:

Mr. Mackenzie King: I think it is, yes; I have come to the conclusion that it is a thoroughly vicious principle.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MANION: I have the floor.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. MANION: I have the floor.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow any interruptions unless the hon. gentleman who has the floor is willing to be interrupted, but I understand that the right hon. gentleman is rising to a question of order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To a question of privilege. I say, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend entirely misinterprets the words he has read.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is not a question of privilege.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is a question of privilege. I have a right to say that the words my hon. friend has quoted have reference to a system of taking money from the federal treasury and giving it to the provinces, and no reference whatever to old age pensions or highways or anything else, and my hon. friend knows it and the house knows it.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Speaker, I will let the right hon. gentleman wriggle out of that as he has wriggled out of so many other things. What kind of leadership are we getting in this country from a government that talks of free trade, in theory, on the hustings throughout the country, but, in practice, in the house puts into force a protective policy? What kind of leadership is it which advocates senate reform when it is on the hustings and out of power, but stands for senate stability when it is seated in this house? What kind of leadership is it that spends millions on the decoration and beautification of the city of Ottawa, but has not one dollar for technical education or national highways? What kind of leadership is it that permits for lack of a proper immigration policy thousands of Europeans to come into our country and drives out, by lack of a Canadian policy, the same number of Canadians to the United States? What kind of leadership is it that builds up United States industries and destroys Canadian industries? What kind of leadership is it that has no word of support or protection for the dairy and fruit industries of this country, but builds up the dairy and fruit industries of other lands? What kind of leadership is it that says we must not mix up the tariff and the St. Lawrence questions, and then proceeds to make a salad of the two? What kind of leadership is it that permits our purchasing nine hundred million dollars' worth of goods from the United States, and when members on this side of the house urge that the Canadian attitude should be to refuse to continue that condition of affairs and offer a remedy, resents our advice and says that its adoption would provoke Washington.

Mr. ROBB: Will my hon. friend say what is the remedy?

Mr. MANION: Yes. The remedy is a proper Canadian policy. And until my hon. friend became Minister of Finance nobody knew that better than he. I have sat in this house for twelve sessions and have listened to him on many occasions when he made as good protective speeches as the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler), and he is one of the best protectionists in the cabinet. I have heard the Minister of Finance make as good a speech for protection as the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) made for free trade when he announced the death knell of protection. If it was not for love of power at any price the Minister of Finance would put in force a good Canadian policy. Nobody knows better than he what kind of policy we need. I am tired—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MANION: Apparently some of my hon. friends opposite are tired too. I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am tired of this hush, hush! policy; I am tired of this pernicious anaemia that the government is suffering from. I believe it is time we brought in a policy of Canada first, decided here in Ottawa without any fear of provoking Washington, without any reference to a theoretical resolution passed in Geneva. I think that our interests, and ours alone, should be considered in shaping a policy to give that prosperity to the farmers of this country which every farmer representative in this house denies they are enjoying to-day, a policy that will build up this country industrially and economically so that our boys and girls will have an opportunity of remaining in their native land instead of being forced by the tens of thousands, yes, by the hundreds of thousands, to go to the United States to earn the living that they are denied here.

Mr. JEAN FRANCOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that I have ever seen such a performance. It is like the effect of a cerebral seidlitz powder. I have the highest regard personally for the hon. member who has just re-

sumed his seat (Mr. Manion), but I think that his speech, judging from the applause with which his colleagues greeted it, must have been sorely needed to revive their drooping spirits.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. POULIOT: I have as many friends on the other side of the house as I have on this side, and I am very much surprised that my friends opposite are so noisy. Who is the greatest man of the Conservative party to-day?

An hon. MEMBER: What about Taschereau?

Mr. POULIOT: I enjoy a point of humour, but not a pointless interruption. May I say with all respect to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett), who is a personal friend of mine, that he is not the greatest man of his party? May I say also that the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen was not the greatest leader of the Conservative party, because he never won an election? The greatest leader of the Conservative party was the man who has retired from politics and is now living in Ottawa—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Taschereau!

Mr. POULIOT: —a man who has more brains than several members of the Conservative party put together, I mean the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. POULIOT: I am sorry that his name should be jeered at by my friends opposite. Now that he has retired from politics and has given himself to the study of constitutional questions, they never speak of him with pride, in fact they seem to forget all his accomplishments. But, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the greatest man of the Conservative party is he who led the party to victory in 1911—Sir Robert Borden.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Taschereau!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. POULIOT: May I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to read the following extract from the Ottawa Journal of August 15, 1928? It is headed:

Ottawa branch League of Nations passes resolution of congratulation on trip.

The article proceeds:

At a special meeting of the executive committee of the League of Nations Society of Canada held in Ottawa yesterday, the following resolution was moved by Sir Robert L. Borden, seconded by Tom Moore and passed unanimously:

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. POULIOT: I am going to speak about Geneva.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. POULIOT: Perhaps my hon. friends opposite will allow me to proceed. This is the resolution:

Resolved that the League of Nations Society in Canada congratulate right hon. Prime Minister on his decision to represent Canada at the ninth session of the assembly and the fifty-first meeting of the council of the League of Nations—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friends opposite ought to find this resolution very interesting. Perhaps they will allow me to proceed. It continues:

—and also on his decision to attend at Paris for the purpose of signing the treaty for the renunciation of war.

Mr. GOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Since the hon. member for Témiscouata rose to speak he has not touched the subject matter that is before the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order is not well taken.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, Sir John Macdonald is dead, Cartier is dead, Lafontaine is dead, but the member for South Essex (Mr. Gott) is alive.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): And the Liberal party is dead.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. POULIOT: But to continue with my quotation:

In representing Canada for these purposes the Prime Minister, we believe, is expressing the unanimous desire of the Canadian people to seek by all possible means the establishment of an ordered and peaceful world society and the substitution for war of arbitration, conciliation and conference.

This is what the most eminent man in the Conservative party, the only living man in that party who has won general elections, declares. This is what Sir Robert Borden says, now that he has left active politics and is enjoying the quiet of private life in Ottawa, in a position to study the great problems that affect our country. He has no prejudices; he has no longer any interest in the

welfare of his party but is concerned about the future of this country which we all cherish. And if he were in the house now he would be silent instead of being noisy, like hon. gentlemen who prefer noise to argument. He stands out as the great figure of the Conservative party, a man personally above all reproach. And what does he say? He says that the Prime Minister of this country (Mr. Mackenzie King) is doing his best for Canada.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Fort William spoke of political juggling, and I noticed when he spoke that he was doing his daily dozen before dinner. He spoke of the many attitudes taken by the members of the government and said, "I am not responsible for the revolution of the planets." I do not say that he is a wandering star in the Tory constellation, but he is responsible for his own evolutions, because he had two distinct policies in 1917. He was then a Laurier Liberal and afterwards a Unionist. He spoke of the lack of leadership and qualified this as a deadhead government. The Tory party is a hydra, a seven-headed monster; there are nearly as many leaders in that party as there are front seats on that side of the house.

Then my hon. friend referred to the fact that many members of the cabinet went to the United States during the Easter recess, and at the same time he spoke of cold feet. Yet he says he likes the United States; ignoti mulla cupido, he could not like that country without knowing it. Although he reproached the members of the government for going to the United States he went there himself during the Easter recess in order to get his cold feet sunburned. He was surprised that the Prime Minister was not called to order for using the word "deception" while referring to speeches made by Tory members. If the word "deception," like truth, hurts so much, does my hon. friend think the Prime Minister should have used instead the expression "sour grapes"?

There are two kinds of governments; there is the government of the people, by the people and for the people, which is the Liberal government, and there is the government for the few privileged classes, which is the Tory government. On this side of the house the Liberal party has a red-blooded Canadian policy; on the other side of the house the Tory party has a blue-blooded class policy. My hon. friend said he did not like the expression "conscription of wealth" but he is willing to conscript the services of the people.

Mr. QUINN: Conscript them all, Frenchmen and everyone.

Mr. POULIOT: Hon. gentleman opposite do not like the conscription of wealth because they are a capitalistic party looking after capitalistic interests and hoping for a capitalistic future. The hon. member for Fort William approved the issue by the Tory government of victory bonds free from income tax. This was not conscription of wealth but far from it; it gave an opportunity to people who were well off to buy large quantities of victory bonds of that kind and escape the payment of income tax. In that way the rich Tory lords evaded taxation.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): May I ask one question? Is it not a fact that the issuance of tax-free victory bonds was approved unanimously by the house?

Mr. POULIOT: Perhaps I might ask my hon. friend a question also: Is he one of the wealthy Tory lords who enjoyed that benefit?

An hon. MEMBER: Answer the question.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I will answer my hon. friend at once; I am not a wealthy Tory lord. Now will he answer my question?

Mr. POULIOT: Then I do not understand how my hon. friend can be a Conservative; he should be a Liberal. It is not a fact that the bankers' trust had for sale an issue of Canadian tax-free victory bonds and that they stated Canada was heavily taxed in order to have a better opportunity to sell those bonds?

Mr. BENNETT: I wonder if my hon. friend knows that all the municipal bond issues in the United States are exempt from income tax?

Mr. POULIOT: This is just another instance where hon. gentlemen opposite, who complain very much because we are friendly with the United States instead of being at war with them, quote the United States as an example for Canada.

My hon. friend from Fort William said that the Minister of Justice did not finish his speech. He did not do so because of the interruptions of a member on the other side of the house, so why should he be reproached

because he was unable to conclude his remarks? Then my hon. friend said the Minister of Justice was disloyal to his own province, but that assertion does not stand for a moment. The Minister of Justice stands very high in Quebec; I am proud of his accomplishments, and moreover I used his name in my county when Mr. Patenaude was bringing in his policy of nothing.

We all heard the Prime Minister say that the tariff policy of this country has been and always will be decided in Ottawa, and that is the course which will be pursued by the Liberal party. This afternoon the hon. member for Fort William was quoting Senator Borah and a banker named Fiske in the United States, and to-night his leader quotes the municipalities of that country as an example for us. This is the dessert after dinner.

An hon. MEMBER: Tell us about Taschereau.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friends opposite tell me to speak about the Premier of Quebec, but I will not do so to-night because I have no orders to take from hon. gentlemen opposite. To use the expression of the hon. member for Fort William it would be a kind of disappointment.

May I say this about the resolution which has been passed by the Quebec assembly; there are three kinds of protection, high protection, moderate protection and low protection.

An hon. MEMBER: And Liberal protection.

Mr. POULIOT: When our friends speak of protection they do not say whether they mean high protection, moderate protection or low protection. High protection protects the capitalists only, the money lords of this country, while moderate protection is of benefit to the manufacturer as well as to the consumer. That is the policy which has always been advocated by this party, but our friends do not say just what kind of protection they want to have; they do not say whether they want protection for the rich or for the poor.

The acreage in field crops is not the only criterion of prosperity. The banks are boasting of the prosperity in this country.

An hon. MEMBER: And Premier Taschereau.

An hon. MEMBER: And the Seven Sisters.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. POULIOT: Premier Taschereau can boast of prosperity because he is a financier himself. He is a director of the Sun Life Assurance Company, the Metropolitan Life, Barclay's bank, and a savings bank in Quebec. He is very well acquainted with business conditions, and when he says the country is prosperous, at least he must be prosperous himself. The banks are boasting of the prosperity of this country, and so are the financiers. Even the member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) is boasting of prosperity; he said that his business is prosperous. The heads of the great railways, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railway, are also boasting of prosperity. When this government boasts of prosperity it is only repeating what is said by the men who know the true state of affairs. When any member says that the government is killing our trade he only shows that he is, not a disappointed, but a "sour grapes" politician.

Low prices are sometimes caused through there being a better harvest than in previous years, but the policy of this government has always been the policy of government of the people, by the people and for the people. Before recess, and with regard to Geneva, I mentioned what Sir Robert Borden had said. An article appears in to-day's five o'clock edition of the Ottawa Journal, which gives an interview with Sir Robert Borden who had just returned from a two months' visit to the United States. He stayed there longer than the hon. member for Fort William, so he should know of the conditions prevailing there. Sir Robert Borden has had more experience in the government of this country than any hon. member on the other side, and the article, which appears on the front page of this newspaper, reads:

A few days were spent in New York, where Sir Robert had the privilege of meeting at dinner a gathering comprising many men very prominent in finance, industry and transportation. He was particularly impressed with their friendly attitude and with their warm appreciation of Canadian development, progress and institutions.

An hon. MEMBER: Dispense.

Mr. POULIOT: The article continues:

"Without exception," said Sir Robert, "they evinced the utmost faith in the future of our Dominion, and emphasized its abundant resources. A leading New York banker spoke with great admiration of our banking system and of its remarkable success.

The vice-president of a very important railway commented on the fact that in Canada we had practically only two railway systems while in the United States there are more than one hundred, and he expressed the opinion that Canada in this respect occupied a more advantageous position than the United States. He

spoke also of the excellent organization and service of both the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways. Keen interest was evinced in the remarkable development of electrical energy in Canada and the mineral development in the northern portions of Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba."

As my hon. friends have asked me to talk about matters pertaining to Quebec, I will read from a Tory paper of Quebec, the Chronicle-Telegraph of April 8, which has the following to say about the Conservative party:

Campaign Afoot to Split up Federal Conservative Party and divide the Leadership

Cahan is Named as the Sectional Leader

That a subtle campaign is now on foot to split the federal Conservative party, and create in the province of Quebec what may be descibed as a Nationalist-Conservative wing, with Mr. C. H. Cahan, member for St. Lawrence, in the saddle—

I suppose that refers to the dark horse. The article continues:

—to divide control with the Hon. R. B. Bennett, appears to be substantiated following the discovery of an underground movement, engineered within the province, and sponsored delicately by some sections of the so-called provincial Conservative press.

Already the movement has gone so far as to nominate delegates, agreeable to the proposal, to attend a convention to be held in Montreal in the near future, at which it is presumed tangible shape will be given to the scheme. Absolutely no authority for any such convention has been given by the federal Conservative organization, it is claimed, and if this is the case, there is no alternative but to believe that the project is a deliberate attempt to split the party on racial lines, with the province of Quebec playing an isolated and it is hoped dominant role, in the prospective destiny of the Conservative party at Ottawa.

I do not know on which side they will be when they are called upon to give their opinion. The article concludes:

The genesis of the trouble in the Conservative party goes back to the Winnipeg convention when the leadership of the party went to Mr. Bennett in preference to Mr. Cahan. Mr. Cahan no doubt believed he had a legitimate title to leadership and a change came over his attitude in the federal house which the French press or sections of it were not slow to note. From the "Mail and Empire", Toronto, came the news that the member for St. Lawrence was in actual revolt against his party. If his activity in fighting the federal Liberal party was unabated, it was felt that it was out of no love for his chief Mr. R. B. Bennett.

I think I like his chief more than he does.

It is no secret that the Conservatives of the province have for some time been dissatisfied with the treatment the party headquarters meted out to them and the stage seemed all set for a split.

A curious procedure then followed. Reorganization of the party in the province has long been necessary. But the means adopted are, to say the least of it, distinctly odd.

It is understood that Mr. J. L. Gauthier, an ex-candidate for Dorchester, has been busying himself in the matter. It is known that he has gone through the province arranging meetings of Conservatives and Quebec was one of the places visited. His business, it is understood, was to have delegates appointed from the various constituencies in the province who would attend a convention in Montreal in the near future, and the question is being asked what the business of this gathering will be.

To Create Schisms

At any rate other leaders of the party are apparently convinced that he has no good intention in the matter and have circularized the delegates thus appointed with various pointed questions. "Did Mr. Gauthrier say who gave him the mandate for acting so and what is the aim of this convention?" they are asked.

Continuing the circular letter points out that its writers are convinced that Mr. Gauthier had no mandate from Mr. Bennett nor from General McRae—

In a local theatre there is a play called Mother Machree where Belle Bennett plays a leading role. Mother Machree is a hen which has been breeding ducks.

—chief organizer for the Dominion, and that this so-called convention has in reality a hostile object to Mr. Bennett. They believe the aim is to appoint a Conservative chief in the province who will be in a position to dictate to the leader or create a schism in the Conservative ranks which would do irreparable damage to the party.

The damage is already done.

The pro-Bennett Conservatives apparently believe that the provincial leader is to play something of the role of a king-maker—

We have our own King and we made him what he is. We are proud of his accomplishments.

—or at least dictate to the legitimate chief just how he must act.

In view of the existing situation it is believed that General McRae will shortly visit Quebec to conduct an elaborate investigation of the whole matter—

Hear, hear.

—ascertain just how far the movement has gone and naturally attempt at all cost to preserve the integrity of his party and prevent the formation of anything in the nature of an independent provincial Nationalist-Conservative party.

Cryptic Editorials

Cryptic editorials have recently appeared in the local press which readers have been at some difficulty to understand. For example a recent editorial—

It must be an editorial in L'Evenement, a Tory French paper published in Quebec.

—points out that while the Conservatives in this province do not disown Mr. Meighen's successor (Mr. Bennett) they have a tendency to follow the leadership of the member for St. Lawrence who is characterized as the possessor of a legitimate ambition with important financial backing.

Important financial backing.

The editorial continues that to assure the success of this manifestation a provincial convention will be held in Montreal in April.

It will be called the Montreal convention.

The convention is to be a replica of the Winnipeg convention, only on a provincial scale and Mr. Cahan is to be rewarded for the goodwill he showed in vindicating the rights of the French minority.

The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, is to be rewarded, like old man Simeon, before his death.

Continuing, it is pointed out that the aim of the convention is to invest Mr. Cahan with the high command of the Conservative forces in the province of Quebec so that Mr. Cahan can in future speak to Mr. Bennett—

Apparently he does not speak to him now.

—and dictate to him the conditions of a Tory alliance. Mr. Cahan has given no indication of his position in the matter but these chiefs of the Conservative party are apparently apprehensive of a schism in the party—

What is the matter with these chiefs of the the Conservative party?

—and wish to nip the project in the bud.

I am proud to be on friendly terms with the leader of the opposition; I respect him very much as an individual; I think he is well fitted for the position, and I believe he will be leader of the opposition in this house as long as he wishes to be here, provided that he is elected in his constituency.

May I recall to you, Mr. Speaker, the fact that for four generations members of my family have been in this house. My great granfather stood for responsible government and against the family compact. My grandfather supported Blake, Mackenzie, Dorion; my father recommended you, sir, to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as member for Gaspé, and it was a very happy selection. They have all done their duty. I consider that I am the servant of the people; I do not care for the wealthy; I am the representative of the people who are the majority; they are the people who suffer and who struggle when the Tories are in power. When this party is in power it is a government of the people, for the people and by the people, and they are glad to support it.

There is another difference between the Liberal party and the Conservative party. The Conservative party is the party of the few, where everyone expects to be a chieftain; but in the Liberal party we do not try to favour this one or that one; we try to do justice to all, and this is what has been done by the government since it has come into power. We are very proud of our Prime Minister and of his distinguished colleagues in the cabinet.

My hon. friend's speech will not help the Conservative party in any way; the Conservative party does not know how much damage it will suffer from such a speech, because the people outside of this house are not fools. They grasp the arguments and if they will read the resumé of a speech like that of my hon. friend, they will find only words and not a single argument except two ridiculous quotations from Senator Borah of Idaho and a Mr. Fiske, of New York City.

Mr. Speaker, my last word is this: the Liberal party is strong in the province of Quebec to-day and it will come out stronger and stronger after the general election takes place—I do not know when. I shall not be sorry for them then, but those on the other side of the house who scream to-day will no longer retain their seats. There will be fewer Conservatives returned. The people of this country do not appreciate those appeals to prejudice. They do not appreciate the appeals of the hon. gentleman from Fort William who goes to New York and dares to complain because other hon. gentlemen go there. This is a very trifling matter, and I never thought that a man of high culture like my hon. friend would use such matter in his speech. It is the Conservatives that will be the losers on account of such appeals. The people in the country will realize as we realize in this house that there is nothing in their speeches but gross insult.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement.

Mr. POULIOT: I will say then, Mr. Speaker, that they will lose their deposits.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression "gross insult."

Mr. POULIOT: I withdraw it with pleasure, Mr. Speaker. I have no intention of hurting the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite at all. I like them enough to tell them the truth, and that is why I am speaking in this way. I can tell them that the people of Quebec remember the past, and they know that their real friends, the friends of the people in this country, are the Liberal party, and the Liberal party is sure of even greater attainments in the future than in the past.

The house divided on the main motion (Mr. Robb), which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Adshead, Allan, Bancroft, Beaubien, Benoit, Bettez, Blanchard, Blatchford, Bock, Bothwell, Bouchard, Boucher, Boulanger, Bourassa, Bourgeois, Bradette, Brown, Cahill, Cannon, Casgrain, Cayley, Delisle, Denis, Desaulniers, Descoteaux, Deslauriers, Dionne, Donnelly, Duff, Dunning, Dussault, Elliott, Euler, Fafard, Ferland, Fiset (Sir Eugene), Forke, Foster, Gershaw, Gervais, Girouard, Gray, Hall, Hay, Hepburn, Howden, Jacobs, Jelliff, Jenkins, Johnston (Long Lake), King (Kootenay East), King, Mackenzie (Prince Albert), Lacombe, Lacroix, Laflamme, Langlois, Lang, Lapierre, Lapointe, Lavigueur, Letellier de St. Just, Lovie, Macdonald (Glengarry), MacLean (Prince), McLean (Melfort), McDiarmid, McIntosh, McKenzie, McMillan, McPhee, McPherson, Malcolm, Marcil, Mercier (Laurier-Outremont), Millar, Morin (Bagot), Morrissy, Motherwell, Neill, Parent, Perras, Pouliot, Power, Prévost, Ralston, Rhéaume, Rinfret, Robb, Roberge, Robitaille, St-Père, Sanderson, Séguin, Sinclair (Queens), Smith (Stormont), Steedsman, Stewart (Edmonton West), Sylvestre, Telford, Thorson, Tobin, Totzke, Vallance, Verville, Ward, Young (Saskatoon), Young (Weyburn).—107.

NAYS

Messrs:

Arthurs, Bell (St. John-Albert), Bennett, Bird, Black (Halifax), Bowen, Boys, Brady, Cahan, Campbell, Carmichael, Chaplin, Charters, Church, Clark, Coote, Cotnam, Cowan, Dickie, Edwards (Frontenac-Addington), Edwards (Waterloo South), Embury, Ernst, Esling, Evans, Fansher (Last Mountain), Fansher (Lambton East), Fraser, Gardiner, Garland (Bow River), Geary, Grimmer, Guthrie, Harris, Hubbs, Irvine, Jones, Kaiser, Kennedy, Ladner, Lawson, Lennox, Lucas, Luchkovich, Macdonald (Kings), Macdonald (Richmond-West Cape Breton), Macdougall, MacLaren, Macphail (Miss), McGibbon, McGregor, McQuarrie, McRae, Manion, Matthews, Maybee, Peck, Perley (Sir George), Pettit, Price, Quinn, Rennie, Ross (Kingston City), Rowe, Senn, Short, Simpson, Sinclair (Wellington North), Smith (Cumberland), Smoke, Speakman, Spence, Spencer, Spotton, Stevens, Stewart (Leeds), Stinson, Stirling, Thompson, Tummon, White (London), Woodsworth, Young (Toronto Northeast).—83.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Glen, Lanctôt, Morin (St. Hyacinthe), Rutherford, Edwards (Ottawa), Fontaine, Kay, Boivin, Odette, Bissett, Guérin, Ilsley, Cardin, Veniot, Heenan, Mercier (St. Henri), Raymond, Howard, Chevrier, Milne, Bowman, Baldwin, Taylor, Ross (Moose Jaw), Kellner, White (Mount Royal), Ryckman, Gott, Garland (Carleton), Anderson (Halton), Wilson, Hocken, Robinson, MacDonald (Cape Breton South), Maloney, MacNutt, Cantley, Hanson, Black (Yukon), Bell (Hamilton), Bell (St. Antoine), Casselman, Anderson (High Park), Barber, Hodgins, Johnstone, Ryerson, Plunkett.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): I was paired with the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Bell). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. ODETTE: I was paired with the hon. member for West Essex (Mr. Robinson). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The first resolution is:

Resolved. that it is expedient to amend schedule A to the customs tariff, being chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, as amended by chapter 17 of the Acts of 1928, by striking thereout tariff items 113, 215, 363, 369, 437, 438b, 442, 448, 453c, 453e, 453g, 460, 460e, 478a, 696, 777, the several enumerations of goods respectively and the several rates of duties of customs, if any, set opposite each of said items, and by inserting the following items, enumerations, and rates of duty in schedule A:—

Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the Minister of Finance would have the resolutions printed in the votes and proceedings for use by the members. At present they have no knowledge of each particular item.

Mr. ROBB: May I direct my hon. friend's attention to the votes and proceedings of March 1, where he will find all these items set out? Before proceeding further with these resolutions to-night, as there are some matters which we desire to advance with the Speaker in the chair, I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Progress reported.

ESTIMATES

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS AND MERCHANT MARINE

A message from the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General transmitting estimates for the financial year ending March 31, 1930, was presented by Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Finance), and read by Mr. Speaker to the house.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS BRANCH LINES

GRAND MERE—EAST BURRILLS
PILKINGTON—NIAGARA JUNCTION
ROSEDALE SOUTHEASTERLY

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in measures to provide:—

1. That the time for completion of the Canadian National railway line between Grand Mere and East Burrills, in the province of Quebec (1927, c. 13), be extended from 31st August, 1930, to 31st August, 1931, with the same location and mileage, an increased estimate of average expenditure per mile from $213,038 to $294.430, and an increase in the estimated cost of from $1,683,000 to $2,326,000.

2. That the time for the construction or completion of the Canadian National railway line between Pilkington and Niagara Junction, in the province of Ontario (1927, c. 14), be extended from the 31st August, 1930, to the 31st August, 1932, with a change of location to a point near Montrose Junction, at a decreased mileage of from 16.7 to 7.0, an increased average expenditure per mile of from $69,700 to $107,143, and at a decreased estimated cost of from $1,164,000 to $750,000.

3. That the estimated mileage for the construction of a Canadian National railway line, being a joint section from Rosedale southeasterly in the province of Alberta (1924, c 30), be decreased from 39 to 26.19; the average expenditure per mile (one-half) be increased from $23,642 to $34,936; the estimated cost (one-half of total by company) to remain at $915,000, and the location changed to run from Rosedale to a point in section 4, township 26, range 16.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC ORIENTAL AND ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RAILWAY

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Canadian National Railway Company may purchase the undertakings and railways of the Quebec Oriental Railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, at a price of approximately $3,500,000; and that the governor in council may guarantee the principal and interest of securities to be issued for this purpose by the Canadian National Railway Company, not exceeding in aggregate face value such amount as the governor in council may consider sufficient to raise the said sum.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY COMPANY

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to provide that the Canadian National Railway Company may purchase the undertakings and railways of the Saint

John and Quebec Railway Company, and the interest of His Majesty in the right of the province of New Brunswick in such undertakings and railways, for a total price of $6,000,000, inclusive of certain outstanding debenture stock secured by mortgage, and the payment at maturity of certain debentures issued by the province; and that the governor in council may guarantee the principal and interest of securities to be issued for this purpose by the Canadian National Railway Company.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the house.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, since you took the chair we have been unable to hear a single word.

Mr. DUNNING: I stated that the Governor General had given his approval.

Motion agreed to.

KENT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to provide that the Canadian National Railway Company may purchase the undertakings and railways of the Kent Northern Railway Company, in the province of New Brunswick, at a price of $60,000; and that the governor in council may guarantee the principal and interest of securities to be issued for this purpose by the Canadian National Railway Company, not exceeding in aggregate face value such amount as the governor in council may consider sufficient to raise the said sum.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

INVERNESS RAILWAY

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to provide that the Canadian National Railway Company may purchase the undertakings and railways of the Inverness railway in the province of Nova Scotia, at a price of $375,000; and that the governor in council may guarantee the principal and interest of securities to be issued for this purpose by the Canadian National Railway Company, not exceeding in aggregate face value such amount as the governor in council may consider sufficient to raise the said sum.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: Before this motion is carried I desire to point out that there are some documents that should be forthcoming with respect to the recommendations and reports of the engineers made at various times upon the value of these different undertakings. When they are before us in committee I shall expect that these reports will be available for the benefit of the house; indeed, they should be produced before we are in committee.

Mr. DUNNING: I am quite prepared to produce documentary evidence of value of any kind which exists; but the procedure I was proposing to adopt, subject of course to the approval of the house, was to have the bills introduced so that the whole matter might be before the house, and the bills could then be referred to the committee on railways and canals in order that the officers of the railway—the railway having conducted negotiations—might produce all documents. However, if it is desired, every document can be produced before the whole house. I have no objection.

Mr. BENNETT: The resolutions must go to the committee of the whole, and when in committee of the whole we desire to discuss them in the light of the reports. There are, for instance, two separate reports I know of with respect to one of these matters—reports made some years ago fixing a value wholly at variance with the value now fixed. We desire to have these reports so that we may discuss the resolutions intelligently in committee of the whole.

Mr. DUNNING: I will undertake to see that everything is here, if it does not require a truck to bring it in.

Mr. BENNETT: Just the reports.

Motion agreed to.

WESTERN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

READJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF THOSE DISMISSED AND REEMPLOYED

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General) moved that the house go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to provide for the readjustment of the salaries of certain postal employees in western Canada who were dismissed in 1919 and subsequently re-employed, to give them the benefit of salary they would have

received had they re-entered the service in the class equivalent to the one they were in when dismissed, and of subsequent salary revisions, and to make provision whereby certain former employees not now in the said service shall be eligible for reappointment as vacancies occur.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: Is this a notice, or is it a motion to go into committee?

Mr. VENIOT: It is a notice.

Mr. BENNETT: It is not put as a notice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He notifies the house that to-morrow, and so on.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly. I did not hear any motion made, and I assumed that His Excellency had approved of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may say that I have the approval of His Excellency for these several motions.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Customs tariff—112. Cocoanut, desiccated, n.o.p., per pound: British preferential tariff, 5 cents; intermediate tariff, 6 cents; general tariff, 6 cents.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the present rate?

Mr. ROBB: It is the same rate. It is proposed to classify sweetened desiccated cocoanut and unsweetened desiccated cocoanut into separate items. It is estimated that one-half the product will be affected by the change in the rates.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are you changing the rate on the sweetened or the unsweetened?

Mr. ROBB: Cocoanut meat or copra in its crude form enters Canada duty free under item 113a. whereas desiccated cocoanut sweetened or unsweetened enters under 113 at 5, 6 and 6, chiefly from the island of Ceylon. Application was made for a reduction on the unsweetened in order to leave a spread between it and the highly processed form, it having been represented at public sittings that, in the case of the unsweetened, the specific duty at present operative had an ad valorem effect of about 60 per cent. It is proposed by means of 112 and 113 to reduce the duty on the unsweetened and less highly processed cocoanut. leaving unchanged the duty on the crude. The imports in 1928 of desiccated cocoanut sweetened or unsweetened were valued at $193,000, of which $180,000 came from Ceylon.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The matter has been under discussion before the board?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And they made a report?

Mr. ROBB: Yes; this is their memorandum.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The amazing thing about this item would appear to be that, in accordance with some extraordinary fiscal sleight of hand on the part of the minister, he is able to undertake that the consumer of sweetened cocoanut—and after all it is in the sweetened state that it is consumed—is going to have to pay the sweeteners of it a duty over the unsweetened amounting to just about twice as much. It is an amazing form of fiscal policy for a low tariff government to persist in. The consumer is the only one who suffers under it. The manufacturer of desiccated sweetened cocoanut introduces his raw product, sweetens it, and sells it at a high rate. It is ridiculous.

Mr. ROBB: There is no change in the rate on the sweetened cocoanut, and it may interest my hon. friend to know that the application for this change was made by Dodwell and Company of Vancouver and was supported by the consumers' league. There was no opposition before the tariff board.

Mr. ADSHEAD: According to my information the agent of the league was very much opposed to this change on the ground that it was a straight present to the manufacturers.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am afraid the minister's information is inaccurate.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I do not know whether or not the minister is aware that this change probably will close up a little industry in Montreal which brings in cocoanut in this form. They have written me that they are afraid they will have to close up their industry in Montreal.

Mr. ROBB: I know of an industry in Montreal which has represented to me for three years that they were going to close up unless this particular tariff was increased.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are these decreases?

Mr. ROBB: There is no change in the rates on sweetened cocoanut; it is a reclassification. The present specific duty on unsweetened cocoanut was stated in evidence to have an ad valorem effect of 60 per cent.

Mr. SHORT: What is this consumers' league, about which we have heard a great deal and which was referred to by the minister? Of whom do they consist?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend knows as much about the consumers' league as I know. I have noticed in the press and in the minutes of the tariff board that there is a consumers' league which from time to time appears before that board. The statement just made by the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Adshead) is rather interesting, and in view of that statement I would like this item to stand, because I have a memorandum from the department saying that the consumers' league consented to this change.

Mr. SHORT: Does the tariff board take advice from an unknown association? The minister says he does not know these people but that they recommended this change. I would like to know who compose the consumers' league; I notice from the reports in the press that they have a man appearing before the tariff board all the time, and I think the minister knows who they are. Who is this man Deachman who appears before that board and makes all these recommendations? I think the house is entitled to know who he is, where he comes from, what is his business and who pays him.

Mr. ROBB: I said that this was a recommendation coming to me from the tariff board. The board sends me a memorandum that the application for this change was made by Dodwell and Company of Vancouver and that it was supported by the consumers' league. I do not know who are the consumers' league any more than I know who are Dodwell and Company.

M. GUTHRIE: Did the tariff board recommend the change in the rate of duty on unsweetened cocoanut?

Mr. ROBB: The tariff board recommended all the changes I am submitting to the house.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then they are more than a fact-finding board?

Mr. ROBB: They are a consulting board, and are consulted by the minister just as I consult the officers of the department.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am asking for information, because from statements made by the minister previously I understood that they were a fact-finding board. Now I understand that they have recommended these changes in the tariff.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend has been a minister and he knows the minister does not read all the evidence which comes before his department. When we proceed to make changes in the tariff schedules the members of the tariff board are called into consultation together with the officers of the department. When they are called into consultation after having heard the evidence on both sides, they suggest so and so and the minister may accept that recommendation and pass it on to his colleagues, or he may reject it. As I said before, they are a fact-finding board, and at the request of hon. members last year we ordered that the evidence be printed, so that now it is available to any person who wishes to read it.

Mr. CLARK: Does the minister accept the recommendations without investigation and without checking the conclusions?

Mr. ROBB: I may or I may not do so.

Mr. CLARK: It would appear in this case that the minister had not done so; he has simply accepted the recommendation without investigation.

Mr. ROBB: I did not say so.

Mr. CLARK: The minister gives the house two reasons why this recommendation should be accepted, one being that it was made by a certain firm and the other that it was approved by a certain league, and he does not know who constitutes either the firm or the league. Those are pretty poor reasons to give the house.

Mr. MALONEY: Is the consumers' league represented before the tariff board by any individual and if so, who is that individual?

Mr. ROBB: From my reading of the press and of the evidence taken by the board, occasionally the consumers' league appear before the board, and sometimes other organizations appear.

Mr. MALONEY: There is an impression abroad in this country that a certain gentleman by the name of Deachman is the representative of this so-called, ephemeral consumers' league, but the main purpose of Mr

Deachman's existence seems to be to spread propaganda throughout the country, in every weekly newspaper, in favour of this government.

Mr. ROBB: That is very laudable.

Mr. CHURCH: I would like the minister to explain who compose this league. It seems to be a one-man league, like the League of Nations, and apparently this man has been appointed by some outside agency to act as its paid representative before the minstrel show known as the tariff board. His purpose seems to be to bring out facts which will sound the death knell of protection. We have all heard of the consumers' league; what do they consume? Apparently they only consume tens of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money. It seems that this person who appears before the board on behalf of the consumers' league is connected with a number of Liberal newspapers for which he writes many articles, many of them scurrilous, having to do with the business of this house, and the chairman of the tariff board seems to be in league with this gentleman. Apparently the head of that league and the chief consumer are the same person, who appears before the board, takes up the time of the lawyers and causes a great deal of expense. The tariff board seems to be a sort of Alphonse and Gaston affair, with Mr. Moore at one end of the table and Mr. Deachman at the other. The quicker the tariff board is abolished altogether and the consumers' league disbanded and put out of business the better for everyone. I protest against this league, which is just wasting the time of the country when we should be looking after more important things; I think the time has come when we should instruct the chairman of the tariff board that it is not necessary to listen to the league any more. We should find out all about the league and all about Mr. Deachman, whom he represents, his superior officers and so on.

Mr. SHORT: Can the minister tell us just who Mr. Deachman represents?

An hon. MEMBER: Wait a minute, we will tell you.

Mr. SHORT: You sit right down, and I will stand up just as long as I please. I do not take my orders from the members on the other side of the house. Do not give me any orders as to what I have to do, whoever you are.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Now you have been told.

[Mr. Maloney.]

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bothwell) has the floor.

Mr. SHORT: You are not going to put one over on me, because he did not get up until after I had risen. I am going to appeal to the house to say whether I did not have the floor before the hon. gentleman got up.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course he had the floor.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I rose immediately the hon. member for Toronto Northwest sat down.

Mr. SHORT: You rose after I did.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I did not.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman on this side had the floor; he rose immediately after the previous speaker took his seat, and I pointed to him. The hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Bothwell) rightly and properly has the floor, even though the other hon. member spoke first.

Mr. SHORT: I beg to take issue with you, Mr. Chairman; he rose after I did. However, I am gentleman enough to sit down and give him an opportunity to speak.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member will not think there is any injustice being done.

Mr. SHORT: You are showing partiality.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. When the hon. member saw the hon. member for Swift Current rise, it was the second time he had risen.

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps we could obtain a compromise between the two hon. members by giving certain information which they seem to be seeking.

Mr. SHORT: I have not finished my question.

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps I can anticipate the question.

Mr. SHORT: I do not want you to anticipate anything.

Mr. ROBB: I heard the hon. member asking who the Consumers' League of Canada is.

Mr. SHORT: I rise to a point of order; the minister is going to answer a question before I have asked it. The Chairman has ruled that the hon. member for Swift Current has the floor and I am submitting to that ruling. The minister cannot answer my question until I ask it.

Mr. BOTHWELL: Some of the hon. members opposite seem to be very much concerned

about the Consumers' League of Canada. This league is an incorporated body made up of people from all parts of Canada, and Mr. Deachman appeared before the tariff board in the same capacity as Mr. Darby did for the Canadian Council of Agriculture. Mr. Deachman appears before that board to meet some of the foolish applications which, in our opinion, are being made.

Mr. SHORT: I have seen a great deal in the papers about this man appearing before the tariff board, and I ask the minister if he is in the pay of the government.

Mr. THORSON: You have had your answer already.

Mr. SHORT: I did not ask you.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member (Mr. Thorson) need not be so smart; the minister is here for that purpose.

Mr. THORSON: The minister is not running the consumers' league.

Mr. ROBB: As to whether or not the government is paying Mr. Deachman, the answer is no. If the league is looking after the interests of the consumer, I am rather surprised at the statement made by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) that Mr. Deachman has said that he is opposed to this change, because the change involves a reduction in the duty.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. minister will probably give the credit to the person to whom it is due; I think it was the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Adshead) who made that statement. However, that is also my opinion.

Mr. ROBB: Both items were previously classified at 5 cents, 6 cents and 6 cents, and under the new classification, cocoanut, desiccated, unsweetened, will be reduced to 2 cents, 3 cents and 3 cents.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would ask the hon. minister if he is not departing from the recognized principles of responsible government. He has introduced a resolution and he admits that he has no reason to offer why this change should be made, except that it was asked for and recommended by the tariff board. Surely a responsible minister, sitting in his place in the house, should be able to give some reason for the action which he asks this house to take. Surely we are not delegating the duty of the Finance minister to the consumers' league or to the tariff board or to anyone else. They may be an investigating body, but I think their duty should be to place the facts before the minister and let him deduce his conclusions and give those conclusions to the house with his reasons therefor.

Mr. ROBB: After consultation with the officers of the department, I reached the conclusion that there should be this reduction from 5 cents, 6 cents and 6 cents to 2 cents, 3 cents and 3 cents. This will involve an estimated reduction in revenue of some $39,657.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister does not see the crux of my question. What were the reasons upon which he based his decision to reduce the tariff?

Mr. ROBB: There will be a reduction in price to the consumer.

Mr. McGIBBON: I am afraid I am not making myself clear. The minister has surely some reason for the change outside of the reduction in revenue. What were the principles involved which led the minister to recommend the change?

Mr. ROBB: To give the consumer a reduction in price.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Does the consumer use this article sweetened or unsweetened?

Mr. ROBB: Both.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is the minister speaking from experience? Is not the object of this reduction to allow people to bring the unsweetened article into the country and then sweeten it and sell it?

Mr. ROBB: I think that is a fair statement, but we are only proceeding along the lines which have been advocated by our hon. friends during the course of this debate; that this work should be done in Canada instead of being done outside of the country.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am not finding fault with the item at all, I am only asking for information. I was told at first that the article was used unsweetened, but it is now admitted that it comes in unsweetened, is sweetened and then sold. This extra protection must be given for the purpose of protecting an industry, and I think the minister should give us all the circumstances of the case.

Mr. FRASER: Is not the effect of this amendment to give protection to the sweeteners of desiccated cocoanut?

Mr. ROBB: It is to take protection away from some who already have it.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Answer the question.

Mr. ROBB: Does the hon. member argue that it is an increase?

Mr. FRASER: It is a decrease upon the raw article, but you put it on the manufactured article.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. FRASER: There is no question about that.

Mr. ROBB: There is no change in that at all.

Mr. FRASER: It is a straight raise in protection from a low tariff government.

Mr. ROBB: It is a reduction.

Mr. GEARY: The Minister of Finance said that the basis for these changes is the finding made by a fact-finding body. We are told that there are not many results of investigations before the minister. I think he said in his budget speech that important investigations were still proceeding and the information from the tariff board, that is the finding of fact in regard thereto, is not yet before him. There is apparently a finding of fact in regard to this tariff item. Does the tariff board submit its findings of fact in writing? Does it follow up its findings of fact with recommendations, and if so, are the recommendations and the reasons for them also in writing? It would be very convenient for the house, which is called upon to discuss each and every one of these items, if it had before it the findings of fact of the tariff board and the reasons for its recommendation. That would be only fair to enable us to discuss these matters intelligently. On the other hand, am I to understand from the minister that, after going to all the trouble of printing the record of evidence, these gentlemen come in a most informal manner to sit about the minister's office and have a general discussion from which the minister ultimately takes something which he can recommend to his colleagues? If so, I submit that the tariff board is working on no principle. There is no way in which the house can check up its work or findings. If we are not to be made aware of the recommendations or findings of the board, what is the use of it? It is simply a sort of confidential ally of the minister.

Mr. STEVENS: Buffer.

Mr. GEARY: It has been described as a buffer; but there is nothing by which this house can check up the reliability of the findings of the board or the recommendation which, the minister says, is the basis for his changes. The tariff board is stopping short in its duty and it can be of no use at all to us, because what the house is asked to do is to take the transcript of evidence, draw its own conclusions and then discuss what facts the house would have found and what recommendations the house would have made from the facts so found. It would be better if the minister and the cabinet, in making a change on the findings of the tariff board, were to have those findings in writing, together with the reasons for the recommendations which the tariff board makes to the minister. In that way we would have something to go on, and there would be none of this cross-firing as to whether or not the change was justified.

Mr. ROBB: I think it was made abundantly clear last session that the tariff board is in the same position as the officers of the department were before the board was created. There is this difference now that the tariff board has been created: before we had a tariff board, those seeking increases in tariff—and from my experience in the department people of that type are rather persistent; I am not saying whether they are right or wrong—would come into the office of the Minister of Finance and present their own side of the story without the other fellow being there to check them up. The minister had then to use his own judgment as to what was in the general interest of the country.

Mr. GEARY: The minister would find the fact.

Mr. ROBB: The tariff board is an open forum, a court, if you will, because the hearings are conducted along that line. Each hearing is advertised and all parties, those who are in favour and those who are opposed, may go before the tariff board and present their case in the open, with the newspapers representing all sides of public opinion present to advise their readers in regard to the evidence brought out before the board. In order to meet the wishes of hon. members we decided last session to print the evidence of the tariff board and that evidence is available for every hon. member who desires to study it. Hon. members must assume the responsibility in reaching their own conclusions just as they do in reaching their own conclusions as to whether the public debt has been reduced or increased, or whether we have a surplus or not. I think that is a fair answer to the question of my hon. friend.

Mr. GEARY: Why in the world does the minister call it a fact-finding board if the facts are not submitted formally to somebody? It is not a fact-finding body at all; it is simply, as the minister said, another officer of the department and a tremendously expensive one at that.

Mr. CHAPLIN: To come back to the item of the tariff under discussion, I find that item 113 in the tariff reads:

Cocoanut, desiccated, sweetened or not: British preference, 5 cents; intermediate, 6 cents; general, 6 cents.

Mr. ROBB: That is right.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister has split the item into sweetened and unsweetened. I assume that the article will come in now "unsweetened" at the lower rate of duty and "sweetened" at still the higher rate of duty.

Mr. ROBB: It remains where it is.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Where is there any reduction in the tariff in this case?

Mr. ROBB: When we made a similar change in regard to automobiles in 1926, my hon. friend argued there was a reduction.

Mr. CHAPLIN: No; I argued that my hon. friend fooled the people. There was not any reduction at all, and I contend that is true. It never reduced the price of automobiles in Canada one cent except in the matter of the excise taxes that my hon. friend had on them. My hon. friend fooled nobody except a few voters.

Mr. BENNETT: I desire to ask the minister a question with respect to this matter. On page 5 of the report dated January 5, 1928, of Mr. Moore, Chairman of the Advisory Board on Tariff and Taxation, I find these words:

As was perhaps to be expected from a comparatively new departure in government, some question has been raised as to the boards' functions. As set forth by order in council, April 7, 1926, (P.C. 530).

"The duties of the board are to inquire into and hear representations on all matters pertaining to the tariff and other forms of taxation, as may be directed by the Minister of Finance, and to advise the minister in regard thereto."

Little difficulty has been experienced as to the duty of inquiry. Possibly we might have succeeded better proceeding under a set of questions stated by you, outlining the scope of the investigation, but we believe that on the whole our duty of inquiry has been discharged with reasonable satisfaction. Difficulty, however, exists as to determining the nature of the advice we are presumed by order in council to tender to the minister.

Applications in regard to customs invariably contain submission of evidence with the object of obtaining relief, whether by upward or downward revision of the tariff.

Parliament alone can grant that relief.

What then becomes the nature of the advice expected from the board? Is it for the board to express an opinion that the relief in question should or should not be given? If this be not its function, then is it possible for the board to report its opinion as to the extent to which the reasons urged for relief have been established, without reference or inference bearing upon the justification for relief.

The board has no desire to avoid responsibility. The board has a sincere desire to make its work helpful through you to parliament.

How best, then, may the board convey to you the information which it has received as a result of its investigations? As has been stated, verbatim reports are taken of the proceedings at public hearings. The transcripts will generally be found to contain much evidence helpful in the construction of tariff items in respect to their subject-matter. Reports of the inquiry into the major references, and some of the minor as well, are lengthy, and at times somewhat involved, usually containing valuable statistical matter. To present the evidence in precise form, possesses the advantage of brevity—and the disadvantage of incompleteness.

Then he proceeds about the arguments. The relevancy of the question put to the minister by the hon. member for Muskoka must be apparent in view of the observations of the chairman of the board, which observations I have just read to the house from his report. I ask the minister whether or not the report, upon which he arrived, with the aid of his officials, at the conclusions now embodied in this tariff item, is available? Was the advice tendered in writing?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. BENNETT: If not, there has been a disregard of the duty which I conceive to be that of the board, because we should have before us in writing the advice tendered to the minister in order that we may study not only the evidence given but the advice tendered. I do submit that the purpose of the tariff board as indicated was to enable that to be done, and unless the minister provides us with something on which he grounds his recommendation with respect to this item, the tariff board is a perfect farce. All that the tariff board did was to hear people make statements which the minister was capable of receiving himself in written form from the gentlemen who made the application. Somebody else appears, but in the end what is done is that two or three gentlemen are invited into the ministry and become part of the cabinet. They tender secret advice. They are officers of the department—employees, the minister says. I ask the minister if that is what is intended, that there should be secret advice tendered to the minister, without any written recommendation which the house may be able to consider or criticize, and upon which it may arrive at a conclusion. Certain action is to be taken with respect to every item contained in these changes. Only this evening the minister stated that every change he proposed

was based upon a recommendation made by the tariff board. That recommendation should be in writing. That recommendation should be before this parliament. That recommendation should be available to every member of this house. Otherwise, we have substituted for governmental responsibility two or three gentlemen—it was three at first; then one ran off to Manitoba to run an election for hon. gentlemen opposite and he has become a part of the administration in that province, leaving the chairman, who, with one other, considered some of the most important matters affecting western Canada without western Canada having any representative on the board. And now secret advice is to be tendered—nothing open—nothing written. All we have is the word of the minister, which is always beyond question, but his word is based solely on his memory as to the advice tendered him by this board. In the light of the statement made by the chairman of the board himself, that is not the function of the board.

Have we a report from the tariff board this year? I have not seen it yet. The last report I have seen was dated January, 1928. We have no report before the house for the calendar year 1928, and yet we are asked to proceed to a discussion of these tariff items and arrive at conclusions with respect to them, not having before us any report made by that body which cost this country so much money last year. I ask the minister if that is his idea. Does he want us to think that? I am sure he does not. I am sure that he intends that we should have before us the report of the tariff board in writing. I have seen no report brought down this year, and I do submit that it is time we had it. I would ask the minister when we may expect it. I had made a note to ask him that question on the orders of the day some days ago, but I failed to ask him. The report for 1928 has not been tabled, I think. The only one tabled, so far as I have been able to ascertain, is the one which I have in my hand, which is for a period of time ending January, 1928. Is it proposed that we shall have the report from the chairman of the tariff board, and that the report shall be printed and made available to the members of the house before we consider the tariff changes that the minister proposes? If that report is not available to us, I ask the minister why he talks about this board at all. It becomes then, I will not say a secret tribunal, but a public tribunal that is tendering secret advice. That is not what the Canadian people expect from a tariff board. This is not a hole-in-the-corner business of which the minister used to talk. He used to complain of people affected coming to Ottawa and meeting the minister and making representations with regard to their particular industries, but is that any worse than the farce and hypocrisy of a tribunal that hears evidence publicly and tenders advice secretly?

The minister says that the members of the board are his servants. That is not the idea of the Canadian people. That was not in the mind of Sir Thomas White when he introduced his bill providing for the appointment of a tariff board, the bill that was killed in the senate. The purpose was to have a tribunal clothed with powerful functions, that the Canadian people should have a tribunal beyond suspicion, not men looking for office, looking to their own election in Manitoba or Ontario, not men who were concerned about their own political fortunes, but men who would sit in a judicial capacity and adjudicate and determine and make written recommendations in which the Canadian people would have some confidence and upon which the minister might act with confidence. The minister has before him nothing more than a limited knowledge of this whole transaction, and he hopes to get all his proposals through simply by saying: "All these changes are made on the recommendations of the tariff board. I do not know who Dodwell and Company are, or who Mr. Deachman is, or the consumers' league, but I called them in, and they sat in my office. I heard their recommendations, and I ask you to accept these changes." That is not discharging the functions of the minister; that is not discharging the functions of the tariff board.

Mr. ROBB: I am sure that my hon. friend did not mean to leave the impression that I had called in the consumers' league and Dodwell and Company.

Mr. BENNETT: No, the tariff board.

Mr. ROBB: I consulted with them along with the permanent officers of the department, and the evidence taken by the board is printed and available to every member of the house. Perhaps I was remiss in not tabling and having printed the report of the board. I have the report here, and I shall be glad to send it over to my hon. friend, and if the house desires, I shall be glad to have it printed.

Mr. BENNETT: Does it apply to all these items?

Mr. ROBB: I do not think it does. It is a report generally. I can read part of it now.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not want to tire the hon. gentleman by asking him to read it all, but perhaps he would read part of it.

Mr. ROBB: This is the annual report of the advisory board on tariff and taxation, for 1928-29:

Since the date of its last annual report, the Advisory Board on Tariff and Taxation has received for investigation twenty-seven references, being numbers ninety-eight to one hundred and twenty-four inclusive. This brings the total number of references to this board to date, to one hundred and twenty-four, as listed in detail in the accompanying memorandum.

During the fiscal year now ending, the board has spent thirty days in public sittings, devoted to the initiation or furtherance of inquiry in forty-one references. In the period under report, hearings of references were as follows:

First hearings..	26
Second hearings..	17
Third, or further hearings.. ..	4
Total..	47

Major subjects of investigation during the past year were: Cement, paints and varnishes, aluminum and aluminum products, copper rods, sewing machines, coal and coke, printed matter and iron and steel.

Inspections

The board has continued during the past twelve months, its policy of visiting plants, and meeting at the scene of their labours many of those whose problems have been brought, directly or indirectly, to its notice. These visits have been of the greatest value, not alone in adding to the store of information available to the board and its investigators, but in establishing between the board and scores of industries an intimate understanding that has been mutually beneficial. Farming areas also were visited in connection with references arising from or bearing specifically upon the industry of agriculture, notably in western Canada.

Printing

A new departure since last March is that of printing the records of public sittings. Printing of the verbatim records was begun in June, and to date complete records have been issued, or are now on the press, for the following:

Paints and varnishes
Cement
Coal and Coke
Iron and steel
Stoves and parts
Sewing machines
Celotex
Sardines and herring
Copper rods
Aluminum and its products
Enamel ware
Ethylene glycol
Thin plate glass
Cigars

Personnel

Changes in the personnel of the board were necessitated during the year by the resignation in June of Mr. Alfred Lambert, Montreal, and, in October, of Mr. D. G. McKenzie of Brandon. Mr. Lambert's place was taken by Mr. Hector H. Racine, wholesale dry goods merchant, of Montreal, while the appointment of Mr. McKenzie's successor is still pending.

(Signed) W. H. Moore,
Chairman.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the whole report? What is the date of it?

Mr. ROBB: February 22, 1929.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the minister will agree that he should have laid that on the table.

Mr. ROBB: I do. I will table it now.

Mr. ADSHEAD: In view of the fact that the splitting of this tariff item—it was one item before—means a gift to the manufacturers of sweetened cocoanut of $66,000, I would ask that this item stand in order that I may be able to produce certain information.

Mr. SPOTTON: I also was going to suggest that the item should stand. As the chairman of the tariff board is campaigning in his own constituency to-night, giving table talks on tariff, and the minister is confused, it might be well if the item were left over until the chairman is back from his constituency and is able to tender the minister a little advice in the matter.

Item stands.

Customs tariff—172a. Directories for free reference directory libraries when imported by publishers of directories for use only in such free reference directory libraries: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the old rate?

Mr. BENNETT: What is this?

Mr. ROBB: Directories for free reference directory libraries when imported by publishers of directories for use only in such free reference directory libraries enter under the present tariff at rates of five, ten and ten per cent. It is proposed to allow them to enter duty free. This request was made by Might Directories Limited, Toronto. The imports are not traceable.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—208f. Fused borax, commercially or generally known as borax glass: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

Mr. STEVENS: On reference to the tariff schedule I find that borax comes in free under item 208. Now we have this particular class of borax, known as fused borax, put on the free list. What is the object of segregating it in this way?

Mr. ROBB: The present rates on fused borax are 15, 17½ and 17½ per cent under item 711.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the reason for the change?

Mr. ROBB: At present borax comes in free of duty under tariff item 208. The proposed new item will permit the free entry of fused borax. It is not made in Canada. It is merely borax with the water element driven off. The imports are not ascertainable.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is it used for?

Mr. ROBB: In enamelling iron ware, forming glazes on earthenware, and in medicine.

Mr. BENNETT: Is this the item wanted by William J. Michaud & Company, Montreal?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Is it borax glass dealt with at the hearing on November 15, 1927?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GEARY: What is the significance of the minister's statement that this is not made in Canada?

Mr. ROBB: I was giving that as information to the committee.

Mr. GEARY: What has it to do with the question, whether fused borax is made in Canada or not?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friends complain when I give them information, and they also complain when they do not get any.

Mr. GEARY: I think the minister has admitted that we should have information so that we may be able to consider the item and discuss it intelligently. Now the minister tells us that this commodity is not made in Canada. Apparently that is the fact-finding upon which is based the change in the tariff. I want to know from the minister of what significance is it to him that fused borax is not made in Canada?

Mr. ROBB: I have given the information to the house that I think it is not made in Canada. My hon. friend can draw his own conclusions.

Mr. GEARY: Facts are nothing unless they lead somewhere. The minister is not finding facts in his tariff schedule; he is applying conclusions to the schedule drawn from facts. One of the facts, we are told, is that fused borax is not made in Canada. I desire to know how far that has influenced the minister in his action.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the question of the hon. gentleman is too difficult, because after all this government states at election times that it proposes to introduce a tariff for revenue, and then it takes the duty off those things not made in Canada in order to render it impossible to have a revenue tariff. You see the illogical character of the change makes it impossible for the minister to answer the question.

Mr. STEVENS: May I ask the minister whether the tariff board find as a fact that fused borax is made from borax?

Mr. ROBB: I have given my hon. friend the information handed to me. The evidence is available to him; he might read it.

Mr. STEVENS: I think that is scarcely fair. I am aware there is a great mass of evidence given before the board, but surely the minister will agree with me that members of the house cannot possibly read, and study, and weigh all that evidence, especially with Mr. Deachman in attendance, because from what I have seen there are reams, not of evidence, but of the most reckless form of propaganda. We have to wade through thousands of pages of that sort of stuff to pick out here and there a few facts. Here are the facts as I see them. At the present time borax, so described in the Customs Tariff, 1917, with amendments, is scheduled under item 208. Item 208 is free. Now, item 711, to which the minister refers, and under which he says fused borax has been coming in, provides a duty of 15, 17½ and 17½ per cent. I have no means of determining whether my reasoning is sound, but as near as I can see it the point at issue is this: Is fused borax made from borax, which is free of duty? Obviously it has been enjoying a protection of 17½. By the reduction from 17½ to free, is the minister doing an injustice to any existing industry in Canada?

Mr. ROBB: I hope not.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister says he hopes not; but he is unable to give me the information I am asking for which will enable me to judge whether fused borax is made from borax, and if it is made in Canada.

Mr. ROBB: I have just told my hon. friend that the proposed new item will permit the free entry of borax glass, which, according to the evidence at the public sitting of the tariff board, is not made in Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: Is that the finding of Mr. Moore as chairman of the board?

Mr. ROBB: That is the statement that comes over to me as a memorandum from the tariff board.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it on the authority of Mr. Moore?

Mr. ROBB: I cannot tell my hon. friend. It is taken from the evidence.

Mr. STEVENS: This is the point I am getting at,—is it simply an observation that has been made before the board, or a finding by Mr. Moore after hearing evidence? If Mr. Moore, on his responsibility as chairman of the board, says that this article is not produced in Canada, of course we will accept his findings; but if that is simply a part of the evidence given, we will say, by some person asking for the reduction or opposing it, then such a statement would not be of much value to the house.

Mr. ROBB: May I clear this up at once? A moment ago my hon. friend paid me a very great compliment. He says he has no time to read this evidence, but he thinks I have so little to do that I can read it.

Mr. STEVENS I did not make that statement.

Mr. ROBB That was the implication.

Mr. STEVENS: No. I read a great deal of it. I receive it, as other members do, and spend hours reading it, but I do say that I find, looking through the evidence, that there are hundreds and, I venture to say, during the past year, thousands of pages containing merely prejudiced utterances and not evidence at all.

Mr. BENNETT: Just yapping.

Mr. STEVENS: And I guarantee that the minister does not read it. I will venture the statement that 90 per cent of the material in the evidence, under the name of Mr. Deachman, is not read by the minister.

Mr. ROBB: Make it 95 per cent.

Mr. STEVENS: Ninety-five per cent, then. And the reason the minister will not read it is the reason I won't read it. I have known Mr. Deachman for twenty-five years and he is an estimable gentleman in many respects.

Mr. ROBB: Why pick him out?

Mr. BENNETT: Because he takes up most of the time of the board.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, because he takes up the major portion of the board's time, not in presenting evidence but in making reckless statements.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Bringing out the evidence.

Mr. STEVENS: There is one of the gentlemen who are supposed to pay for it.

Mr. SPOTTON: Supposed.

Mr. STEVENS: And they are now trying to induce an unsuspecting public to help to pay for the retention of Mr. Deachman before the board, giving him a cheap living, a good living. I have known him for probably twenty-five years, and in many respects he is an estimable gentleman. But he is an avowed free trader who positively will not allow to enter his mind any evidence that would go to interfere with his fixed ideas on free trade. He is an absolutely prejudiced witness of the most pronounced type.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): He is not a witness.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the point.

Mr. STEVENS: Exactly, that is the point. Material by thousands of pages is now published and presented on the public platform by the hon. member for Weyburn as evidence given before a responsible tariff board, deluding the public. My hon. friend and others who sit near him go before audiences in this country, presenting to them printed statements under the aegis of this government, under orders in council of this government, and say, "This is evidence before the tariff commission of Canada." And it is nothing more or less than the vaporings of Mr. Deachman given forth as evidence. Then the minister comes in and says to me, with a smile on his face and a wink in his eye—

Mr. ROBB: Not the wink.

Mr. STEVENS: He says, "Surely hon. gentlemen can read the evidence." And, as I say, about 60 per cent of it consists of the vaporings of Mr. Deachman. I refuse to waste my time reading it.

Mr. BENNETT: And the country's money.

Mr. STEVENS: And the country's money as well.

Mr. ROBB: It is not fair to pick out only Mr. Deachman's and say that I did not read 95 per cent of it. I did not read 95 per cent of all the material.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is what we thought.

Mr. ROBB: But this is the point before the committee, namely, that the present rates on this product are 15 per cent, 17½ per cent and 17½ per cent. This borax is used in the enamelling of ironware, forming glaze on

earthenware, and also in medicine; and after the hearing before the tariff board, where there was no opposition, and in consultation with the officers of the department and the members of the tariff board who had heard the evidence, we decided to put it on the free list. The question now is to decide whether or not the committee wants to put it on the free list or to leave it where it is with the rates of duty I have mentioned.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister told us that raw borax was used as flux. I would ask him this question: Is borax glass a waste product?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend probably knows more about it than I do.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It is information of this kind that should come before the house. I did not hear what the minister said.

Mr. ROBB: I say I am not so well posted as my hon. friend.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Then we had better pass this item along because I shall have something further to say when I have the information.

Mr. ROBB: No; this is a fair item and we will test the committee on it.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister said that this evidence had been printed, but the hearing took place six months before any evidence was printed, and there is no record of it for members of this house. The hearing took place in November, 1927, and Mr. Moore in his report says that he began to print the evidence in June. But, as I say, there is no record before the members of this committee. Is that fair? Is it fair to say now that the members of this committee had as good an opportunity to read the evidence as had the minister, who asks us to come to a conclusion with respect to the matter.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend is right; the evidence was not printed.

Mr. WHITE (London): The minister has not told the committee how much difference it will make to the revenues of the country if this item goes through. He has said that this article is to be brought in free. He has given us the information with regard to the free entry of borax, but he has not yet stated the policy of the government in the matter. He has not told us whether they have changed their policy and decided to bring in free everything which is not produced in Canada. If so, have they abandoned the old idea of a tariff for revenue?

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. ROBB: I am unable to give the evidence as to the reduction in revenue because, as I have said, the commodity comes under another item and is not traceable.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I know what ordinary ground borax is used for; as the minister has told the house, it is used as flux. The people who work in iron and steel know also what it is used for. I am asking the minister now for information as to what borax glass is, whether it is a waste product and what it is used for. We have no information about that, and the minister does not tell us. No one in his department seems to know. The gentleman who is advising him on the subject cannot tell him. Why does he not let us know what the facts are?

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend object to the reduction?

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is the same old story again. The minister asked me the same thing about automobiles a few minutes ago and I gave the answer. I can answer him about this too if he wants the answer.

Mr. ROBB: I should like to have the answer.

Mr. CHAPLIN: But the minister is there to give us information.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Give us the answer.

Mr. CHAPLIN: You can wait too.

Mr. COOTE: Would the minister be good enough to say whether this reduction is in the interests of the manufacturers?

Mr. ROBB: I have said that this product is used in enamelling ironware, in glazing earthenware, and also in medicine, and the rates of duty are 15, 17½, and 17½. It is proposed to make it free.

Mr. COOTE: Then that is an affirmative answer to the question I asked.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Absolutely.

Mr. COOTE: In view of that answer will my hon. friends to my right allow the item to pass?

Mr. CHAPLIN: My hon. friend knows very well that we have nothing to do with allowing the item to pass. We are asking for fair information which is not forthcoming from the minister.

Mr. BENNETT: And the record is not before the committee.

Mr. STEVENS: I have sent for the evidence and I should like to see it.

Mr. ROBB: It is not printed.

Mr. STEVENS: That is hardly fair on the part of the minister. He said I might have read it for myself and now he says it is not printed. There is a distinct question at issue on that point. The point is that fused borax is made from borax; fused borax is undoubtedly an article made from borax. I have asked for some information regarding this material so that we may estimate whether or not it is good business for this country to change from the classification of 711. Let me point out that the government have been classifying this article under item 711, which reads as follows:

All goods not enumerated in this schedule as subject to any other rate of duty, and not otherwise declared free of duty, and not being goods the importation whereof is by law prohibited—15 per cent, 17½ per cent, 17½ per cent.

That does not mention fused borax at all; it is simply an omnibus item into which classification the customs department can put a lot of miscellaneous articles and impose duty upon them. Borax is classified under item 208, and this has been the case right along.

Mr. ROBB: Not fused borax.

Mr. STEVENS: All borax.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does not the minister think he had better let this item stand until to-morrow in order to obtain further information? We do not know how much was imported; we do not know what the duty was; we do not know what the article is used for or what purpose is to be served by this proposed change. I think it would be well to let it stand until we get further information on the subject; we cannot legislate in the dark like this.

Mr. ROBB: I do not mind telling the committee again that it is not possible to trace the importations because, as my hon. friend has said, this article came in under an omnibus item because there was no special classification for it. I have told my hon. friends what it is used for. The duty now is 15 per cent, 17½ per cent and 17½ per cent, and after inquiry we propose to make it free. There was a public sitting of the board, at which evidence was given that this article is not made in Canada, and there was no opposition to the application.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Does not the minister think the tariff board should have found out how much of this article is imported into Canada?

Mr. ROBB: How could they?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): What is the trouble? Would not the people appearing before the board know something of it and what use is made of it? Surely the board have not exhausted their investigation if they have not found out those relevant facts.

Mr. STEVENS: I would like to ask the minister a question in order to assist him in giving us the information. Will he tell us who are William J. Michaud and Company of Montreal? In order to show on what I base my question I may say that I give this name from page 10 of the report, item 78. That is all the printed evidence before the committee with regard to this item.

Mr. ROBB: I understand they are wholesale importers and jobbers. I do not know their rating, but if my hon. friends so desire I might look up Dun or Bradstreet and secure that information.

Mr. STEVENS: That is the first light we have had on the matter. These people are not manufacturers and they are not competent to say whether or not an industry is being affected. They made an application to the board, presumably in good faith, in their personal interests. On their evidence, apparently, we are told that this article is not manufactured in Canada, and I submit that is pretty flimsy evidence. I think the minister should let this item stand until we have further information.

Mr. IRVINE: I would like to ask the minister a question. Would he tell the committee whether Mr. Deachman has absolutely sanctioned the free importation of this article?

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister said a few moments ago that there was a duty on fused borax and that it was under a separate item. Would he tell us what were the importations of fused borax last year on which duty was paid? There was no duty on ordinary borax, which comes into Canada free.

Mr. ROBB: I have told the committee already that it came in under a blanket item and that we were not able to trace the imports.

Mr. RYCKMAN: At this late hour I dislike to ask the minister to favour me, but I am engaged in the business of enamelling ironware and I have not heard what effect this change may have on that business. Frankly, I would like to make some inquiries.

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend object to the item?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I do not know; I may not object at all, but I could find out by a telegram what influence this change would have upon a business which is well established

in Canada and in which many people are interested. If the minister has made exhaustive inquiries these people may be quite well satisfied, but this is an important business and if it is not interfered with I shall be only too glad to make no objection to the item. I ask this purely on personal grounds and in absolutely good faith.

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend make fused borax or does he use it?

Mr. RYCKMAN: The minister has said that this article is used in enamelling ironware. I am a director of a company which is engaged in enamelling ironware as part of its business, and I have not heard anything about this change. I really would like to know whether I am attacked, boosted or thrown down.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend is the first member of the house to acknowledge that he uses this product.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I acknowledge that I am interested in a company which enamels ironware.

Mr. ROBB: Before the hearing was held a full month's notice was given the trade and no person appeared in opposition. If my hon. friend is interested in it we will let the item stand for the present.

Item stands.

Customs tariff—215. Stearic acid, n.o.p., 12½ per cent, British preferential tariff; 17½ per cent, intermediate tariff; 20 per cent, general tariff.

Mr. ROBB: The only change in this item is to add "n.o.p.".

Mr. STEVENS: What is the reason for merely adding those words? It is in the schedule now at the proposed rates, so why add the words "not otherwise provided". There must be some reason.

Mr. ROBB: It is proposed to widen item 215a, formerly item 777, to make it cover stearic acid for manufacturers of crayons as well as for makers of candles. The main raw materials of the crayon industry are paraffin, wax and stearic acid. The latter is not made in Canada, so the loss of duty would be negligible. Stearic acid for other purposes is dutiable.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Why should an ordinary person who wants to use this article be discriminated against to the extent of 20 per cent while the manufacturer imports that article free of duty? I heard the minister say his was a low tariff policy; I supported the budget this year, but here we have an item which is free to the manufacturers but which costs anyone else 20 per cent. Is that fair?

Mr. ROBB: The manufacturers of crayons were asking for an increase in duty, and the decision arrived at was that we were not disposed to give them that increase, but we thought we could help them by giving them this reduction in the raw material.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): For what purpose is stearic acid used, outside of the manufacture of candles and crayons?

Mr. BENNETT: Was that under reference number 96? Was that the application of the crayon company at Peterborough, heard on May 16, 1928 and November 30, 1928?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, that is the one.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What are the rates of duty on candles and crayons?

Mr. ROBB: Seventeen and a half per cent on crayons and 25 per cent on candles.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In other words, the policy of this government is to give the manufacturer his raw material at a cheaper rate in order to enable him to exact the full tariff from the consumer. I find item after item in the schedule containing the words "for manufacturers' use only," or their equivalent. No less than three items on the first page, three on the second and one on the last, contain this proviso.

Mr. IRVINE: Is that expression used in the budget?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It is all in the budget. It only shows the utter hypocrisy of the low tariff policy of the Liberal party.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member probably has lost sight of the fact that before the change was made the manufacturer of crayons was paying 20 per cent on part of his raw material, while he had only 17½ per cent protection on his manufactured article.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the situation now?

Mr. ROBB: He will obtain his stearic acid free.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What will be the situation of the consumer with regard to that product?

Mr. BENNETT: The price will be lower.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Will the duty be increased to the consumer?

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly not.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is the duty on the finished product any lower? The minister is telling us that he is lowering the duty on the raw material, which will benefit the manufacturer, but he is not touching the duty on the fininshed product.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Did the minister say that these applicants were asking for an increased duty?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): And instead of increasing the duty, he gave them some help by reducing the duty on their raw material?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It is an indirect way of giving them more protection.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It is a very direct way.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): And means a loss of revenue.

Mr. ROBB: That is not quite the fair way to put it. We must keep in mind the fact that he was paying more on the raw material than the protection he had on the finished material.

Mr. COOTE: Would that statement apply to candles as well as to crayons?

Mr. ROBB: The candle men have this privilege now.

Mr. COOTE: Were the candle men paying a higher rate of duty than the rate of protection on candles?

Mr. ROBB: The candle men were receiving their stearic acid free of duty.

Mr. BENNETT: And candles were free.

Mr. EVANS: This incident may seem insignificant but it is serious as showing the policy of the government in putting raw material on the free list but leaving the duty intact on the finished article. We find the same situation throughout the whole schedule; every change that is made is made in the manufacturers' interest. Is there nothing for the consumer at all? Is that the policy of the Liberal party? I would like to know if the tariff advisory board recommended that alteration, and I would like to know also if that board is simply to be a link between the manufacturers and the politicians.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Does it not look as though the representative of the consumers' league was asleep at the switch?

Mr. SHORT: What will the loss of revenue be in connection with this item?

Mr. ROBB: The imports are not traceable as they are mixed up with other items. It might interest the hon. gentlemen to know of some of the troubles we have in the department. These manufacturers of crayons made a very strong appeal for an increase in the duty on crayons; they wanted it increased to 40 per cent general, and 30 per cent British preference.

Mr. STEVENS: Is that evidence printed?

Mr. SHORT: It seems as though we cannot get very much information from the minister on these items. A few minutes ago I understood him to say that the loss in revenue would not amount to anything, that it was immaterial; if that is the case, it would appear that these items are being changed in order to deceive the public into thinking they are getting something for nothing; trying to make them think that some item is coming in free when they are actually getting no benefit whatever.

Mr. ROBB: We are putting it into a separate class so that we will be able to trace it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River). If there is to be very little loss in revenue, I fail to see how the minister has met the wishes of the manufacturers in giving them the advantage they asked for.

Mr. ROBB: I have not.

Mr. SHORT: They are fooling the public, that is the idea.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am afraid the minister cannot get away with that. Either he does not know what he is doing or he is doing something for the manufacturers.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It was the same thing in the case of automobiles.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The unfortunate minister does not really know. I do not know whether Mr. Deachman has had anything to do with this, but someone has made the recommendation to the minister. I am inclined to discount much of Mr. Deachman's material, but he appears to have stirred up the protectionists and in that way I am almost convinced that he must be of some value to the low tariff element in this country.

Mr. STEVENS: As a propagandist he is quite good.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am not sure whether the tirade against Mr. Deachman was not the result of one or two little articles

which he wrote against the hon. gentlemen on the front benches of the Conservative party. But apart from the value of his material—and after all, one has to study it a good deal to make sure that it contains any value at all—there is a great deal of entertainment in it, and I am sure the members of the house would not miss it for anything.

Mr. STEVENS: It is good fiction.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think the minister should be prepared at all times to give the committee the fullest possible information on these matters, particularly with respect to the possibilities of a loss in revenue. He should be able to tell us what benefit will accrue according to his own opinion or the report he receives from the tariff board. If he would give us that information there would be much less difficulty in getting these items through, or at least in getting some of them through. If he would state at the outset that it was for the manufacturers' benefit, I do not think my friends in the Conservative party would raise much objection to the item.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has the evidence in this particular case been printed?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Could we get even a typewritten copy of it for our information? We are anxious to obtain some information in order that we may deal intelligently with these matters. Some resolution or order in council was passed last session providing that all this evidence should be available to the members of the house.

Mr. ROBB: I shall be very glad to table the typewritten evidence.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There must be some information regarding this particular item, and I would ask that this item stand until we obtain that information.

Mr. ROBB: I have not read the evidence, but after having listened to what the members of the tariff board had to say, I know that the application was for an increased duty on crayons. I think that is what the evidence will show. We were not disposed to grant the application.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no evidence on this point at all, then.

Mr. ROBB: There is evidence that it is used as one of their raw materials.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not think the minister is quite fair. He says that this was an application made to the tariff board for an increase in duty on crayons, and that he was not disposed to grant that. Did he say he was not disposed to grant the increase?

Mr. ROBB: Yes; I was not disposed to give them the increase they asked for.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The application was made to him as Minister of Finance. He was not disposed to grant the increase and he transferred the application to the tariff board. Is that the procedure?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The tariff board considered the matter. Did the board, on its own initiative and its own ability to determine policy, actually decide: Well, we cannot give these fellows this increase in protection; but we are going to do just as much for them; we are going to do the same thing as giving them protection; we are going to reduce the duty on the raw product, the material entering into their manufacture. They come to the minister and they say: These poor manufacturers came to us and asked for an increase; you told us to consider their case; we have considered it and we think they are deserving; but we know it would not do for the minister of a low tariff government to bring in an increase in protection, and so we have made a recommendation that the duty be reduced on the raw product. The minister comes into the house and says that the whole policy of the government is to lower tariffs; that its policy is tariff for revenue. Then he turns around and gives the manufacturers the only relief that is given on the items I have read so far in the schedule. The situation is amazing. I would like the minister to tell the committee just on what argument he was convinced that he should provide this changed item in the tariff.

Mr. ROBB: On the argument of enabling this industry to get its raw material at a lower rate of duty than it was paying on the finished product.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But why?

Mr. ROBB: Will my hon. friend argue that we should help industries in this country by charging them a higher rate of duty on their raw materials than on their finished product? A previous government at one time thought they could help the manufacturers of tractors in Canada by putting tractors on the free list and leaving the raw material with a higher rate of duty. The result was that they closed up all the tractor business throughout Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the minister mean that seriously?

Mr. ROBB: I do mean it seriously.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, those are not the facts.

Mr. ROBB: I have applications before the Department of Finance now for rebates of losses that were made by certain industries that were closed up.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not what the minister said.

Mr. ROBB: This is not a new policy of attempting to make the duty on the raw material a little less than that on the finished product. That was the policy when the duties on agricultural implements were changed in 1924. That was the policy when the duty on automobiles was changed in 1926. That was the policy last year when the duty on textiles was changed. Each year, according to hon. gentlemen opposite—and they managed to get together on it, and sometimes, but not always, they managed to vote with the government—we have been ruining industry. Now the argument is that we are helping industry. It is pretty hard to satisfy the house when it is in that frame of mind.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is the minister through with his sophistry? because it is nothing else. The first of all raises the argument that hon. members to my right, to the left of the Speaker, did irreparable damage to the tractor industry of Canada by allowing tractors to come in free while leaving a high rate of duty on the raw materials, and then he proceeds to relate that to this item. The situation is as hypocritical as is the policy of the government. There is no relation at all between the two cases. In this particular case the minister is making the raw product free and leaving the duty on the finished product, which the customer uses, as high as it ever was. I believe it is high—17½ per cent and 20 per cent.

Mr. ROBB: I think it is 20 per cent under the general tariff.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): After all, the question is not: what is good for the manufacturers? I think the government is looking after them well enough. I am thinking of the consumer; I am more concerned with the consumer than with the manufacturer. If the minister could only find some means of inducing the protectionists within his party to consent to some reductions of duty that would be of direct advantage to the consumer instead of always to the manufacturer, not only would he be more in keeping with the policy of his party, but he would receive more support from this party.

Mr. ROBB: The duties on crayons are 15 and 17½ per cent.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is very substantial considering the fact that the raw material comes in free of duty.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I confess I am a little mixed up in connection with the nature of this application. I understood the minister to say that the application by the Crayon Company of Peterborough was for an increase. Am I correct in that?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: I can hardly understand the minister in connection with that observation. I hold in my hand the printed report of the Advisory Board on Tariff and Taxation, and on page 11 I find reference number 96:

Subject—Crayons and chalk.
Upward or downward revision—Decrease.
Applicant—Canada Crayon Company Limited.

Mr. ROBB: That is a decrease in the duty on the raw material.

Mr. BENNETT: I now turn to the manuscript dated 1928-1929, which the minister should have presented to the house and which, instead, he kept in his cabinet. And I find again on page 11:

Article—Crayons.
Applicant—Canada Crayon Company Limited, Peterborough.
Up or Down—Upward.
Dates of Hearing—First hearing, May 16, 1928.
Second hearing, November 30, 1928.

The evidence certainly was not printed, because Mr. Moore says in his report that he did not commence to print until June. He says:

Printing of the verbatim records was begun in June, and to date complete records have been issued, or are now on the press, for the following.

And in the list I do not see any mention of crayons. But the last answer of the hon. gentleman and the observations he has made make very clear these words of Mr. Moore:

The board has continued, during the past twelve months, its policy of visiting plants, and meeting at the scene of their labours many of those whose problems have been brought, directly or indirectly, to its notice. These visits have been of the greatest value, not alone in adding to the store of information available to the board and its investigators, but in establishing between the board and scores of industries an intimate understanding that has been mutually beneficial.

I put it to the house; I put it to the country, whether or not Mr. W. H. Moore, who is holding tariff talks to-night in his constituency,

as the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Spotton) says, is not visiting these plants for the purpose of fixing these people up in a way that they do not ask in order to secure their support in the next election. This is the record of Mr. Moore himself:

In establishing between the board and scores of industries an intimate understanding—

Between the manufacturers and themselves. That is what this country has come to under the tariff board which the Minister of Finance has established. Where is the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) with his "intimate understanding?" Is that his idea of a tariff board: then when an application is made one year for a decrease and the next year for an increase, the minister, not being able, because it would offend these very gentlemen for whom he speaks, now changes his mind and says: We will put your raw material on the free list, but we will not reduce the duty on the finished article, so you will get that much protection, and in that way an "intimate understanding" is established between the manufacturers and the government?

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps now that we have heard from hon. gentlemen who are interested in this, it might be a good idea to hear what the crayon company themselves have to say.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what we have been trying to get.

Mr. ROBB: I had a memorandum given to me one day this week by representatives of the company. It is unsigned. It is on their own letterhead.

Mr. BENNETT: That is, the government first decides, and then this evidence is produced by these gentlemen, and it is unsigned. Is this an "intimate understanding"?

Mr. ROBB: I should have said, it is undated. It is on the letterhead of the Canada Crayon Company, Limited, manufacturers of crayons, carpenters' and railroad chalks, Peterborough, Ontario. The letter is signed by the Canada Crayon Company, Limited, per J. W. Gravestock, Managing Director. It says that this company, located in Peterborough, were told to state their case to the tariff board, and on doing so they met no opposition, but considerable and unnecessary delay. They say:

We went ahead with the company on the basis of the government doing the correct thing with the tariff, but the only help they gave us was a total of about $40 a year by allowing stearic acid to come in free.

We have installed the most modern equipment and have adequate finances. It was our intention to add many more lines providing we got protection on the present ones, which are what would be described as our "bread and butter" lines. We intended to turn out various grades of water colour paints as soon as our crayon business had been protected, but now that we have been given no protection, not only can we not go ahead with the paint end of the business, but it is more than doubtful if we can even continue to manufacture anything here at all. We have been operating at a substantial loss ever since we started and obviously cannot continue. Unless help is forthcoming before our present raw materials are consumed, we shall have to go out of business and have arranged that our machinery and equipment can be readmitted to the United States.

That sounds like an old story. We heard it in 1924 and again in 1926. We hear it every time.

Mr. SHORT: The letter may have been written in 1924. It is undated, the minister said.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Judging from the paper, it looks as if it had been written ten years ago.

Mr. IRVINE: I think the point before the committee is of considerable importance and I want to make sure that I have got correctly the steps of the reasoning which the questions to the minister have disclosed. First of all, I understand that there is in Canada a consumers' league. I understand that manufacturers are very large consumers, and therefore they belong to the league.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): You are dreaming.

Mr. IRVINE: It sounds like a nightmare. I understand, further that this consumers' league, acting for some of the greatest consumers in Canada, has undertaken to give them relief through the reduction of customs duties upon the raw materials they use. These reductions in some cases have been material; in other cases the duties have been entirely wiped out and the goods put on the free list. This must, of course, reduce the amount of money coming into the treasury by the amount of the tariff reduction, and where the goods are put on the free list there would be no tariff revenue derived from that article at all. Meanwhile other consumers of Canada who do not belong to the consumers' league must still pay the 20 per cent on the finished product of the consumer of the first part, and not only that, but the consumers of the second part must also pay the deficit to the treasury which has been brought about by putting the articles on the free list in the interests of the consumers of the first part. Is that the position?

Mr. STEVENS: It is a scientific tariff.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would ask if this is what the minister calls scientific tariff making.

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend object to it?

Mr. STEVENS: Surely the minister is going to give us that evidence. I would remind the minister of what he said to me earlier in this discussion on another item. He rather threw across to me the evidence as if to say, let the hon. member read that. Now on all these previous items and on this item we have not the evidence printed, and we have not had an opportunity of reading it. It is not fair to come before the committee without something at least that would give us the information upon which to base an opinion. The only thing we have in this case is the undated memorandum which the minister read from the company.

Mr. ROBB: That is a criticism of the budget.

Mr. STEVENS: It is a criticism of the budget; it is not evidence upon which the minister bases his position at all. The facts are these, as far as I can judge from Mr. Moore's report. The company made an application for a decrease in the tariff.

Mr. DUNNING: Not on their finished product.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Moore says it was an application for a decrease; the minister says an increase.

Mr. EULER: That is wrong.

Mr. DUNNING: Has my hon. friend not heard of a manufacturer asking for a decrease on the raw materials entering into his finished products?

Mr. STEVENS: I am quoting from the report which Mr. W. H. Moore made to Hon. J. A. Robb, Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Customs questions my statement. The point is this. We are asked to place implicit trust in this tariff board headed by Mr. Moore. We are asked to accept everything they present through the mouth of the minister at one hundred per cent of its face value. I have shown the minister that inadvertently, because I am sure he would not do it intentionally, he has misinformed the house on this matter. He has been led astray by verbal reports, I suppose, from the tariff board, which are not in harmony with their written report. I submit that we should not be asked to pass tariff items on such a flimsy basis as this.

Mr. BENNETT: However insignificant the amount involved might be.

Mr. STEVENS: I am glad my hon. friend mentioned that. The minister a moment ago said that it was only $40, but it was $40 to one company that was just commencing operations. How many other companies are affected? There was a pencil company in the constituency of North York, formerly represented by the Prime Minister, a company which enlisted his great support on one occasion. What would be the effect on them?

Mr. RYCKMAN: They went broke.

Mr. STEVENS: The Prime Minister at one time was quite interested in their welfare—as a public man, I mean. The Minister of Customs expresses doubt as to the accuracy of my statement. He is very clear and logical when he deals with the tariff, and he knows a great deal about it. I am sure if he would give his attention to some of these items, this one relating to stearic acid, and one or two others that we have touched upon, he could contribute something that would be valuable to the committee. Of course, he has been wholly unable to read the evidence; we could not expect him to read it. None of the ministers has had the time to read the evidence. The minister says that the board does not make a finding. He tells the house that the board is a fact-finding body, but yet he bases his position on some verbal discussions he has had with the board, after consultation with two or three of the officers in his department, and upon this general information that he has received from his officers and Mr. Moore and probably one of his colleagues, these items are framed and brought before us, and possibly the most influential voice is supposed to be that of the consumers' league. But as my hon. friends to the left are now finding out, there is a nigger in the woodpile so far as the consumers' league is concerned.

Mr. EULER: Mr. Chairman, when I stated to my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) that he must be mistaken, I based that statement on the knowledge that I have. I could not understand for a moment the consistency of a firm asking for a decrease in the tariff at one time, and then for an increase at another. Such a contradictory attitude is not reasonable. But I do happen to know that in both instances they did ask for an increase in the tariff, because members of the firm in question came to my office and spoke to me with regard to the necessity of an increase in the tariff if their business was to be saved.

Mr. STEVENS: On the finished product?

Mr. EULER: Certainly. If in the report which has been read by my hon. friend they

are shown as asking for a decrease, I am very certain there must be an error. If they asked for a decrease, most assuredly it must be on the raw material which it is now proposed to make free.

I must say that I fail entirely to understand the position of my hon. friends opposite or that of my hon. friends in the corner to the right. The difference between them, as I take it, is to be found in the history of the two parties—one party being in favour of protection, the other being opposed to protection as a low-tariff or free trade party.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister combines them both.

Mr. EULER: Just two days ago the representatives of this company came to my office and stated their difficulty. At the time I suppose they had no knowledge of the reduction in the tariff on their raw material.

Mr. ROBB: Yes, it was in the budget.

Mr. EULER: Well, they stated to me at that time that unless they received an increase in the tariff on the finished product they could not survive. I do not know whether that is true or not, but that is the situation as they represented it to me.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Should not the tariff board have found that out at the investigation?

Mr. EULER: I am just stating what is within my knowledge because of what my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre said a few minutes ago. I may go a little further. Speaking for myself alone—and I think what I am going to say will meet with the approval of everybody, my hon. friends directly opposite as well as my hon. friends to the right—I submit that if the government can assist any industry—and after all a manufacturer is a citizen of this country and deserving of consideration as well as any other citizen, and the mere fact that he is a manufacturer should not prejudice him—if the government can help any manufacturer without injuring the consumer, I think my hon. friends to the right will have no objection to such action. That, it seems to me, is exactly what was being done in this case. By giving a reduction on the raw material the manufacturer will be enabled to produce his product a little more cheaply, and, whether he does or not, he ought to pass on to the consumer some of the advantage,—

An hon. MEMBER: That is the problem.

Mr. EULER: —if he can stand it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

[Mr. Euler.]

Mr. EULER: That is a perfectly fair argument. If he has been able at all to survive with the duty on his raw material in the past, assuredly he should not increase the price to the consumer now that he is able to buy his raw material a little cheaper. Therefore by this act of legislation the consumer is not going to be injured, but the manufacturer may legitimately receive a little assistance. That seems to me to be the position.

For the life of me I cannot see why my hon. friends on the other side should object if the manufacturer is assisted, unless they accuse us of inconsistency in so assisting the manufacturer; but I see no inconsistency at all in our attitude. The consumer himself is not injured because the manufacturer can produce more cheaply than he did before, and at the very worst he should not charge any higher price to the consumer, and perhaps he will charge a lower price by reason of the fact that he can manufacture more cheaply.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, I have just found my portfolio, and before the house adjourns I should like to put the following on Hansard:

Examination of the records in the possession of the tariff board indicates:

1. This company was established in Peterborough only in 1927, in the knowledge that the general tariff on wax crayons was 17½ per cent.

2. That in that same year (December 6, 1927) it applied to the Minister of Finance to have the general tariff on crayons elevated to 40 per cent and the British preferential to 30 per cent.

3. That the first hearing of the application was held on May 16, 1928, and the second hearing on November 30, 1928.

4. That in its first year of activity, namely, 1928, this company's sales were stated to be about $12,000 or, roughly, 40 per cent of the total Canadian market for the commodity.

5. That the chief competing country of which the company complains is the United States.

Evidence at the hearing brought out the fact that the stock in the applicant company is owned in part by the American Crayon Company of the United States and the complaint that the Canadian concern was at a disadvantage with its larger American competitors in respect of purchases of raw material and labour and distribution of costs. Evidence showed that there were in the United States nearly one hundred crayon companies and, therefore, the industry in that country was highly competitive. It was shown by the applicant company, that three of its major raw materials were paraffin wax, colours and stearic acid. It is proposed under the present budget that stearic acid for the manufacture of crayons be admitted free of duty; the duty on colours and pigments is still under review in connection with the reference re paints; there is before the board an application for the reduction of duty on paraffin wax. It is the case, therefore, that the application of the Canada Crayon Company Limited cannot be said to have been fully dealt with until the applications involving colours and paraffin wax have been disposed of.

That is part of the raw material.

So far as the board is concerned, there has been no delay in the investigation of this case; indeed, a measure of relief is proposed in the present budget, although two major factors of the cost of production of crayons are still under review.

At the second hearing of the application, Mr. R. P. Sparks,—

We have heard of him before.

An hon. MEMBER: And you will hear from him again too.

Mr. ROBB: Probably.

—representing the Garment Manufacturers Association of Canada, objected to any increase in tariff that might involve chalks used in the clothing industry; these chalks, the applicants state, were not included in their application.

There are two ways to help the industry:

1. Reduction of duty on raw materials;
2. Increase of duty on crayons.

It has been decided to recommend some change of the duty on the raw materials.

Mr. BENNETT: Who is that from?

Mr. ROBB: An officer in the department.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, April 12, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. GOTT

Mr. ECCLES J. GOTT (South Essex): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. The Ottawa Journal of this morning under the caption of "Joint Debates," contains an editorial, the first two or three lines of which are as follows:

Mr. Gott, Liberal member for South Essex, and Mr. Hepburn, Conservative member for West Elgin, are going to meet in joint debate at St. Thomas a week from Saturday.

I do not propose to read the remainder of the editorial, but I do want to say that under present conditions there can be no Liberal representative to the House of Commons from the good old riding of South Essex. The hon. member for West Elgin has been unduly complimented.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GOTT: The Journal has referred to me on another occasion as a Liberal member. I resent the imputation, despite the fact that hundreds of Liberal farmers are to-day supporting our policy of protection for the farmers.

PRIVILEGE—MR. HEPBURN

Mr. M. F. HEPBURN (West Elgin): On the question of privilege, the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Gott) appears to have been signally honoured. If press reports are authentic, he was on Friday last granted by the Speaker a special extension of time for his speech after a similar request had been denied to another member. This in my opinion violated not only the rules of the house but the neutrality of the Speaker. This latter honour, however, of being named as a Liberal member is the greatest of all. With regard to my name appearing as a Conservative member, I want to deny the allegation most emphatically.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suppose the house will accept the word of both gentlemen.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Eighth report of the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines. —Mr. Cahill.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

Mr. A. F. TOTZKE (Humboldt) moved:

That Bill No. 83 respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company be placed upon the order paper of the house for consideration this day in committee of the whole house and for third reading.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 85 for the relief of Effie Margaret Hill.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 86 for the relief of Frederick Rutherfoord Zoppi.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 87 for the relief of Lera Ethel Vallance.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 88 for the relief of Minerva Elliott.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 89 for the relief of Naomi Pauline Wilson.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 90 for the relief of Harry Babington Millward.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 91 for the relief of Frances Gwendolyn Snow Lott.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 92 for the relief of Edward George Croucher.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 93 for the relief of Elsie Alice Hervey.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 94 for the relief of Edyth May Shields.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 95 for the relief of Mary Melvina Guerin.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 96 for the relief of Calvert Mitchell Carruthers.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 97 for the relief of Hunter Wilbert Faulkner.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 98 for the relief of Marion Ruth Laidman.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 99 for the relief of William Henry Blackwell.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 100 for the relief of Mabel Lorene DeClute.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 101 for the relief of Isabell Leach. —Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 102 for the relief of Emily Munnings.—Mr. Hubbs.

Bill No. 103 for the relief of Constance Mary Kearns.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 104 for the relief of Alfred Rescorl. —Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 105 for the relief of Clarence Percy Shields.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 106 for the relief of Isabella Einboden.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 107 for the relief of John William Telfer.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 108 for the relief of Thomas Southwood.—Mr. Howard.

Bill No. 109 for the relief of James Ross Curry.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 110 for the relief of Edna Louise Brown.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 111 for the relief of Frederick Davenport.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 112 for the relief of William Greig Green.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 113 for the relief of Antoine Joseph Bourdon.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 114 for the relief of Arnold Whitchurch Little.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 115 for the relief of Arthur James Taylor.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Bill No. 116 for the relief of Alla Chretter. —Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 117 for the relief of Wallace Evered Gillespie.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 118 for the relief of Marjorie Grace Coleman.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 119 for the relief of Bessie Ruth Glass.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 120 for the relief of Janet Gee. —Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 121 for the relief of Sylvester Wilfred Kerr.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 122 for the relief of Florence May Forbes.—Mr. Bell (Hamilton West).

Bill No. 123 for the relief of Florence Velma Strachan.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 124 for the relief of William Ernest Foulkes.—Mr. Cahan.

Bill No. 125 for the relief of Edith Marie McFarlane.—Mr. Jacobs.

[Mr. Totzke.]

Bill No. 126—for the relief of William Henry Laverty.—Mr. Bothwell.

Bill No. 127 for the relief of Sophia Love. —Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 128 for the relief of Cleoniki Paleologou Drakoulas.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 129 for the relief of Ernest Carl Bouck.—Mr. Casselman.

Agreed to on division.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REGULATIONS AND INTERNAL ECONOMY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In the local papers last night and this morning there is an account of the Liberal caucus, in which to my mind the honour of the house and of the Speaker is brought into question —at least the Speaker is severely criticized for certain restrictions he has placed on the activities of the messengers and for other reasons. This tends to hold His Honour up to the country as a man who needs discipline by a party caucus. As a member of this house I protest most emphatically against any caucus, whether Liberal, Tory or U.F.A., attempting to discipline His Honour the Speaker, and so holding him up to contumely. The reports to which I have alluded in both local papers appear under the heading, "Members kicked against the Speaker's ruling and the Speaker's action." Such accounts tend to undermine the prestige of His Honour the Speaker and to create an impression that he may be subject to influence in regard to his decisions, the value of which as a consequence may be very seriously impaired. I want to say, sir, that you were elected Speaker by all the members of the house, and that you are the servant, not of the Liberal party but of the whole house. One of the matters brought into question was the fact that you, sir, had given orders to the messengers of this house that they should not supply liquor to members of the house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ADSHEAD: That, I understand, was one of the orders. I wish to say, sir, if that is true, that I support such action on your part. But I have full confidence in the impartiality of Mr. Speaker, and I resent the impression that has been created.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): May I ask where the question of privilege comes in? An unconfirmed report in the press is cited by the hon. gentleman, and I fail to see the question of privilege. A few days ago a very serious accusation appeared in the press against some

hon. members of this house and the matter was not allowed to be discussed. I fail to see where the hon. member who is protesting has been injured in any way.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I say to my hon. friend that I was present at the caucus to which he has just referred, and the one comment of caucus was upon the publicity that had been given to certain instructions issued by Mr. Speaker, which caucus felt had created a wrong impression abroad with respect to certain matters alleged to be transpiring in these houses of parliament. As a matter of fact there was not criticism of Mr. Speaker's instructions; there was no reflection upon Mr. Speaker. The one criticism that was made—and it was made with respect to this House of Commons and this parliament—was that the public would get an entirely wrong impression as to what is transpiring in these buildings, from the publicity that had been given certain instructions upon which the newspapers have put their own interpretation. The thought of caucus was that the committee on internal economy might very well take up that matter with Mr. Speaker, but I find that that committee has no authority whatever in this respect. I would take advantage of the present discussion to suggest that Mr. Speaker might meet with a committee of this house to discuss certain matters that relate to the House of Commons—not to the government but to this house which manages its own affairs. May I say this with respect to any report that has appeared in the press. Caucuses, as every hon. member knows, are private and secret meetings, and there was a most implicit understanding at this caucus, as there has been at every caucus, that members of caucus were to give no statement whatever to the press as to what might transpire there. Anything, therefore, that appears in the press with respect to yesterday's caucus is without any authority, and what I have read of its proceedings in the press cannot be said to be a correct account.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The fact that the Liberal party itself in the Liberal caucus reprimanded the Speaker for his regulations—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): With many of the observations made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) every member of this House of Commons must be in accord. But I think it is also apparent that a matter of this kind should be discussed behind closed doors; and if it is agreeable to you, Mr. Speaker, I think that before we open the doors to the public at the next sitting we might discuss the subject that has now been brought to the attention of the house. That would be the more proper course to follow in dealing with the situation that has arisen.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): I was not present at the caucus, but I entirely disagree with the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bennett). There is nothing transpiring in this house or in the building, of which any of us are aware, that would necessitate secret discussion.

Mr. BENNETT: It is the practice of the house.

Mr. CAHILL: If there is to be discussion let us have it in open house. My only experience of a secret meeting of the House of Commons was some years ago when we held such a session to learn of certain things that were taking place in the war.

Mr. BENNETT: We have twice had such a meeting in the last few years.

Mr. CAHILL: The questions discussed on that occasion were published in the morning papers before this secret meeting took place, and the subject matter of any secret meeting we might hold here would be public property not many minutes after the opening of the house. I do not think, from my short experience in this house, that anything transpires here which cannot be dealt with openly by the members of the house, with Hansard and the galleries present. I entirely object to the suggestion of the leader of the opposition. I repeat, if we have anything to say, let us say it in public.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): I am inclined to agree to a great extent with my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill). Anything that has transpired within the walls of parliament has been broadcast to the four corners of this country. The orders given by His Honour the Speaker, and the manner in which they were executed, are familiar to all who pay any attention whatsoever to the political situation in this Dominion.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What were the orders?

Mr. POWER: The orders were published in the newspapers, to the effect that certain messengers should not do certain work, and that certain policemen should patrol corridors on such and such floors of this building. I believe therefore that the suggestion made by the hon. member for Pontiac is quite sound, that no good purpose can be served by having a secret session. On the contrary, too much

importance will be attached to what after all are mere incidents, if we take the extraordinary view that a secret session is necessary. Secret sessions are held, as a rule, only when matters of great importance to the nation are to be discussed, and I submit—

Mr. BENNETT: May I correct the hon. gentleman in order that he may not misunderstand me. We are speaking merely of the internal economy of the House of Commons, and the secret session proposed is just such a session as those that have been held twice during the past two years in connection with the approaches to this building. It is not well that matters of internal economy should engage the attention of the public; such matters should be discussed by us before the doors are opened.

Mr. POWER: I accept my hon. friend's correction and I will go further and say that, if the matter is not important enough to warrant a special session behind closed doors, the house to-day should select from amongst its members a committee to wait upon Mr. Speaker to discuss the whole question with him and to report its findings to the House of Commons as soon as possible. In my humble opinion, the matter can be settled in fifteen or twenty minutes by means of a free, frank and open discussion with His Honour, and the report having been made to the house publicly we shall no longer have such a situation as has arisen, of reports in the press giving rise to rumours which are utterly unfounded and which seriously reflect upon the honour of all members of this house.

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask the hon. gentleman, before he takes his seat, what there is to be settled? I am not clear as to what the question is about.

Mr. POWER: I will briefly explain it, although it must be quite clear to everyone. Undoubtedly the hon. member must have heard about the matter from conversation with other members. The question has reference to certain orders which have been issued, and to the publicity which has been given to those orders, and I think that question can be settled by discussion with the Speaker.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): After a fairly long experience in this house, I believe that in every instance I can recall where a matter of internal economy has been mentioned it has always been mentioned behind closed doors before the opening of the house. The very first day I sat in the House of Commons the late Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper mentioned the question of the allocation of rooms as between the two parties in the House of Commons. Mr. Speaker Brodeur immediately said the point should be discussed behind closed doors on the following day. On at least half a dozen occasions during the last thirty years a similar course has been followed, and I think that is the course which should be pursued now. That is parliamentary practice, and I see no reason for departing from it.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I desire to say that I agree with the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for South Wellington as to that having been the usual practice in matters of this kind, and after all I think it is a good practice. A few years ago, Mr. Speaker, I heard you say with regard to a certain matter that this House of Commons was a gentlemen's club, the best club in the land.

Miss MACPHAIL: A gentlemen's club?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I beg my hon. friend's pardon; I suppose that will have to be modified now. However, that is an additional reason why this should be discussed in the usual way by the members of parliament themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is the pleasure of the house that this matter be discussed at a later sitting behind closed doors, I am the servant of the house.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): I do not think that is altogether the opinion of the house, and I should like to protest against this closed door policy. Certain charges, whether founded or unfounded, have been broadcast by the press. These charges are not made against particular individuals but are made in a vague sort of way which leaves any member of the house liable to suspicion. I do not think that is fair to hon. members. Further, the very appointment of a committee such as has been suggested, under these circumstances would be more or less of a reflection upon the decision of the Speaker, and some of us do not want to see anything of that kind take place. Whatever the opinions of the members of the house may be with regard to certain practices, I submit that no one member can act along the lines which have been followed in the past without involving the standing of all the members in this house, against this any member has a right to protest.

I suggest that perhaps we might find a way out of the difficulty by appointing a sort of house committee such as exists in a good many clubs, not to deal with this particular matter at this time but rather as a support

to the Speaker. I quite understand that there are certain difficulties which have made it very hard for the Speaker to act and take the entire responsibility for his actions without at least consulting some of the members in order to obtain their views as to what is proper in the circumstances. I do not think such a committee would discipline the Speaker at all. It would be a means by which various members of the house could make their complaints known to the Speaker in order to obtain that free discussion which is necessary.

With regard to the particular matter now under consideration I would protest against it being decided behind closed doors. If liquor has been carried by messengers, as I understand to be the case, I for one would like to see that practice cease; I do not think that is the work of a messenger of this house.

Mr. POWER: In view of the knowledge which I have just gained that the rules do not provide for such a committee as I have suggested, I beg to withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. COOTE: It is with a good deal of hesitation that I rise to take part in this discussion, because it seems to me entirely out of order. However, I am not going to miss this opportunity of pressing for the appointment of what I would call a house committee. For years I have thought such a committee should be appointed.

An hon. MEMBER: There is a standing committee.

Mr. COOTE: Then if we have a house committee I would like to know what it is doing. I want a house committee representative of all parties and groups in this house, similar to the other parliamentary committees which now exist. That committee should have duties with respect to the house similar to the duties of the restaurant committee with respect to the restaurant. It does not matter very much to me whether this matter is dealt with in camera or at a public session of this house, but I do want to press for the appointment of a house committee which will include representatives of all groups in the house.

Mr. POULIOT: I am just told that you, Mr. Speaker, would be ready to clear the galleries and have the matter discussed now if it is the wish of the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think hon. members of the house will feel that Your Honour is the presiding officer of the house and that we should be quite prepared, after what has been said, to leave it to your own judgment, Mr. Speaker, to decide what further step it may be advisable to take. I think we might proceed now with the business of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no objection to discussing this matter right now, but in deference to the opinions which have been expressed I shall wait, not until Monday, because, Monday morning I must attend the funeral service of a dear friend of mine in Montreal, but until Tuesday next when, behind closed doors, I will be ready to explain these two orders which were given ir good faith for the protection of the dignity and the privileges of the house.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): I do not want to prolong the debate, but I would like to remind hon. members that it always has been the custom of this house that before the doors are opened any member may bring up any question concerning the internal economy of the house before the ordinary business is taken up. That has been the custom for many years; I could cite many instances where that has been done before the doors were declared open.

Mr. BENNETT: Before this question is left perhaps you, Mr. Speaker, might ask the clerk of the house to give the names of the members of the Internal Economy Commission already appointed, for the benefit of those hon. members who apparently are of the opinion that such a committee does not exist.

Mr. SPEAKER: Early in the session a message was read to the house from His Excellency the Governor General appointing four ministers of the crown as members of the Internal Economy Commission, but that commission deals only with the financial matters of this department. It must be remembered that this is a department, and I want the house to understand that as Speaker of the house I am head of a department which employes about 500 people. Under the Civil Service Act the Speaker is, just as much as any minister of the crown, the head of his department. Therefore, when the Speaker gives orders, they must be obeyed. On Tuesday next I will ask hon. members to stand by their Speaker if his instructions are in conformity with the privileges, the honour and the dignity of the house.

SPEECH OF MR. W. H. MOORE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to direct the

attention of the government to a press report of a meeting held last night, which was addressed by Mr. W. H. Moore, chairman of the tariff board. In that speech Mr. Moore uses language which I regard as strictly political and which would result in any civil servant being dismissed under the provisions of the order in council which was approved by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and adopted during the regime of Sir Robert Borden. Mr. Moore said:

"We, as the tariff board, should not be left with this tariff problem, nor should those on parliament hill be asked to saddle the whole burden." Mr. Moore observed. "One thing the tariff board has done and that is that it has brought out from day to day the different situations which you people have to face on election day for whatever interpretation you place on them, that is your responsibility."

"There is a conflict of tariff opinion in the United States," Mr. Moore said. "We have a clearer vision of what is going on in the states to-day than we have perhaps of what is taking place at home. But American standards of living cannot be increased by making food dearer. The farmers there have come out boldly with their demand, 'We want dearer food,' but in no case was the demand stated more boldly nor baldly than by the sugar beet farmers, who are asking $6 for sugar, when it is now $4.70."

In reference to the dairy industry, he said:

We hear a lot that our imports of New Zealand butter are increasing and our exports of butter are decreasing. That does not necessarily mean, however, that our dairy is dying; only that it is taking another form in the export of milk and milk products.

I ask the government what is to be done with a civil servant, a servant of the Department of Finance, as the minister said last night, who goes out and carries on political propaganda within sight of the walls of parliament.

Mr. ROBB: At what gathering was this?

Mr. BENNETT: The heading of the article reads:

W. H. Moore, of Tariff Board, gives entertaining address to Men's Association of Glebe United Church.

This article appears in the Ottawa Citizen of Friday, April 12.

Mr. ROBB: Some days ago the chairman of the tariff board told me that he had received an invitation from some church to give an address at their annual men's meeting. He wanted to know if there was any objection to his giving this address, and I told him I could see none. He is a citizen of this country and has the same rights as any other citizen. I read this report very carefully, but I am bound to say that I cannot place the same construction upon it as does the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett). They had asked Mr. Moore to explain the workings of the tariff board, and he was making that explanation as interesting as he could.

Mr. BENNETT: It is purely a political speech.

Mr. ROBB: If that is a political speech, then the Deputy Minister of the Ontario Department of Agriculture made the same type of speech in London not very long ago, as did Mr. Ruddick, the dairy and cold storage commissioner. These men who are conversant with what is going on in the country should be allowed to present a statement of facts to the people.

Mr. STEVENS: It was not a statement of facts, but absolutely the contrary.

Mr. ROBB: Surely Mr. Moore, the chairman of the tariff board, has equal rights with an employee of the government of Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER: What have we to do with the Ontario government?

Mr. BENNETT: We are talking about the parliament of Canada.

Mr. ROBB: This gentleman has the same rights as an employee of the Ontario government speaking in the province of Ontario. I am bound to say that I cannot find a statement made by Mr. Moore which is not a statement of facts.

Mr. BENNETT: It is not a statement of facts.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANCOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word of praise for the reporters of Hansard. They deserve a lot of credit because when I was speaking last night there was considerable noise from the opposite benches, but to my great astonishment I found my speech complete in Hansard, with the possible exception of one or two phrases. I think a great deal of praise should be given to these reporters.

Mr. BENNETT: Write them a letter.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Customs tariff—215. Stearic acid, n.o.p.; British preferential tariff, 12½ per cent; intermediate tariff, 17½ per cent; general tariff, 20 per cent.

Customs tariff—215a. Stearic acid, when imported by manufacturers of candles or crayons for use only in their own factories in the manufacture of candles or crayons: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

Mr. BENNETT: When we rose last night the minister (Mr. Robb) was reading from a document which had been prepared by one of the officials of his department. He had not completed reading that document, and I would like to know by whom it was signed.

Mr. ROBB: I thought I read it all.

Mr. BENNETT: You said you would make it available to us.

Mr. ROBB: I gave it to Hansard and I am not sure whether they have returned it.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister was also to produce the typewritten evidence taken at the hearings of these applications.

Mr. CAMPBELL: May I ask what item we are discussing?

The CHAIRMAN: Item 215.

Mr. ROBB: I was reading from a memorandum which had been given to me by an officer of the department; it is not signed.

Mr. BENNETT: Was it prepared by Mr. Moore?

Mr. ROBB: It was prepared by Mr. McKinnon.

Mr. BENNETT: He is the secretary of the tariff board?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister intimated last night that he would let us have the typewritten copy of the evidence which was taken at the hearings of these applications; has the minister obtained that evidence?

Mr. ROBB: I have two copies and I will send them over to my hon. friend.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would like to ask the minister if it will be possible to obtain any information before we pass these items.

Mr. ROBB: I will give the hon. member all the information I can.

Mr. McGIBBON: We have not been able to get very much as yet. Last night we had one of the strangest spectacles I have ever seen in this house. We received information that the tariff board had been holding secret conferences with the manufacturers, coming to secret agreements, and holding secret conferences with the ministers, and yet none of that information was available to this house. We are being asked to make changes in the tariff which may be of far-reaching importance, and I think this whole matter of the relation of the tariff board to the government should be cleared up. That board is costing this country about $120,000 a year and, so far as we can ascertain, its usefulness is practically nil. More than that, we have the spectacle to-day of the chairman going out and making political speeches containing statements contrary to facts. I think it is time that this parliament should object to the servants of this government carrying on political propaganda in favour of one party. It is time we got rid of them and I think we should get rid of them now.

Mr. BENNETT: I have in my hand the report of the second hearing of this item. This evidence shows that the application was opposed, although last night the minister was of the opinion that it had not been opposed. At page 2 of the evidence in connection with the hearing of reference No. 96, this is what is said:

The Chairman: Who appears on reference No. 96, application by the Canada Crayon Co., Ltd., for upward revision of the tariff on chalks and crayons?

Mr. Wilson: I do.

The Chairman: Who is appearing in opposition?

Mr. Darby: We shall certainly oppose the application. . . There are good reasons for opposing this particular application.

Then the chairman proceeds to ask what it is about, and the brief, consisting of a letter written to the minister in December of last year—part of which the hon. gentleman read last evening—was presented. Then there was a question as to the capital involved in the enterprise and the hon. gentleman cannot be expected to remember all the facts. This is the record as it appears at page 5 of the report:

The Chairman: Is the applicant company connected in the States?—A. Indirectly.

Q. Has it a factory there?—A. No, the applicant company has not.

Q. What company is it connected with or related to?—A. It is related in this way; the stock in this applicant company is partially owned by Canadian people, partially owned by British people, and partially owned by American people, but the bulk of the stock is owned by British or Canadian capital.

Q. When yau say American people, does that mean people in the crayon industry?—A. Yes, the American Crayon Company.

Q. Have you a wage comparison between the wages paid by them in the states and by you in Canada?—A. If you are talking of hourly wages we could give you that.

I do not think the minister last evening had that clearly in mind. Then Mr. Wilson related the facts and Mr. Gravestock made

some observations, he being the managing director of the company. At the end the chairman said:

> How can we make further progress when you submit a seven page statement, which is apparently somewhat technical, it contains several figures, how can you have an examination without notice?
>
> Mr. Wilson: I did not expect that. I figured that when we sent this information here a few days ago Mr. Deachman and Mr. Darby would have opportunity to look it over.
>
> Well, we are quite willing to adjourn.
>
> The Chairman: All right: it stands adjourned.

That apparently was on May 16, 1928. The question I should like to ask the minister is this: There appear to be no recommendations made by this political tribunal to which he has referred the matter; there appear to be no findings of fact, the work which, he stated last year, this body was created to do, and there is nothing to indicate upon what principle the minister now proceeds to place upon the free list a material used in the production of crayons while not dealing with the application at all. That is the question we want to have some light upon. It is idle to say that we should have two or three gentlemen meet together in secret session with the Minister of Finance and then, instead of meeting the application as agreed and dealing with it on its merits, the minister to say: We will not do what they ask, but we will put some raw material on the free list. The house is entitled to some definite information in a matter of this kind which appears in the report of the hearing before the tariff commission, more especially in view of the fact that this appears to be an enterprise owned by Canadians which is giving employment to Canadians in a Canadian town or city and which had recited the circumstances under which it sought to avail itself of a tariff to enable it, not to exploit an industry but to place it on an equal basis with competition from across the border, asking no favours, but merely to be placed on even terms of competition. I remind the minister that his political chairman of his political board, in the blister copper inquiry where it appeared that raw copper left Canada, went to the United States to be refined and then had to be bought by Canadians at an excess over the price at which United States could buy the same copper for, was good enough to say that Canadians should be placed on terms of equality with respect to competition under such conditions. Mr. Gravestock in his memorandum asks only that his company should be placed on terms of equality with respect to competition: that they should be given an even chance in competition. The minister says: Look what I am doing for you: I am putting stearic acid on the free list. This is not mentioned in the hearing. Is this the method of compromise to be adopted? The amount involved is small, but the method is one of far-reaching consequence. It represents the difference between the Liberal party and the party with which I am associated. In one instance the government are willing to make a compromise for power, for the purpose of retaining their seats on the treasury benches, without regard to the welfare of Canadian industry. The minister thinks he is going to serve the public by sitting down secretly without Mr. Gravestock, without Mr. Wilson, without any representative of this industry being present, and saying: I will put stearic acid on the free list and not place the manufacturers of crayon upon such terms as, it is claimed in the brief that was submitted to the minister, will enable it to compete successfully with the United States industry. In other words, Canadian industry is to be destroyed in order that more employment may be given to people of the United States and Canadians may be put out of a job. That is the policy the minister has enunciated in his budget if it means anything, and if it does not mean that, it means nothing.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I see from the other brief which the minister has submitted, reference No. 96—and I fancy this is the first application—the application was for an increase in the duty. There is in the brief one rather significant statement which seems to have been accepted as a statement of fact as it existed: that is, that in the United States the selling price of a certain line of crayons was $7.20, while the selling price of the same article in Canada made by the same United States firms was $6.50. It was asked that a dumping duty be applied and it is stated by Mr. Darby that the dumping duty on that particular lot of crayons would be 16 cents, making the Canadian price $6.66, duty added, while at the same time the price maintained by these United States manufacturers in their own market was $7.20. This clearly indicates the effort, and the successful effort, on the part of United States manufacturers to dump their products in Canada and to destroy competition on the part of any industry in this country. The cost of production in Canada for the same article is pointed out in this brief to be $6.20, allowing them only 46 cents as a margin for selling over the cost of production if they meet the United States price. It strikes me that there is a condition of facts which should call for some action upon the part of the government.

If a 16 cent dumping duty is not sufficient to enable the Canadian manufacturer to have at least fair terms, then impose a dumping duty that is sufficient, because it is clear that in this instance the United States manufacturer is using Canada as a dumping ground. He will not cut the price in his own country, though there is evidently competition there, because there are ninety-five concerns engaged in this line of manufacture; but he will cut the price in the Dominion of Canada where it is sought to establish another independent industry. It is to the interest of the United States manufacturer to say: No, we will dump our goods and cut the price to such a point that you cannot manufacture, but the moment you cease manufacturing in Canada, then you will pay the higher price. Surely that is a situation that calls for some action. Has the minister had any report upon that phase of the case? Did the official of his department, in the memorandum he has submitted, draw that to the minister's attention? Because it is very clearly set out in his brief. Moreover, these statements seem to be accepted as facts by the board, as well as by Mr. Deachman, Mr. Darby and the applicants, so I assume they are thoroughly substantiated.

Mr. EVANS: While this incident may seem trivial in itself, it becomes very important because of the policy of the government which is here displayed. Here is a company that is given a concession by the government, and neither the tariff board nor the minister himself has yet shown that the company needs any concession. Not a single thing has been placed before the house to show the need of any concession or to show that this industry needs protection. There is another thing, and that is that the government, by this proposal, is impairing the revenues without in any way aiding the industry from the point of view of the workman, or from any other point of view. I cannot help looking at this incident from no other standpoint than this, that the tariff on this item is used as a bargaining point between the politicians and the manufacturer; it absolutely comes down to that. This company enjoys a monopoly, and nothing has been presented to show that the industry needs help, and so I say it comes down simply to a bargaining point for some reason or other. This is what I protest against, and it is what this budget in particular shows all the way through. It puts the burden on the shoulders of the people, and the government for that very reason is willing to impair the revenues of the country so long as the whole burden goes on the consumer. I protest against this whole thing.

Mr. STEVENS: We are able to get a little light from time to time by getting these typewritten reports. Last night the minister in reading a memorandum, rather needlessly I think, emphasized one portion of it which read as follows:

> At the second hearing of the application, Mr. R. P. Sparks, representing the Garment Manufacturers' Association of Canada, objected to any increase in tariff that might involve chalks used in the clothing industry.

I have here the evidence that was taken before the board, and so far as Mr. Sparks is concerned, it is as follows—

Mr. CHAPLIN: Who is he?

Mr. STEVENS: He was representing the Garment Manufacturers' Association of Canada.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Has he ever been heard of before?

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Sparks in his evidence before the board said:

> We have no opinion to express on the merits of this particular case because it does not touch chalks in which the clothing industry is interested.
>
> Mr. Darby: Would you not like it to affect the chalks in which you are interested?
>
> Mr. Sparks: No, in view of the fact that they tell me the quantities used in Canada would not be large enough to justify them or anyone else manufacturing them.

Why does the memorandum of Mr. Moore single out Mr. Sparks and say that he appeared on behalf of the Garment Manufacturers' Association objecting to this application? Mr. Sparks himself clearly says:

> We have no opinion to express on the merits of this particular case because it does not touch chalks in which the clothing industry is interested.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Sparks appeared before that. I would ask my hon. friend to bear in mind that the application originally was for an increase of 40 per cent, and Mr. Sparks decidedly objected to that increase until he was told that it did not affect chalks, and then he withdrew his objection.

Mr. STEVENS: So far as I can see from glancing hurriedly over the report, there is no reference to Mr. Sparks at any point preceding the evidence I have just quoted, he appears before the board at that point only. Of course I may have overlooked his name, but I have not noticed it in the evidence prior to the quotation I made. In justice to Mr. Sparks it should be stated that he was not there opposing this application. I think it is only fair to say that when a man's name

is brought into a discussion on the floor of this house and he is unable to be present. The application in its original form was for an increase in the tariff on the finished article. My hon. friend from Rosetown, of course, is very emphatic in his objection to an increase in the tariff. I would invite his attention briefly to the facts in connection with this case. He very properly said: There is a principle involved. That is true; there is a principle involved. It is one of the main principles that we in the Conservative party contend for in our attitude towards the tariff.

Let me say, first, that our attitude towards the tariff, is that it is an instrument in the hands of parliament that may and should be so used as to build up and assist in the establishment and upbuilding of Canadian industry. It may be said that this is a small industry, but the industrial life of a nation is made up of its aggregate industries, small and large. There is a considerable quantity of crayons and such like used in Canada. There are some twenty or thirty or more establishments in the United States manufacturing them. I will read a couple of paragraphs from page 17 of this tariff advisory board report, and then I want to direct the attention of hon. gentlemen and of the minister to one or two observations that I wish to make in regard to it. It is headed, "Retention of the Present Selling Price," and reads:

> In view of the fact that school crayons, which are the largest line of production, have to be sold retail at 10 cents per package for high grade crayons and 5 cents per package for low grade crayons, in order to allow the retailer and wholesaler the necessary margin of profit, prices cannot be raised except to such an extent that the packages would have to be retailed for 10 cents and 15 cents respectively. This raise would then put the Canadian prices considerably above the American prices even with an adequate protection.

He goes on to say:

> The company is prepared to undertake that selling prices will not be advanced under a higher rate of protection. If an adequate tariff rate is applied to these products, we would suggest a reinvestigation of such selling prices by the advisory tariff board in two years time to prove that this tariff has not affected prices to the consumer. The beneficial result of such a tariff would harm no one and result in the establishment of a new Canadian industry which most certainly needs assistance.

The point is this: There are certain articles, and this is a typical one, where a package must be sold for a round figure like five or ten cents. No doubt many hon. members will remember doing as I have often done at Christmas and other times, buying a little package of crayons in a carton for five or ten cents. If there was an increase in the tariff this company would have a larger share of the Canadian market. It would extend its operations, increase its output and lower its cost of production. It would thus secure a larger share of the Canadian trade without raising the price to the consumer one iota. My hon. friend from Rosetown shakes his head. Undoubtedly he is under the impression that the manufacturer would increase his price because of the advance in the tariff. That is not necessarily the case at all. We have contended, and I would urge on the minister now that the suggestion contained in the paragraph which I have just read is a good one, namely, that the tariff advisory board not only should consider these cases and make findings, but should observe the effect of any changes that are made, and if an industry is found to be abusing any added protection that is given to it, then the remedy is in the hands of parliament and of the government This concern undoubtedly asked for an increase of protection to give it a larger share of the Canadian market. The minister replies by giving them a reduction on one article, stearic acid, which is only a small portion of the raw materials that enter into the manufacture; for instance, there are also colours, pigments, refined paraffin wax, paper cartons, chalk, and so on. I understand they say that this reduction will make a difference of only $40 a year. Indeed it is so small that it does not amount to anything. On the other hand, if the minister and the tariff board had responded favourably to the application for an increased tariff on the finished article, and safeguarded themselves by this pledge, they might have given some stimulus to a Canadian industry and at the same time there would have been no increase in price to the consumer.

Now the minister has returned to me this marked brief. It is in connection with the point of controversy regarding Mr. Sparks appearing before the board. It will be remembered that last night the minister read a memorandum in which it was indicated that Mr. Sparks was opposing the application. Really it is a small matter, but I do not think it is fair continually to single out Mr. Sparks for attack in this house in the way it has been done. Mr. Wilson is giving evidence before the board, and Mr. Sparks says:

> Before the board adjourns, may I suggest that after hearing the application it appears that the applicants do not ask for protection on all classes of chalk. I am further informed by Mr. Wilson that certain classes of chalk used

in the clothing trade are not made by them, are not made in Canada, and that they have no immediate intention of making them. In the tariff item which you suggested to them, and they may suggest to you, we would ask that these classes of goods which they are not interested in should be left as they are. We have no opinion to express on the merits of this particular case, because it does not touch chalks in which the clothing industry is interested.

Mr. Darby: Would it not affect the chalks in which you are interested?

Mr. Sparks: No, in view of the fact that they tell me the quantities used in Canada would not be large enough to justify them or anyone else manufacturing them.

Mr. Darby proceeds:

Surely it would be assisting an infant industry.

Apparently he is a bit sarcastic.

Mr. Sparks: They say not.

Mr. Darby: It would be a very small infant then.

Mr. Sparks: I do not want to enter into any general argument on the question now. I was here at one time and was willing to enter into a general argument.

Mr. Darby: I am not making any general argument at all. I am referring to these specific articles.

Mr. Sparks: All I suggest is this: that in any change that the board might contemplate they might provide that tailors' chalks should be in a separate item. I think that is in agreement with the views of the applicant.

Mr. Racine: That no changes be made if they are not producing tailors' chalks and have no intention of doing so in the immediate future?

Mr. Sparks: That is my understanding.

I think that is all there is to say about it.

Now I come back, Mr. Chairman, to what I said a moment ago. I invite the minister to give us his opinion on the concluding paragraph which I have read and in which it appears that this industry is asking for an increase in order that it might get a larger share of the Canadian market, and giving an undertaking that the consumer will not be called upon to pay any higher price for the product.

Mr. ROBB: I hope, Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend will agree that there was no thought of doing any injustice to Mr. Sparks. His name appeared on the memorandum that came up. The evidence clearly goes to show that Mr. Sparks, who has been urging increased protection in other lines, went before the tariff board to make sure there was no increased protection on material which the clothing trade required.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And which material could not economically be made in Canada. That is the answer.

Mr. ROBB: We will admit that.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Very well.

Mr. ROBB: As soon as Mr. Sparks discovered that their application for an increase of the duty to 40 per cent did not cover these chalks, very naturally he withdrew. Now, this particular industry was established in Peterborough in 1927. Its promoters knew at the time that the duty on their finished product was 17½ per cent. Before they had been going one year they applied to the Minister of Finance for an increase of the tariff to 40 per cent, and their application was referred to the tariff board. The tariff board instituted an inquiry. That inquiry is involved in some other inquiries which have not yet been concluded. But we did give them this concession on stearic acid. They say they cannot carry on, and they hold out the threat that they are going to pack up their machinery and leave Canada. Yet on their own statement, after operating only one year they had 40 per cent of the business. They came to Canada knowing their protection was 17½ per cent. They have had a fair hearing before the tariff board, and I may say that there are other people interested. There were two ways of helping this concern: Either to increase the duty or to give them relief in their raw materials. We are attempting here to give them relief on certain of their raw materials. As to the balance, the inquiry has not yet been completed by the tariff board.

Mr. McGIBBON: How much will this relief amount to?

Mr. ROBB: They say it will not be sufficient.

Mr. ARTHURS: Is it not true that the basis upon which they asked for an increased tariff was the alleged fact that Americans were dumping their product into the Canadian market at a lower price than they were charging for it in the United States?

Mr. ROBB: There is nothing original in that allegation; we have heard it for many years.

Mr. KENNEDY: Is 215a a new item?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY: I notice in the Trade of Canada at page 437 two items: acids, stearic, n.o.p.—which appears to be 215—and acids, stearic, when employed by manufacturers of candles for use in their own factories, free. Under what authority was this stearic acid, amounting in value to $19,000, allowed to enter free in 1927?

Mr. ROBB: Under item 777. I gave that information to my hon. friend last night.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—246a. Zirconium oxide: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 5 per cent; general tariff, 7½ per cent.

Mr. KENNEDY: I desire to repeat to the Minister of Finance the suggestion that I made to him last session. At the time he said he would be glad to pass it on to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I suggest that we put the numbers of the tariff items opposite the imports in this Trade of Canada. We have the description of the classes, but I think we ought to have also the numbers of the tariff items, so that if anyone wants to study these figures he will be able to find the relation between the imports and the tariff items. Otherwise this Trade of Canada has practically no meaning at all.

Mr. CAMPBELL: How does this compare with the previous duty, and what is this acid used for?

Mr. ROBB: Zirconium oxide is an opaquing agent in the enamelling and ceramic industries, being a substitute in certain concerns for tin oxide, a much more expensive ingredient which enters free. According to the evidence presented to the tariff board, it is not made in Canada, and it enters under item 246 at 15, 20 and 22½, the imports not being separately classified. The application for free entry was made by the Amherst Foundry Company of Amherst, Nova Scotia, and was unopposed. The representative of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association appeared in support of the application. No other users were present.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Where is it imported from?

Mr. ROBB: From the United States.

Mr. BENNETT: What is it made from?

Mr. ROBB: Zirconium ore.

Mr. GARDINER: And the Canadian Manufacturers' Association supported the applications?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. COOTE: This is only a step anticipating a reduction in the duty on emanel ware, which will follow at the next session?

Mr. ROBB: I will not make any promise.

Mr. COOTE: The minister will not make any promise in that regard?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Robb.]

Customs tariff—363. Platinum wire and platinum bars, strips, sheets or plates; platinum, palladium, iridium, osmium, ruthenium and rhodium, in lumps, ingots, powder, sponge or scrap: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

Mr. STEVENS: What is the object in changing the old item, which was pretty clear —platinum wire, platinum in bars, strips, sheets or plates?

Mr. ROBB: The classification is for administrative purposes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Do any goods in this line come under other items?

Mr. ROBB: Under the existing tariff platinum wire, bars, sheets and so forth enter Canada duty free, whereas crude platinum metals, from which these are made, are dutiable. When the present item, 363, was framed, various platinum metals were unknown to commerce and therefore these articles entered in the unenumerated class. An application was made by Goldsmith Brothers Smelting & Refining Company of Toronto, who, according to their representative, employ about thirty persons. The metals which comprise platinum crude are platinum, palladium, iridium and rhodium. Crude platinum contains from 70 to 90 per cent of metal, and the product is an alloy of platinum and one or more allied metals containing impurities.

Mr. STEVENS: Has consideration been given to the fact that platinum is produced in Canada in larger quantities than in former years and, I believe, in a rapidly increasing ratio in British Columbia and also in the International Nickel mines of northern Ontario? Has the minister considered the question in relation to the admission free of manufactures of platinum like platinum bars, strips, wire and so forth? I may point out that most of these commodities enter into a fairly luxurious line of goods where perhaps the tariff would be justified more than in any other branch of industry. Has consideration been given to that fact with a view to encouraging manufacture in Canada?

Mr. ROBB: Platinum wire and bars, strips, sheets or plates enter free now. It is the raw material we are dealing with.

Mr. STEVENS: I did not make myself clear. Ever since November 30, 1906, platinum wire, bars, strips, sheets and so forth have been admitted free, largely for the reason that in those days and for years subsequently very little platinum was produced in Canada. But in recent years—I will limit myself to the last four or five years—there has been a quite marked increase in the production

of platinum in Canada—that is, the production of the raw material itself. Would it not therefore be reasonable to expect that when this item was being considered the possibility of establishing new industries thereunder might have influenced the board in their report and the government in their decision with respect to the matter?

Mr. ROBB: The hearing was advertised and there was no opposition to the application.

Mr. CHAPLIN: But why should an article like platinum, which is used by people who can well afford to pay for it, be allowed in free? Why should not the government obtain some revenue from an article of this kind which is used in the manufacture of a luxury? Where is your revenue tariff?

Mr. ROBB: Is the hon. member asking for an increase on the finished product?

Mr. CHAPLIN: That does not make any difference to me. This article is used in connection with the manufacture of a luxury and by people who can well afford to pay for it. The government therefore should obtain some revenue from it.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister tell me under what item in this report this particular matter can be found?

Mr. ROBB: It is not here.

Mr. STEVENS: It is not here; nor is the evidence published.

Mr. ROBB: I do not think it is published, but I will send the hon. member a copy of the typewritten evidence.

Mr. STEVENS: This touches a matter of principle. Here we have a raw material which is being produced in Canada, and I think we ought to take some pride in the fact that Canada is so rapidly increasing its production of this, one of the most valuable of minerals, which is used very largely in the manufacture of jewelry and very expensive dental work.

Mr. BENNETT: Watches and jewelry.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, watches, jewelry and so forth; yet we have no tariff on it at all. Here is a government that declares itself in favour of a tariff for revenue, and if ever there was a case, so far as I can judge, where the tariff ought to be applied for revenue purposes it is in connection with this item. Nor would it necessarily conflict with the interests of Messrs. Goldsmith Brothers, of Toronto, who were the applicants in the case before the board, because if the tariff were imposed on both the raw material and the finished product they would not be injured a particle. But we are pointing out that here there is an opportunity for us to develop in Canada an industry in the manufacturing of platinum products, based upon the splendid production of Canadian raw material. I should think the minister ought to be in a position to tell us what are the importations of platinum manufactures and platinum raw material, and to say whether or not the government have considered this phase of the subject, namely, the opportunity to establish and to stimulate a new industry in Canada based upon this raw material.

Mr. ROBB: I did not want to detain the house by reading the whole memorandum. Now my hon. friend is talking of only one particular ore, and I repeat that the finished product comes in free and has been coming in free for many years. The memorandum goes on to say that platinum ore is obtainable in considerable quantities in the Ural mountains of Russia and in the rivers of Colombia, South America. Doctor Wilson of the Department of Mines reported that there are probably not more than five firms in the world recovering the metal from this rich ore. Pure platinum, to which my hon. friend is probably referring now, is usually too soft for commercial use, so iridium, palladium or the other metals of the group are added in suitable proportions and then melted and rolled into plate or drawn into wire, in which latter forms they are used by the jewellery trade and by the dental and chemical professions. The items we are reducing are the raw material of what now comes in free.

Mr. STEVENS: I gather from what the minister has said, and from a very brief and cursory glance at this evidence, that Goldsmith Brothers, being a smelting and refining company, desire to have these other ores such as palladium, iridium, osmium and rhodium to mix with the native soft platinum in order to produce a harder metal product. That would lead to the conclusion, I think, that you might admit these ores or the metal from these ores free, but platinum itself could be taxed and the finished article could be be taxed, first in the interests of establishing the industry, and secondly in the interests of revenue; or you could reverse it if you wished, first in the interests of the revenues of the country and at the same time giving protection to this industry. I particularly direct the attention of hon. gentlemen to my left to the fact that if ever there was an opportunity of establishing some sound basis for our revenue you have it here, leaving aside the question of protection for the industry.

We feel that this is an opportunity of building up an industry, even though it may be small. We were considering the matter of crayons previously, another small industry, but when you take the entire schedule, with over 1,100 items, almost each of which affects a great variety of industries, we see that out of these industries we must build our Canadian industrial life. If we let these small things pass one after the other without carefully analysing and scrutinizing them there is not much hope for the establishment of industry in Canada. I think this is an item which warrants a tariff for revenue and a tariff for protection as well.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister give us any reason why this particular item should not pay something to the revenue of Canada? In order to obtain revenue we are continuing the sales tax on clothing and boots and shoes, so why should not this valuable product, which is used by the jewellers and sold to the rich people of Canada, pay a tax as well? Upon what principle does the minister propose to make this item free and maintain the tax on the clothing and boots and shoes used by the people?

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister says this always has been free.

Mr. ROBB: No. We desire to enable this industry in Canada to bring in ores which they may use together with certain Canadian ores in order to bring them up to a standard at which they can be sold. The hon. member for South Wellington asked under what principle we were keeping this item on the free list. It is the same principle that he and I supported in the Liberal party in 1908, the principle which he supported in the Union government and afterwards in the Conservative government. This article has been free since 1906.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If it is wrongly on the free list why retain it there? The mere fact that the minister and I supported it twenty-five years ago does not improve the situation to-day; if we were wrong then for goodness' sake let us get right now. I ask him again if there is any principle under which he can say that this product, which goes only to the rich people of Canada, should be exempt from duty while he deliberately taxes the clothing and the boots and shoes of the poor people of Canada. There is no principle except a wrong one, so why not make it right now?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): If I understand the situation, certain ores are mined in Canada and other ores must be imported to blend with the Canadian ores in order to make a salable product.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. BENNETT: They already mine those ores in Canada, in smaller quantities.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Hon. gentlemen opposite propose to put a duty on imported ores which we require to blend with our own. If we do that what assurance have we that this action will not make it impossible to continue to mine our Canadian ores?

Mr. STEVENS: That is not what we propose at all. We said there was a growing production of platinum, which is a soft metal requiring certain other ingredients such as palladium and so on to harden it in order to make it commercially workable. We say that if these other ores are not produced in Canada and it is thought desirable to bring them in free, we are not particularly quarrelling with that, but we have a large production of platinum which is increasing year by year, and this gives us an opportunity to build up a Canadian industry. Therefore we believe it to be the duty of the government and of parliament to consider seriously whether or not, by our action, we cannot stimulate the establishment of such an industry. Then, having in mind what hon. gentlemen to my left and what my hon. friend himself is always advocating, namely, that the tariff should be exclusively for revenue if it is applied at all, we say that this is an article upon which a tariff for revenue properly should be imposed, because of the general class of consumer affected. There is no question in my mind, either from our standpoint or from that of my hon. friend, that this is an item which should not be placed on the free list. I am referring particularly to the old item of platinum wire and platinum in bars, strips, sheets and plates; and as my hon. friend from South Wellington pointed out, what occurred twenty-five years ago does not apply to-day for two reasons. The whole industrial life of the country has changed so that the use of platinum to-day is much wider than was the case then, and the production of platinum in Canada has increased enormously. I cannot give the figures from memory, but I venture to say that the production of platinum in Canada during the last four or five years as compared with the production twenty years ago has increased at least 1,000 per cent. At any rate the increase is enormous, and I point out to the ministry as a whole that I am informed by those well posted in the mining business that there is a likelihood that Canada will becme one of the greatest producers of platinum in the world. Estimates of the quantity of platinum in use in the world have been widely divergent, varying from 4,000,000 to 8,000,000 ounces troy;

at all events there is a large quantity of platinum used in the world. In former years platinum was so valuable that it was only used in the most expensive trades, such as the jewellery trade; now it is used in the electrical business, for contact points and so on. With the increased production of platinum there will come an increase in its use, and Canada has an opportunity of becoming the producer of a large part of the world supply of platinum and of building up industries based upon the ownership and control of that valuable resource. We are asking the government to consider that phase of it, and not these few additional alloys which are mixed with the platinum.

Mr. ROBB: You must have them first.

Mr. STEVENS: We are not quarrelling so much with that. It may be desirable to bring in palladium, iridium and these other metals to mix with the platinum.

Mr. FRASER: Do I understand the minister to say that these metals are imported into Canada to mix with the platinum ores?

Mr. BENNETT: That is what he said.

Mr. FRASER: My understanding of the matter is that these ores are derivatives of platinum. The report of the mines branch for last year has the following to say in regard to these metals:

The metals of the platinum group produced from Canadian ores in 1928 were valued at $1,309,923 and consisted of:—platinum, 10,452 ounces valued at $704,330, and palladium, rhodium, etc., 13,087 ounces valued at $605,563.

The exports in 1928 were:—platinum contained in concentrates 1,212 ounces valued at $77,908, and platinum, old and scrap, 421 ounces valued at $27,463. These figures do not include the precious metals contained in the copper-nickel matte exported.

I would ask the minister to pay attention to the portion of this report which deals with imports. This reads as follows:

The imports in 1928 were valued at $150,616 and consisted of platinum retorts, crucibles, wire, etc.

The same thing is happening all over the Dominion of Canada; we are exporting our raw material and importing the highly fabricated material. There is some further information in this report with regard to the localities from which these metals are derived, as follows:

With the exception of a very few ounces of platinum obtained from the black sands of British Columbia, all the Canadian platinum and allied metals are obtained from the treatment of the Sudbury nickel-copper matte. The precious metal residues are allowed to accumulate over irregular periods before being treated, so that recoveries do not bear any definite relation to the quantity of matte treated in any particular year.

The minister will notice that the platinum group of metals is produced principally from the mines in the Sudbury district. As we have an ever-increasing production in that area it is only fair to conclude that we will always have an ever-increasing quantity of these metals produced. Some measure of protection should be given to the manufacturers of these metals in the Dominion of Canada. If we continue to export our raw material and import the manufactured article without any duty or restriction, we will never build up any manufacturing of these metals. The same principle would apply to a great many other metals as well as the metals in the platinum group.

Mr. ROBB: Doctor Wilson, of the Department of Mines appeared before the board and reported that there were probably not more than five firms in the world which were recovering this metal from the original ore.

Mr. FRASER: Why could not we have one of the five?

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps we will when we can give them the same basis of treatment as they receive in other countries.

Mr. STEVENS: They are not producing the ore.

Mr. ROBB: That is their statement and they probably know something about this business.

Mr. BENNETT: Who are "they"?

Mr. ROBB: Goldsmith Brothers Smelting & Refining Company, Limited, 21 Wilton square, Toronto. The following letter, dated March 7, 1927, is addressed to the Minister of Finance:

Permit me to call your attention to tariff item number 363, which lists platinum wire, sheets, bars, etc., as free. It has also been ruled that iridium platinum is free.

Iridium powder and platinum sponge are used in the manufacture of a free article. Iridium power and platinum sponge are the forms in which these metals are usually traded in between European and American refiners. These metals, in the form of powder or sponge, or precipitates, enter the United States of American and all other countries duty free. A Canadian refiner is at a distinct disadvantage. One who wishes to cater to Canadian manufacturers of platinum articles is in a better position to handle this business if located in the United States rather than in Canada. The United States refiner imports, free, from Europe iridium powder and platinum sponge, and then puts them in the form of bars and sheets, which enter Canada duty free. As these metals, as precipitates, are unenumerated, they are ruled 17½ per cent. I would request application be considered that they be ruled free of duty, either without restriction, or for the manufacture of platinum sheets, bars, wire, etc.

If no changes in tariff are contemplated by parliament this year, I would request that change be made under provision permitted by number 286 of Customs Act. If an order in council is passed, I request that same be effective from February 1, 1927.

There are other metals in the platinum group, all of which are used as alloys, as follows: palladium, rhodium, ruthenium, osmium. These metals, in the form of precipitates or powders, when used for the manufacture of platinum (a free item) should enter duty free.

If I can furnish you any further information, please command me.

Probably when these people get going and are making this material in Canada they will come along and ask the government for protection.

Mr. BENNETT: They will never get going unless they get some encouragement.

Mr. ROBB: They are proposing to make it.

Mr. BENNETT: They ship this stuff out in the raw form and bring it back as a manufactured article.

Mr. ROBB: They say they require these other metals.

Mr. BENNETT: The copper situation would probably explain that as clearly as it could be explained. We are shipping blister copper and copper matte out of this country, and when our people want to buy copper rods they are forced to purchase from the Copper Export Company of the United States which sets a rate of a quarter-cent per pound higher to foreigners than to their own people. The rseult is that the Canadian people have to buy refined copper made from their own blister copper at a quarter-cent per pound increase in domestic price. This means they have to pay $5 per ton more than their competitors in the United States. The government is encouraging the shipment of blister copper out of this country and the importing of the fabricated article. The same thing applies to asbestos. I wonder if the minister realizes that there are 250,000 men, women and children employed in the fabrication of raw asbestos in the United States exported from Canada. We sell our raw material at between $50 and $70 per ton and purchase the fabricated material at between $900 and $1,000 per ton. As the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) has pointed out, there is an increasing and improving mineral production, and it is the duty of the government to encourage and not to discourage that condition. The people are complaining that they are being deprived of employment in this country. We are simply digging in the rock and getting out these minerals, putting them in a smelter and getting the blister and matte, and then shipping it out in carload lots, and the people are forced to follow the raw material in order to obtain employment.

If I am permitted to anticipate the next item, I would ask the minister to tell us what is going to happen when we develop our aircraft industry and then have no chronometers and compasses made in this country.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): You will never learn to make them by increasing the production cost.

Mr. BENNETT: We will learn to make them the same as they learned to make them in Germany. There was once a day in Germany and the United States when they imported all these things from England and the same specious argument the hon. gentleman now makes was made when industries were established in these countries. We will never encourage industry by increasing the cost of production. The cost of steel rails in the United States was at one time higher than in England, Germany or Belgium; but the United States and Germany said: We are going to promote industry at home to give employment to our own people. They did so, and the result was that thousands of men, who were formerly denied employment, were employed in fabricating thousands of articles, and encouragement was given to their own industry. We do not ask protection; we ask equality of opportunity: we want an equal chance. I cannot understand Canadians; I cannot understand the hon. member for Weyburn; I cannot understand those who appear before the board and take the attitude they do, and I cannot understand the minister when he permits himself to become a party to a transaction which denies to Canadians the right to fabricate their own raw material into the finished article and to give employment to our own people. Are we to be economic slaves or not?—that is the question. If my hon. friend has his way, we will continue to be economic slaves, because every day that passes under present conditions makes us so more and more. We are importing $1,000,000 a day in iron and steel products; we are the greatest customer of the United States Steel Corporation to-day, and this country with a little intelligence, a little determination and a little less fear on the part of those occupying the treasury benches, of the hon. member for Weyburn and those he represents, would be able to stop this at once. What is happening is that we are shipping out our raw material in continually increasing quantities just as

we are doing now in regard to this item of platinum. Then we are buying back the fabricated, highly refined article the manufacture of which gives employment to thousands of people, and we use it and think we are prosperous. That is what is going on in Canada and the hon. gentleman knows it. Will he read the economic history of Germany or the United States or any other country? What about the industrial life of England to-day?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): A country that under free trade was able to finance the greater part of the war.

Mr. BENNETT: Surely the hon. gentleman knows what it is costing the poor English taxpayer to-day to pay interest on the money which England borrowed from the United States. Surely he knows the burden on them is so great they are staggering under it; that their industrial life has been threatened at every point, and that the only hope they have is by safeguarding it. I crossed over there only a few years ago and there were no customs men such as we see now at Dover. They are there now gathering up the Swiss watches, automobiles, chronometres, everything else for duty purposes, to endeavour to safeguard industry for one purpose and one only, namely, that the English workman shall have an equal chance with the continental workman to live. When we ask that Canadians shall have a chance to live, we want them to live in Canada and not in the United States. We want them to live here, eat our wheat, our vegetables, pay taxes in Canada and become part of the life of this country. That is what we are trying to do, and the hon. gentleman knows it. If we continue to do as we are doing, we shall be merely hewers of wood and drawers of water, shipping out the raw material, matte, blister copper, raw material, whether it be pulpwood or cordwood or whatever it may be, and bringing back the highly finished product. Look at the importations of paper. Look at the future. Before this budget ends, the minister will find before him a record of material we are buying which should be made at home and because we are doing this we have lost 600,000 Canadians in the last five years. That is the condition with which we are confronted, and that is the reason for it. This is the principle once more, and the minister has the hardihood to put into tariff items the words "not made in Canada." Is it always to be "not made in Canada"? Is that condition always to continue? That is the problem which confronts the country. It requires courage; it requires more than that; it requires an appreciation of a problem that is not to be dealt with by temporizing expedients to maintain power. The government must be prepared, if need be, to sacrifice power for Canada and Canadians, and as long as they talk platitudes about the cost of production and free trade, we know quite well what will happen—the same temporizing tariff measures, the same effort to do what has been done in days gone by. Not made in Canada! Of course they were not; there were no steel rails made in Canada once. There were no steel rails made in the United States once. In Lincoln's time every steel rail in the United States came from some other country. But they encouraged their workmen so as to put the development of their country on an equality with that of Germany, and now they can meet the world in producing steel rails. The same is true in regard to other matters.

The position is this: Shall we continue as we are doing? That is the real issue before the Canadian people. The minister is here continuing to aid and persistently abet the export of raw material, and then he slips over it by adding the words "not made in Canada." Does he remember that there were times in Canada when we did not grind flour except between two stones in the little grist mills? We had no roller patents, but we got them. Are we to continue in the old way? When the hon. member for Cariboo put before us the conditions with respect to the black sand in British Columbia, with respect to nickel in the Sudbury district, with respect to development now going on in Quebec, he harks back to a time when none of this development had taken place, the time when twenty-one years ago the hon. member for South Wellington and he supported the same policies, and he says: Let us continue. That is conservatism gone mad; that is Toryism. But the conservatism, the Toryism you find on this side is reflected in that single verse of Tennyson:

> That man's a true conservative
> That lops the mouldered branch away.

The mouldered branch is this played-out idea that when this country reaches a certain stage of development, we shall cling to old conditions and not encourage new production, new manufactures. That is the situation to which we are directing the attention of the minister this afternoon, not because this particular item is important, but because the principle makes for the very economic life of Canada.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): It seems to me that the mouldered branch is protection. If

we lop that away, we shall overcome our difficulties. The trouble with my hon. friend is that he fixes his eye on a single point and he watches it so intently that he fails to see what is going on around him. He is like the man who stands on the river bank and judges the force of the stream, not by the sweep of the current, but by the eddies along the shore.

Mr. CHAPLIN: In regard to the particular item we are discussing, I do not ask for any protection, but I have asked the minister two or three times: Why does he not put into force in regard to this particular item his own principle, the principle he is always talking about, namely, tariff for revenue? Is there in the whole tariff schedule any other item that can better afford to pay a revenue into the public treasury? Is there in the whole category of the tariff schedule another article that is being used by the richest people in the country and that can stand a tariff better than this one?

Mr. ROBB: Of course my hon. friend knows that the protection on platinum runs up to 35 per cent on the finished jewellery.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Yes, but not on platinum wire or any part made of platinum. That is free.

Mr. ROBB: The leader of the opposition and I are not so very far apart. All he is arguing for, he says, is equality of opportunity. That is what we are proposing to do: we are proposing to place these refiners in a position where they can make this product in Canada. That is what they ask in their application.

Mr. BENNETT: We are shipping out raw material.

Mr. ROBB: Not at all. May I repeat that Doctor Wilson, of the Department of Mines, who should know something about this, reported that there are probably not more than five firms in the world which are recovering the metal from the original ore, and we want to get Canada in the position of being one of them. As I pointed out once before, some of these products are not produced in Canada, and we are proposing that these metals, palladium, iridium, ruthenium and rhodium come in free, because they are required to mix with the Canadian product. Before we start increasing the duty we must at least put these people in the position where they can manufacture these goods in Canada. Surely my hon. friends can see that.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister has two or three times stated that Doctor Wilson, of the Mines department, says that there are only five firms in the world which are recovering these metals. It may interest the house to know that according to the evidence upon which this finding of the tariff board is based, two of these firms are Canadian firms. Their names are not given, but I judge that they are International Nickel and Consolidated Mining and Smelting Corporation. I will read a sentence or two of the evidence, which is rather interesting, and which bears out exactly what I and my associates have been contending. There is a long story here, and I shall read only a part of it:

> Offhand I cannot give the exact amount, but at one time they were producing over a thousand ounces of mixed precious metals per month.

That is, platinum, palladium and these other metals:

> Of that, roughly thirty-five per cent was platinum and sixty-five per cent were metals of the platinum groups.

Those are the other metals we were speaking of:

> The names have been given you, and it is not necessary to repeat them.

I venture the guess that it is International Nickel and Consolidated Mining and Smelting Corporation. I happen to know something about it, and I think that is correct. He goes on:

> One of these firms, which produces about one-quarter of the total output, exports the raw material to Great Britain and it is refined in Wales (at Clydach). The metals of the group are separated there and that is the sponge which goes on the market, most of it being sold in London. The output from the other plant is treated in the United States.

That is, Consolidated Mining and Smelting Corporation ship their products to Wales for refining and separating purposes. International Nickel have been shipping theirs to the United States. The evidence continues:

> I am not aware whether any of it goes to the European market or not. You would have to go into detail to trace that out. However, that second firm has already installed one electrolytic refinery at Port Colborne and is planning within the next four or five years to install another refinery for the production of copper and nickel near Sudbury.

Which metals contain the precious metals of platinum and palladium.

I pause here to direct the attention of the government to the fact that the recent marvellous developments in the International Nickel Corporation and its amalgamation with the Mond interests indicate a development in the smelting and refining industry in Canada which undoubtedly is world-wide in its importance. Consolidated Mining and Smelting Corporation in its recent amalga-

mation with the Lindsley interests in the Manitoba field purposes to establish another smelter in the neighbourhood of Winnipeg and a refinery in Ontario to take care of the mineral development in northern Manitoba, and to establish another smelter on the coast. This company, after a period of about five years of steady development and blocking out of areas through the coast copper country and the Portland canal district and other parts of British Columbia has created a reserve of ores that will enable them to establish and keep operating a big smelter on the Pacific coast. These three new huge smelters, together with a couple of refineries, will be the medium of producing a tremendously increasing quantity of these precious metals.

Mr. ROBB: I understand that there is another one to go in near Quebec.

Mr. STEVENS: That is another one, the Noranda outfit. It also has platinum, I presume. A large development is going to take place through the enterprise of these big corporations and the investment of public moneys in the production of the ores in question. It would seem, Mr. Chairman, that these facts, which are well known to the minister, ought to have focused the attention of the government on this great principle of building up Canadian industry. I wish to quote a little further from the evidence, and then I want to point out another matter to the minister. Doctor Wilson, of the Mines Department, goes on to say in his evidence:

> They will collect these metals as sludge or residues. These residues may be refined in Canada or shipped to the United States; that will be a question of the tariff at the time, and also a question of markets.

What I have been urging on the minister is that these tariff schedules should be so framed that Goldsmith Brothers who are secondary, not primary, handlers of these metals, should be placed in a position where they will not have to compete, as they say they have to now, against an unfair advantage which the United States refineries have over them.

Mr. ROBB: That is what we are trying to prevent.

Mr. STEVENS: No, the minister is putting the cart before the horse, or rather he is putting the horse behind the cart. There are some of these minerals perhaps that are not produced in Canada. My hon. friend from Cariboo who has a very intimate knowledge, much greater than I have, of these matters, says that most if not all of these metals are produced in Canada. Certainly platinum and palladium are produced here in large quantities, and those are the two main items. What we are arguing is that instead of reducing the tariff still further, the whole schedules dealing with these metals should be so revised as to encourage the establishment in Canada of manufacturing industries based on these metals.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend himself just said that there were four or five new industries starting in Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: No. The minister is taking an unfair advantage of my frankness. Here is the situation. These smelters that I spoke of are not being established on platinum at all, but on the discovery of copper, nickel, lead, zinc and silver; but in the process of developing the base metals they have found these precious metals. According to the evidence on which the minister bases his new item, Consolidated Mining and Smelting Corporation shipped from their Trail smelter —which by the way is recognized as one of the finest and best in the world—lead, silver and zinc to the refineries in Wales, where the precious metals are extracted. What I am contending is that these metals, precious and base, should be smelted and refined, and refined so as to take the precious metals out, here in Canada. Canada, being the producer, as this evidence shows, of something like one-quarter or more of the platinum of the world, ought to develop the finer arts, because they are not an industry so much as an art, of making jewelry and fine electrical equipment. By electrical equipment I do not mean the larger pieces of electrical machinery, but the very fine electrical instruments in which a certain quantity of platinum is used. Canada ought to be in a position superior to that of any other country in the world in the production of these metals from the very fact that she possesses such a great proportion of them.

I find also in this evidence reference is made to the Marking Act. There is no question that Canada is behind the times in her Marking Act dealing with precious metals. As to platinum—again I am speaking without opportunity of careful research and subject to correction—I understand that under the platinum group Canada is not properly equipped in regard to markings so as to safeguard the public interest in the purchase of this metal. I am advised that the United States government is considering the revision of its Precious Metals Marking Act, and has already established some standards for platinum similar to those established for gold. As is well known, gold at 24 carats is considered pure, and there are various gradations down to 14, 12 or 10, as the case may be, for

different uses. So with platinum. But we have no similar protection of the interests and the rights of the purchasers of articles into which this metal enters. This is a serious matter, it is fundamental. I believe, as my leader intimated a moment ago, that we owe it to Canada as a parliament to study these things and to face them. I have some respect for the sincerity of my hon. friend from Weyburn (Mr. Young). I was going to say that I had more respect for his sincerity seven or eight years ago than I have to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEVENS: I say that quite frankly.

Mr. CHAPLIN: He should have been educated in the meantime.

Mr. STEVENS: He has been. Since a member of this house he has received information that his intelligence indicates to him should cause him to change from the position that he persists in taking. It is not a theoretical argument between the old Adam Smith free trade theory and the theory of protection. These things will never be faced and will never be worked out on that basis. Here we have a certain set of facts. Surely as intelligent men we can face those facts and discuss them on their merits.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): And follow them all the way through to their conclusions.

Mr. STEVENS: I have tried to do that, but my hon. friend got up and quoted an observation, hoary with age, about standing on the bank of a stream and instead of judging the course of events by the general current looking at the eddies at one's feet. Why does not he contribute something of interest and value to the solution of this problem? We are offering this solution. Parliament—I am not going to tie it to this ministry—parliament should face the fact that Canada by nature is blessed with large quantities of this rare and precious metal—limiting ourselves to this item for the moment—to the extent that we believe in a very few years will put us in possession of the major portion of the world's production, we at the present time having two of the three concerns producing it. That is fact No. 1. That puts us in a unique position in the world—not on this continent, but in the world.

What does it mean? It means that we have the major portion of the platinum used chiefly in expensive instruments and luxurious articles like jewellery; platinum which will be required in all the countries of the world, the refining and manufacture of which would not affect the living of people elsewhere, and would offer to us a chance of applying to the industry the skill and the artistry of Canadians. But if we ship that platinum to Wales to be refined there, it passes out of our control, and we cannot get it back into our control again for the purpose of developing this industry. Who is hurt by encouraging the refining of it here? Let me turn to the illustration used by my hon. leader a moment ago in connection with asbestos. It is perhaps a little less complicated, but exactly the same principle is involved. Canada possesses 85 per cent of the asbestos resources of the world. Why should not Canada as a part of her duty to this great estate be giving to the world manufactured asbestos?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): What do you propose, an export duty?

Mr. STEVENS: I do not wish to digress too far, but I will not hesitate to answer my hon. friend. Yes, certainly, I would put export duties on the raw material.

Mr. EVANS: Why should it be needed?

Mr. STEVENS: Let me give a personal experience for the benefit of my hon. friends. While in New York I was discussing various matters with a gentleman, an intimate associate of the late President Roosevelt and closely identified with the operations of some of the big financial concerns over there. He made a strong argument to me as a basis for bringing Canada and the United States closer together. He proposed that Canada should adopt the policy of exporting her raw materials and purchasing the finished products from the United States, and he used this expression. He said, "Mr. Stevens, if we would join with you—speaking of Canada—with your raw materials and with our great industrial establishments, we could beat the world." I said, "Hold on a minute, Mr. So-and-so." Then I expounded to him the views which I have tried to place before the house this afternoon and on other occasions regarding the destiny of Canada. My argument to him, and my argument to my hon. friends from Weyburn and Rosetown, is that instead of Canada simply sending her asbestos, 82 per cent of her copper, and her platinum to the United States and to Wales—and this applies also to other of our raw materials—instead of continuing to do that I argued with him that Canada should build up industrial and manufacturing concerns based upon these raw resources, and I carried my argument through as well as I could to its conclusion. When I ended, that gentleman said to me, "If I were a Canadian I would take exactly the

same position. But I want to tell you that the chief concern of the American financial interests to-day is to secure a larger and still larger control of Canadian raw resources to replace the exhaustion of our own resources." That was his attitude, and that is why our asbestos is going to the United States. The Americans come up and seize control—legally of course—of that great raw resource, and it is being sent down to the United States. As I intimated to-day, 250,000 people, if I am not mistaken, directly and indirectly are being sustained out of raw material for which we get the comparatively paltry sum of seven million dollars a year.

The same principle precisely applies to this platinum. We have the material, we have the opportunity of developing the manufacture of the class of articles in which this is used, and we are not taking advantage of that opportunity. The minister knows, as well as he knows he is in his seat, that I am enunciating sound economics for Canada, but he does not turn a hand or move a finger to give effect to such a policy in this regard. I plead with him to-day. If he eschews the word "protection," if he does not want to taint his political vocabulary with that term, then use "tariff for revenue" for the purpose, let him employ any terminology he likes, so long as he accomplishes something in that regard.

Mr. ROBB: Or "safeguarding industry."

Mr. STEVENS: Exactly. I give him liberty to use any pseudonym, as the Prime Minister referred to our own, that he likes. He may invite the member for Weyburn to collaborate with him and call it free trade. But in heaven's name let us have some appreciation of our heritage and make use of the raw materials that a kind and benevolent Providence has given to us.

Mr. EVANS: I have been trying to follow this discussion and to deduce some line of policy both from the opposition and from the government; but neither the opposition nor the government can outline any policy of protection which would build up industry in this country. I know that a great deal of eloquence has been directed from this side to the Minister of Finance this afternoon, and he is probably laughing up his sleeve at us, thinking that we have been impressed by the argument on this side. That is far from being true.

Mr. ROBB: I am thinking of the vote of yesterday.

Mr. STEVENS: He means the vote of the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young).

Mr. EVANS: The hon. member (Mr. Stevens) says that we must build up industries here even if we go so far as to put an export embargo on our raw material. But what is wrong is that we cannot build up industry in Canada when, as the Minister of Finance says, we are given an equal chance with the rest of the world? What further advantage do the manufacturers want when they have their raw material right here? Surely it must be cheaper at the mine than anywhere else in the world since Canada controls the output. Let me say this. Protection in this country has passed on from being a method of establishing industry to the stage where it has become a class advantage, used entirely by one class for one purpose only. If a proper policy were followed for the building up of industry in Canada both the opposition and the government would be anxious to keep down the cost of production here so that Canadian industry might compete with others and fall into line with world prices the world over. Last year when these schedules were under consideration even the opposition did not want protection in regard to several articles. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) himself asked for free trade in certain articles. I would refer the committee to page 1666 of Hansard of last year. The hon. member quarrels with the Minister of Finance for altering the schedule without proper consideration, and he says:

> I think this is done just by the whim and fancy of the minister or his assistants. The whole schedule is got up without any principle.

Well, there is no principle in protection anyway; it is the most unprincipled thing ever devised as a matter of trade. He goes on:

> It is purely haphazard guesswork. Any communication that has come to me on the subject from manufacturers—and I have quite a large hat factory in my riding—has been merely to leave these matters as they were, free, free, free, from all countries.

And the Minister of Finance had evidently to make a bid for the support of the same manufacturer, so he acceded to the request of the hon. member for South Wellington and placed the articles on the free list. It is indeed pathetic, in this Hansard, to see the gratitude with which the hon. member for South Wellington accepted the concession. He said:

> I must thank the minister for his consideration in regard to this item. If he will do the same thing in regard to worsted yarns, I will not have very much to complain of.

Then the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart) spoke; he was just as grateful as the

hon. member for South Wellington. But what does it all go to show? It shows an utter want of policy and a callous disregard of the consumers of this nation, to put the price-fixing power in the hands of certain classes to fleece the consumers all the time. There is no other purpose in the tariff to-day. They care not for industry any more than anyone else. The fact is that free trade is the only logical way of building up industry, because it puts all on the same plane, and it will enable Canada to come down in the cost of production and so be in line with world's prices. No; I cannot but classify this whole discussion and the whole policy of protection as two-faced. Protection is a two-faced policy in which there is no sincerity in relation to the building-up of industry; because if you put a tariff on an item you increase its cost. There is no other purpose in protection than to give the price-fixing power to those engaged in certain industries.

Mr. FRASER: I am interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Rosetown. There is no one who does not admire the persistence with which he advocates his free trade principles. But we are confronted with a condition and not a theory. I referred a moment ago to a million dollars' worth of exports of ore of the platinum group, shipped out of Canada to be conditioned and refined in foreign countries. We are exporting at the present time at the rate of $50,000,000 worth of minerals—

Mr. ROBB: Will my hon. friend give the source of that quotation in regard to the million dollars.

Mr. FRASER: I take it from the report of the Minister of Mines for the calendar year 1928.

Mr. ROBB: I have the report here; let us correct the statement now.

Mr. FRASER: No; that is not at all the report from which I quoted. The report from which I quote the figure is for the calendar year just ended, issued by the Deputy Minister of Mines a few days ago.

Mr. KENNEDY: In British Columbia or Ottawa?

Mr. FRASER: In Ottawa. I am speaking of the annual report. It has not yet been printed but, I understand, it was distributed in typewritten form. Now, I have quoted the amount of platinum ore exported.

Mr. ROBB: The export records show $83,000,000.

[Mr. Evans.]

Mr. FRASER: Export of platinum ores?

Mr. ROBB: I am looking at the item in the report of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, giving the total exports of platinum contained in concentrates or other forms, and the amount is some $84,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the date?

Mr. STEVENS: There would be platinum contained in other metals, unrefined, such as lead, zinc, silver and so forth.

Mr. ROBB: Maybe.

Mr. STEVENS: It takes a special process to separate it from the other metals.

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps.

Mr. FRASER: If I am wrong in the figure I gave I shall be glad to be corrected. But I am not wrong—because I have made the calculation from the last report issued by the Minister of Mines—when I say that we are exporting at the present time $50,000,000 worth of minerals in the raw form, of which 75 or 80 per cent is not processed but is raw ore as it is extracted from the mines. That is all I have to say in that connection.

Let me refer for a moment to something the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) said in regard to the copper situation, which he discussed a moment ago. In my opinion he did not show the worst side of that situation. He showed how the copper was exported from Canada and was under the control of the copper export people of the United States, so that our manufacturers had to buy back the manufactured or partly manufactured article—wire and rods, or the material to make into wire and rods. They have to apply to the export company for their raw material. This Canadian manufacturing company actually makes an application to the American exporting company for 1,000 tons of copper, and for that copper the Canadian company must pay $5 per ton more than is paid by an American company. That is not the worst feature of it, however; they go further than that. When the Canadian company makes application for 1,000 tons of raw copper the American export company says, "We cannot give you 1,000 tons to-day; we can only give you 250 tons and you will have to come back in two weeks, when we will tell you what we can do about the balance." The Canadian company goes back in two weeks and the American company says, "We can give you another 250 tons but we will have to charge you an additional $5 per ton." That is what happens every time the Canadian company goes back for the balance of their order, and I submit

that it is about time we found some solution for a condition of this kind. We produce the raw material and send it to the United States to be refined, but when we want to buy it back we are dictated to with regard to the price. How long are we to continue to be treated in this way not only by the United States but by any foreign country? This does not seem to me a reasonable business basis, and I think it is about time the government woke up and applied some remedy to a condition of this kind.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Ever since I came to this house I have been pleading with the present Minister of Finance and with other ministers to take some interest in the ore industry and the mineral production of Canada. I pointed out what Canada was deriving from her one smelter, located at Trail, even though that smelter was operated on a small scale and only taking care of the one mine, and I drew attention to the fact that under present conditions we were losing millions of dollars a year in this way. In the case of nickel in northern Ontario we were simply producing the ore and sending it to the United States; in the case of the other ores, they were sent to Deloro where concentrates were formed, which concentrates were shipped to the United States for further refining and smelting. The minister says there are only small quantities of platinum or other metals shipped out of Canada, but we have no idea what is in these concentrates. However, now we know that we are obtaining platinum and several of these other minerals right in Ontario and the northern part of Quebec, and if we do not institute a policy of completing the refining of our metals in our own country we will continue to lose millions of dollars annually.

After all, platinum is only a small matter; for seven years I have pleaded with the minister to consider the question of the treatment of feldspar, which is obtained in Ontario in its finest form. To-day we ship practically all the ore to the United States to be ground, after which it is returned to Canada free of duty, while great quantities are retained in the United States for the development of their great industries. The minister has thrown out a gesture to-day, and I am hoping that it is a promise that he is preparing for the further manufacture of platinum in this country. I hope it is a a promise, because to-day feldspar is being ground by two concerns in Canada, and we have the whole production in our own hands if we wish to make use of it. These two industries, one in Toronto, and one in Kingston, are now prepared to grind our own feldspar in sufficient quantities to supply the manufacturers of Canada, but the minister has turned them down repeatedly when they have asked for a little protection. I believe he has done so innocently, however, without having been given the information. These firms have assured him that if he will grant them some small protection in order to give them the Canadian market, they are willing to employ twice the number of people they are employing at present. In other words, if he will see that United States manufacturers do not have an opportunity of sending this product to Canada under conditions equal to those which must be met by the Canadian companies, they will carry on the manufacture of feldspar in our own country and will not increase the price of any article into the production of which it enters. I hope the gesture of the minister indicates a determination that he will deal with the further manufacture of these ores in Canada and that next year he will take cognizance of the question of feldspar in order that the manufacture of this product may be carried on in Canada.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—369. Chronometers and compasses, and parts thereof, including cards therefor, of a class or kind not made in Canada, for ships or aircraft: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What was the duty on these articles previously?

Mr. ROBB: They were free, but the parts came in under item 453, with a duty of 15 per cent, 25 per cent and 27½ per cent; under item 657, with a duty of 17½ per cent, 22½ per cent and 25 per cent and item 590a, with a duty of 15 per cent, 25 per cent and 27½ per cent. There is no change in the rate on compasses and chronometers except those for aircraft, which at present enter under item 590a with a duty of 15 per cent, 25 per cent and 27½ per cent. This item is intended to cover parts for chronometers and compasses for ships and aircraft; the typical part is the compass card, which cannot enter under either item 369 or item 470. Such cards consist of a steel magnet and metal float for the liquid compass or a pivot for the dry compass, and a paper card showing the points of the compass. These are not manufactured in Canada, as they require to be manufactured by the actual compass makers. The amended item is to obviate this difficulty. The item is further amended to provide for compasses and parts. These are not made in Canada and enter now under item number 590a.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What would be the loss in revenue?

Mr. ROBB: The imports are not ascertainable.

Mr. STEVENS: At the present time this item is limited to chronometers and compasses for ships?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: The item will now include chronometers and compasses, and parts thereof, including cards therefor. Do I understand that the minister is limiting that item to ships or aircraft?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, and the item specifies "of a class or kind not made in Canada."

Mr. FRASER: Is that an amendment?

Mr. ROBB: No, that is the same as it was before.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—437. Safes, doors for safes and vaults; scales, balances, weighing beams, and strength testing machines of all kinds, n.o.p.: British preferential tariff, 20 per cent; intermediate tariff, 27½ per cent; general tariff, 30 per cent.

Mr. ROBB: We are just adding the words "n.o.p." which are made necessary by an amendment in item number 448.

Mr. STEVENS: There is practically no change.

Mr. KENNEDY: How is it we have luxuries and articles entering into the manufacture of luxuries on the free list, while articles of this kind carry 20 per cent, 27½ per cent and 30 per cent?

Mr. CHAPLIN: You must have a safe to keep the platinum in.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister tell us at whose request this change was made? Was there a tariff board hearing; is there any report, and is it printed?

Mr. ROBB: I have already explained that the "n.o.p." is added because it comes under another item.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—438b. Automobiles for conveying passengers only, n.o.p., valued at retail at place of production, when new, with standard equipment complete, at not more than twelve hundred dollars each; motor cars or motor trucks (not for railways or tramways) for carrying goods only; motor cycles or sidecars therefor; chassis for motor vehicles specified in this item: British preferential tariff, 12½ per cent; intermediate tariff, 17½ per cent; general tariff, 20 per cent.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. STEVENS: What is the basis for that change?

Mr. ROBB: We are adding the words "or sidecars therefor."

Mr. STEVENS: It is a new item.

Mr. ROBB: Here is the explanation:

The Canadian Wheelmen's Association, in presenting to the board an application for reduction of duty on motorcycles, stressed the fact that under the existing tariff, sidecars for such motorcycles pay rates of 22½, 30 and 35 per cent under item 359, whereas motorcycles themselves enter at 12½, 17½ and 20 per cent under item 438b. On giving evidence on behalf of the Wheelmen's Association, Mr. W. M. Gladish of the Ottawa Journal stated that the high duty on sidecars was an obvious anomaly and caused considerable objection among distributors as well as among users of motorcycles who regarded sidecars as an essential part of motorcycle equipment. It is proposed, therefore, to amend item 438b by the insertion of the words "or sidecars therefor" which will permit entry of both under the one item. Motorcycles are not made in Canada. Imports of sidecars are not separately classified, whereas imports of motorcycles in the fiscal year 1927-28 were valued at $257,000.

Two public hearings were held of the application, that portion of it relating to motorcycles being withdrawn by the applicant at the opening of the second hearing.

Mr. COOTE: In 1926 this government removed the 5 per cent excise tax from motor cars valued at less than $1,200, and at that time some of the members of the Conservative party pointed out to the minister that this was really giving another 5 per cent protection. I would like to quote from Hansard of 1926, page 4133, as follows:

Mr. Robb: It does not make any difference where they pay it. My hon. friend from West Calgary and my hon. friend from West York have forgotten that I hold in my hand a letter from the automobile manufacturers of Canada guaranteeing that they will pass this on to the Canadian people, and that the purchaser of a Canadian car will have all this reduction in the excise tax.

The minister continued:

I repeat that we have the promise of the associated automobile manufacturers of Canada, of all the manufacturers of automobiles in Canada—it will be found on Hansard to-morrow morning—that they will pass this excise reduction on to the Canadian purchaser, and I serve notice on them now, in the presence of my friends, that if they do not live up to that agreement we will find means of placing them in a position where they will have to do so, or meet competition of the world.

The minister made a very positive statement that he would see that the automobile manufacturers would live up to these terms. Last year I brought to the attention of the minister what seemed to be very good proof that some of these automobile manufacturers

were not living up to the promise which they had made. In Hansard of March 30, 1928, at page 1820, I pointed out to the minister that at that time a Ford coupe was advertised in Canada at a price of 29.1 per cent over the United States price; that a Whippet coach, which was made, I think, by the Overland people, sold at 29.9 per cent higher in Canada than in the United States, and that a Chrysler coupe was 29.8 per cent higher in Canada than in the United States. The firms manufacturing these cars all signed a letter which the Minister of Finance referred to in his statement of 1926. The percentages which I quoted a year ago were the prices as advertised in Canada at the factory and, of course, without any sales or excise tax being included. When this was brought to the attention of the minister last year, he said in reply to me:

Mr. Robb: I have no information other than what my hon. friend has said, nor have I any complaints that the reduction has not been passed on to the purchasers. But after the session, when I have more time, I will look more carefully into the matter. My hon. friend will agree with me that, just on a bare statement, we cannot adopt legislation affecting all the different firms throughout Canada.

And a little further on he says:

I shall this afternoon direct the attention of the Department of National Revenue to the observations of my hon. friend and ask them to check the matter up. It may take some time to do so.

I am taking advantage of the fact that the Minister of National Revenue is in the house as well as the Minister of Finance, and I should like to ask either of these ministers what investigation has taken place into this matter and whether the government can now inform us whether the automobile manufacturers are living up to the promise which was contained in that letter, that is, that they would pass this reduction on to the consumer. I understood the minister at that time to assure us that they would not take advantage of the elimination of the excise tax.

May I, before I sit down, point out to the house that the tariff on automobiles valued at less than $1,200 is only 20 per cent. I have not been able to get prices for comparison this year, but according to figures I gave last year based on prices published by these different automobile concerns, the prices were in nearly every case more than 29 per cent higher in Canada than in the United States. It seems evident on the face of it that these firms are taking advantage of the remission of the excise tax. Again I should like to ask either of these ministers what the result of that investigation was.

Mr. ROBB: Carrying out my promise to my hon. friend, I have had letters written to the manufacturers, directing their attention to his observations. I do not recall at the moment, because I have not the correspondence before me, whether I said who had made the complaint; in any case I asked them for an explanation. My recollection is that I had satisfactory replies from some of the firms, but I will admit frankly that the replies of one or two of them were not very satisfactory. I recall some time ago having looked over this correspondence, and my recollection is that I wrote them again. I shall have the matter checked up and find out whether I got a reply, and I shall be able to give my hon. friend some information about it after eight o'clock or let him know about it confidentially. I do not object to his bringing the matter up now. It affords an opportunity of directing the attention of the automobile people to the promise then made.

Mr. GARDINER: Might I suggest that this item stand until the information is brought down?

Mr. ROBB: That is not necesary, because it does not affect this at all.

Mr. GARDINER: This is the only opportunity we have of discussing it.

Mr. ROBB: I will not object to my hon. friend discussing it on any other item.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Is my hon. friend sure that the benefit of the excise tax elimination was passed on to the consumer at the time the tax was taken off?

Mr. ROBB: I have the assurance of some of the automobile people.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): It is my firm conviction that, in reality, it was not passed on at that time. I know this would call for a 15 per cent reduction, because the duty was lowered from 35 to 20 per cent. Not long before that time I had been selling cars of a certain make, and I know one firm made a reduction of 10 per cent, leaving 5 per cent of the reduction yet to be made. In the meantime application was made to the Minister of Finance that the excise tax be removed, with the promise that if it were removed, the benefit would be passed on to the purchaser. The excise tax was removed, and shortly afterwards another 5 per cent reduction in the price was made, but to my mind this was virtually the remaining 5 per cent of the 15 per cent reduction, and the benefit of the

excise tax has never been passed on to the consumer, at least by some firms. I am of the firm conviction that is what was done at the time.

Mr. KENNEDY: I think the minister's statement with regard to the matter leaves on the committee the impression that he was not very enthusiastic about it.

Mr. ROBB: Enthusiastic about what?

Mr. KENNEDY: About carrying out the promise that was made in 1926.

Mr. ROBB: We might as well settle the matter now. Perhaps my hon. friend will check up with the hon. member (Mr. Coote) who sits in front of him when I show him the correspondence.

Mr. COOTE: It is true that the minister—

Mr. KENNEDY: Just a minute. This is a question that was very important in the session of 1926, and on which, I may say, the government ran its election in parts of this country. Yet the minister, after two years and after the matter was called to his attention a year ago, can only say: "My recollection is that certain things happened and certain representations were made to me." Surely the matter is one of great importance. I remember something of the lobby that was carried on in this building by the manufacturers and the definite promise that was made to the house. But in a matter that has been so prominently before the house and that has meant so much to the government and to the manufacturers themselves, the members have not a clear explanation to-day as to what was done between the government and the manufacturers, or as to whether the minister's department really carried the thing through to a conclusion or not. This simply illustrates how easily the government has been making promises in regard to the tariff and everything else, and how it has failed to carry them out in any effective degree. It is just another instance of the same thing.

Mr. COOTE: I think the best way for the minister to convince the house of the efforts he has made to see that this promise is carried out would be to give us very frankly all the correspondence which he has had with the automobile manufacturers since the passage of this legislation, and particularly since I brought this matter to his attention a year ago. I first made a statement in regard to the matter when I spoke on the budget last year, on the 6th of March, and I thought that I had made a good case, that I had established at least what the lawyers call a prima facie case. I thought it was then the duty of the minister or of his department, a member of parliament having claimed that the automobile manufacturers had not lived up to the agreement, to look into the matter; but when the budget resolution was being discussed on March 30, over three weeks later, the minister did not seem aware at all that I had made my complaint in that connection, and was not able at the time to give me any reply. He had no information as to whether or not the automobile manufacturers had really been taking advantage of the reduction. He did not know whether the prices I had quoted were correct, and if they were, he did not know if that was proof that the manufacturers had not been living up to the agreement. Now a whole year has passed, and when the correspondence is brought down I think it will be found that the minister has not made any serious effort to find out whether or not the automobile manufacturers were taking any advantage of the elimination of the excise tax. It will be found that the Fort Motor Company, for instance, just to mention one of the companies concerned—and it is the largest manufacturer in Canada of automobiles affected by this change, valued at less than $1,200—has not even replied to the department; there is on file in the department no reply from that company in regard to this matter.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 39, respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Odette.

Bill No. 61, respecting the Lacombe and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Blatchford.

Bill No. 83, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Vallance.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock we were considering item 438b, automobiles for conveying passengers only.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon hon. gentlemen opposite asked for certain correspondence between the Minister of Finance and the Automobile Association. I now lay the correspondence on the table.

Mr. COOTE: I think, Mr. Chairman, it would facilitate the work of the committee if the minister would tell us what is in that correspondence.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend can look at my copy.

Mr. COOTE: I am only anxious that the committee should be made aware of what is in the correspondence. I do not think the item under consideration should be disposed of until the committee are advised by the minister just what action has been taken, and until the committee know whether or not he is aware if the Automobile Association has taken advantage of the reduction of the excise tax or not.

Mr. ROBB: I have their statement. If my hon. friend will send me back the correspondence I will read it into Hansard.

Mr. KENNEDY: Does the correspondence demonstrate whether they did or did not take advantage?

Mr. ROBB: Last session, Mr. Chairman, as correctly stated by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote), he brought to the attention of the house the question of the reduction of the excise tax on automobiles. On April 10, 1928, I wrote to T. A. Russell, president of the Automotive Industries of Canada, the following letter:

My Dear Russell:

I am not sure whether you are president this year of the Automotive Industries of Canada, but as you signed the letter which was given to me on June 5, 1926, and read into Hansard on June 7, on behalf of the industry I am writing you to-day with the request that you bring it to the attention of the proper officers of the association.

With this letter I am enclosing a copy of the Hansard of March 30, and would in particular draw your attention to the debate which started on page 1948 in connection with the Special War Revenue Act.

You will notice that Mr. Gardiner, Mr. Coote and Mr. Fansher took exception to the prices of automobiles in Canada and expressed the opinion that the consumers did not receive the full benefit of the tariff reduction of 1926,

I promised to have the matter looked into, therefore this letter is written.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) James A. Robb.

T. A. Russell,
President,
Automotive Industries of Canada,
Toronto, Ontario.

On the 12th the following letter was received:

Willys-Overland Limited,
Toronto, April 12th, 1928.

Hon. James A. Robb,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Robb:

I have your letter of 10th regarding automobile prices. It came during my absence from the city, hence the delay in acknowledging.

I am taking up the question as you suggest with the officers of Automotive Manufacturers and Exporters Association. Neither our company nor the Ford Motor Company are members, but it is the only organization representative in any way of the manufacturers, and I have asked their secretary to bring the question before their committee. You will also hear from me further with regard to it.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) T. A. Russell,
President.

On the 14th, in reply to that letter I wrote:

Ottawa, April 14th, 1928.

My dear Russell,

I have your letter of the 12th instant and note that you are referring my letter to the officers of the Automotive Manufacturers and Exporters Association. I also note that your company is no longer a member of that association, but as you signed the original letter sent to me in 1926 and as you can undoubtedly speak for your company, I would appreciate if you would let me know, not later than Saturday the 21st of April, what your reply is to the statement made in the House on the 30th of March.

I need not point out to you that it is important that I have this information immediately.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) James A. Robb.

Mr. T. A. Russell,
President,
Willys-Overland Limited,
Toronto 9, Ontario.

On April 18, this letter was written from Walkerville:

The Studebaker Corporation of Canada,
Limited,
Walkerville, Ont., April 18th, 1928.

Hon. James A. Robb,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:

We have noted your letter to Mr. T. A. Russell with reference to the discussion in the House of Commons regarding the prices of automobiles in Canada.

We would call your attention to the fact that the comparison of Canadian and American prices on the Erskine car as written in Hansard March 6th is erroneous. The American price list of the Erskine six is $795.00. The increase of Canadian list over American list is approximately 25 per cent instead of 35 per cent as shown in the record.

We have not qualified for the omission of excise tax on the Erskine car in Canada and

we therefore collect from our dealers the amount of excise tax which we pay to the government.

Yours very truly,
The Studebaker Corporation of Canada, Ltd.
(Signed) D. R. Grossman,
Sales Manager.

On April 21, my secretary acknowledged that letter.

Ottawa, April 21st, 1928.

Dear Mr. Grossman,

I am directed by Mr. Robb to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 18th instant regarding the prices of automobiles in Canada.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) Watson Sellar,
Private Secretary.

Mr. D. R. Grossman,
Sales Manager,
The Studebaker Corporation
of Canada, Ltd.,
Walkerville, Ontario.

On April 24, the Chrysler Corporation of Canada Limited wrote:

Chrysler Corporation of Canada, Limited
Windsor, Ontario,
April 24, 1928.

Hon. James A. Robb,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:

We have before us copy of your letter of April 10th to Mr. T. A. Russell.

In this connection will say when the government discontinued excise tax on cars built in Canada, under $1,200, June 8, 1926, we immediately discontinued collecting from dealers excise tax on such cars in our line as qualified, in accordance with this government regulation, and have not, since that time, collected excise tax on such cars.

It is the policy of our corporation to base our sale price on the cost of production, plus a reasonable percentage of profit, and it will be our policy to continue to do this in the future.

I assure you our records are open for the inspection of your department any time you might wish to check the manner in which we are handling our business; the returns we are getting on capital invested, etc. We would welcome going over these matters in detail at any time with anyone from your department whom you might wish to delegate.

Very truly yours,
(Sgd.) Jno. D. Mansfield,
President—General Manager.

On April 27, I acknowledged that letter.

Ottawa, April 27, 1928.

My Dear Mr. Mansfield:

I have your letter of the 24th instant in connection with the price of automobiles in Canada.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) James A. Robb.

Mr. Jno. D. Mansfield,
President,
Chrysler Corporation of Canada,
Windsor, Ontario.

On April 24, I received the following letter:

General Motors of Canada Limited
Oshawa, Ont.
April 24, 1928.

Honourable J. A. Robb,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Ont.

Honourable Sir:

We have been requested by the Canadian Automobile Manufacturers and Exporters Association to give you a statement relative to the accusation recently made on the floor of the house, to the effect that the automobile manufacturers in Canada were not acting in accordance with Mr. T. A. Russell's letter to you of June 5, 1926.

I wish to positively state that General Motors of Canada, Limited has not only lived up to this agreement, but has gone further than was agreed, and the records of our company which are open for inspection, will substantiate this statement.

Taking the Chevrolet line for example, I would point out to you that prior to June 8, 1926, our mark-up over the United States was as follows:

Roadster	1.30
Coupe	1.30
Landau sedan	1.31
Commercial chassis	1.30
Utility express chassis	1.39
Touring	1.30
Coach	1.30
Sedan	1.29

making an average of 1.31 with the excise tax added with the exception of the commercial and utility express chassis.

Immediately after June 8th, the excise tax was removed and the Canadian mark-up over the United States list remained the same.

At the present time, I would point out to you that the following mark-up over the United States list is in effect.

Mr. BENNETT: What do they mean by "mark-up"?

Mr. ROBB: I imagine it is 1 per cent.

Mr. BENNETT: It cannot be; it must be the scale.

Mr. ROBB:

Roadster	1.26
Coupe	1.24
Sedan	1.23
Imperial Sedan	1.24
Roadster Delivery	1.26
Commercial Chassis	1.26
Utility Express Chassis	1.28
Touring	1.26
Coach	1.26
Cabriolet	1.24

or an average mark-up on the whole list of 1.25 which is just 6 per cent less than the average mark-up used immediately following the removal of the excise tax, so that we have not only kept faith with the government with regard to the use of the excise tax as a protective item, but have reduced our mark-up in addition thereto an average of 6 per cent.

I wish further to call your attention to the fact that the Chevrolet car as produced in

Canada, is not identical with that as produced in the United States, due to many necessary Canadian refinements which increase the value of the Canadian-made article.

Any further details that you may wish in this connection, we will be only too pleased to submit.

Yours very truly,
(signed) H. A. Brown,
Vice President &
General Manager.

HAB/H

This was acknowledged by myself on April 25th:

Ottawa, April 25th, 1928.

My dear Mr. Brown,

I have your letter of the 24th instant with respect to the price of automobiles in Canada.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) James A. Robb.

Mr. H. A. Brown,
Vice-President & General Manager,
General Motors of Canada, Limited,
Oshawa, Ontario.

The following letter was received on May 11, from Dodge Brothers:

Dodge Brothers (Canada) Limited
Toronto

May 11th, 1928.

To the Honourable James A. Robb,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Sir:—Your letter of April 10th, addressed to Mr. T. A. Russell, late president of the "Automotive Industries of Canada" of which we were members, has been forwarded to the writer through the Automotive Manufacturers and Exporters Association, "Automotive Industries" having ceased to function as representative of the associated automotive manufacturers of the Dominion of Canada approximately eighteen months ago.

Apropos of your letter to Mr. Russell, and enclosures therewith and in answer to the query as to whether upon the excise tax being discontinued on cars built in Canada at a price under $1,200, upon June 8, 1926, the purchasers of our product received the benefit of the same, please be advised this company promptly discontinued the collection of excise tax from our selling organization upon such models and types as reached, Canadian content qualification, nor have we since that time collected excise tax upon any vehicle so qualifying. Upon the other hand, it is obviously necessary, in the proper conduct of our business, for us, through the computation of actual manufacturing cost, to arrive at a selling price, plus a reasonable profit, and, upon such a computation the prices of our product are set.

As the writer had the privilege of stating to you personally some little time ago, our records are constantly being reviewed by the officers of, and under the authority of the Department of Customs and Excise, and we are of course prepared to submit at any time to any investigation or review that in your good judgment may be deemed proper.

Yours very truly,
(signed) E. P. Clarkson.

This was acknowledged on May 14:

Ottawa, May 14th, 1928.

Dear Mr. Clarkson,

I am directed by Mr. Robb to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 11th instant with respect to price of automobiles in Canada.

Yours faithfully,
(signed) Watson Sellar,
Private Secretary.

Mr. Ernest P. Clarkson,
Managing-Director,
Dodge Brothers (Canada)) Limited,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. COOTE: It will be noticed from this corespondence which has been read by the minister that no reply has been received from the company of which Mr. Russell was president. Apparently Mr. Russell was the prime mover in this matter in 1926. As the leader of the opposition said at that time, he was very importunate and he finally persuaded the minister to put through this elimination of excise tax for the benefit of the Canadian Automobile Manufacturers' Association. To say the least, I think Mr. Russell's company certainly showed ingratitude towards the minister in not replying to his letter.

With reference to the statement of the Studebaker people I wish to state that the price of an Erskine coach, which was quoted by me in 1928, was an error, and later on in the session on a question of privilege I corrected that statement. I was quoting in good faith from a motor magazine published in the United States, but evidently it was a misprint. With reference to the General Motors Corporation, last year I am reported in Hansard of March 6, as saying:

> I think the prices which I have quoted are ample proof that our automobile manufacturers, with the exception of the Chevrolet people—

That is the General Motors Corporation.

> —are taking advantage of this removal of the excise tax.

In that sentence I intended to exempt General Motors from any charge of taking advantage of this removal. I point out to the minister and to the committee that no reply has been received from the Ford Company of Canada as to this charge. Last year I showed that the price of the Canadian car was 29 per cent in excess of the price of the American car on every model placed on the market by the Ford Company of Canada. There is a reply from the Chrysler people, and certainly anyone who heard the letter read would see that it contains no proof that they are not taking advantage of this remission of the excise tax. They did not give the price of any car they are making, and if they had done so it would have re-

quired quite an explanation to show why their car in Canada should be 29.8 per cent higher in price than the car in the United States.

I have already said that no reply was received from the company of which Mr. Russell is president. Last year I showed that the price of a Whippet coach manufactured by his company was 29.9 per cent higher in Canada than in the United States. As far as this correspondence is concerned I think we may take it that in the cases of the Ford Company of Canada, the Willys-Overland Company and the Chrysler people no proof has been offered that they are not taking advantage of this remission of the excise tax, and it seems to me only fair to ask the minister that he make good the statement which he made in 1926, as follows:

> I serve notice on them now, in the presence of my friends, that if they do not live up to that agreement we will find means of placing them in a position where they will have to do so, or meet competition of the world.

My suggestion to the minister is that he take off the excise tax on cars valued at $1,200 or less, no matter where they are made. That is the only way of assuring the people of Canada that these companies will live up to the promise they made in 1926.

Mr. McGIBBON: Did my hon. friend see the statement by Mr. Campbell of the Ford company a few months ago, in which he said his company lost over $60 on every car they turned out last year?

Mr. COOTE: I did not see that statement, but here I have a statement made to the house by the minister three years ago, when he said these people would have to live up to this promise or he would place them in a position where they would have to meet the competition of the world. I charge that they have not lived up to that promise, and I ask the minister now to tell the house whether he is not convinced that he should remove this excise tax from American-made cars in order to keep the promise he made the house in 1926.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend forgets that according to the statement the majority of these people have lived up to that promise. There is also a question of revenue involved, which has to be looked into carefully. These other companies which he alleged are not living up to the promise are in competition with the companies which have lived up to it, and I am sure the people will not buy these cars if prices are too high.

Mr. COOTE: The minister should not attempt to get out of his promise in that way.

[Mr. Coote.]

He did not say that if certain of the manufacturers lived up to the agreement it would be all right, even though other manufacturers did not do so; he said if they did not all live up to it he would do a certain thing, and I think the house took it for granted that that was what he was going to do.

Mr. STEVENS: That is out of date; that was last year.

Mr. COOTE: No, that was three years ago. Perhaps the Minister of Finance is like some people who, when they get on in years, find their memory of what happened long ago better than their recollection of what happened in the immediate past. I am trying to find in Hansard a statement made by the minister in 1926, when it was suggested to him that if he were going to put this into force he should place in the act a stipulation that if the companies did not live up to the agreement the government would reintroduce the excise tax on Canadian-made cars. At page 4136 of Hansard for 1926 I find that the hon. member for Rosetown asked the following question:

> If we are going to pass this amendment to-night I would like to know if it contains a provision that if at any time it is proved to the satisfaction of the government that this rebate of excise tax is not passed on to the consumer, the tax will at once again be imposed.

The minister's reply was as follows:

> To do that it would be necessary to give the governor in council the right to increase taxation, and that is not good legislation.

It seems to me now that it would have been good legislation.

> We have, however, the right to reduce taxation, and if they do not live up fairly to this agreement we have the right to reduce the excise tax to all the trade of the world.
>
> Mr. Evans: Will that be inserted in the bill?
>
> Mr. Robb: It is not necessary.

I am rather convinced from the answer given a moment ago by the minister that it really was necessary, and perhaps the house was derelict in its duty in not insisting that that be done. I have a high personal regard for the minister, as I had at that time, and from the statement he made that night I believed him to be in earnest in this regard; I thought if these men did not live up to the agreement, as soon as the matter was brought to his attention he would remove the excise tax on imported cars as well. Is not that the impression which anyone would gather from reading the remarks which I have quoted from Hansard? I do not wish unduly to delay the committee on this matter but I think the minister owes it to the committee to state that unless these automobile companies can

absolutely prove, by a comparison of the prices of the different models of their cars in Canada with the prices in the United States, that they are not taking advantage of this excise tax, collecting that tax in actual practice and putting it in their own pockets, the minister should at once remove the excise tax on all cars. The minister stated:

> We have, however, the right to reduce taxation, and if they do not live up fairly to this agreement we have the right to reduce the excise tax to all the trade of the world.

I asked the minister to take this tax off and have the reduction applied to all cars.

Mr. ROBB: I can answer that quickly by saying, no. Cars coming from countries with whom we have no preferential trade agreement pay the excise tax when they are valued under $1,200.

Mr. BENNETT: Is that tax five per cent?

Mr. ROBB: Five per cent where the value is under $1,200 and ten per cent where the value is over $1,200. Any person who buys a high-priced car, one costing five or six thousand dollars, is able to pay the government a little revenue. If the hon. member were to argue that we should consider raising the limit next year, I might consider that, but it is too late to do anything this year. My hon. friend says that a few companies have not lived up to this agreement, and I will tell him that to-morrow morning I am going to send them a letter enclosing a copy of Hansard and demanding an answer. But why should we lose revenue when the great bulk of the trade is living up to the agreement?

Mr. GARDNER: How do you know they are doing that?

Mr. ROBB: They say so, and it has not been contradicted to-night. I am not here in the interests of the countries who do not give Canada any trade concessions; this legislation is very fair and the government of Canada is obtaining a certain revenue from the high-priced cars, and it all goes towards the liquidation of the national debt.

Mr. COOTE: All I am asking the minister to do is to take the excise tax off all cars under $1,200 regardless of whether or not they are made in Canada. My reason for asking that is the statement made by the minister in 1926, when he persuaded the house to pass this amendment which removed the excise tax on cars valued at less than $1,200, and the realization that certain manufacturers have not lived up to that agreement.

Mr. ROBB: A very limited number.

Mr. COOTE: If the cars valued at $1,200 or under which are produced in Canada are not being sold under the proper terms and at the proper price, I would like the minister to explain to the house just what he meant when he said in 1926:

> We have, however, the right to reduce taxation, and if they do not live up fairly to this agreement we have the right to reduce the excise tax to all the trade of the world.
>
> Mr. Evans: Will that be inserted in the bill?
>
> Mr. Robb: It is not necessary.

The house did not consider it was necessary after the Finance minister made that statement. They took it for granted that if the companies mentioned in that letter, and who had given their word to Mr. Russell, authorizing him to write the letter, did not live up to the agreement the minister would place all automobiles valued at less than $1,200 on the same basis. That is the impression which he gave the house. Now he says that as some of the automobile manufacturers have lived up to this agreement, and as he needs this revenue, he is not going to do anything. I suggest that he put them all on the same basis, or that he reinstate the excise tax on Canadian-made as well as on imported cars. If he will not take the tax off all cars valued at less than $1,200, then I suggest that he do that. I now ask the minister if he is willing to put this tax on all cars, whether or not they are made in Canada? That would be an attempt to make good his word given in 1926.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member is asking me to break faith with that part of the automobile industry which is living up to this agreement.

Mr. GARDINER: What proof have you of that?

Mr. ROBB: No one has contradicted that statement.

Mr. GARDINER: You have not given any proof of it.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member must remember that we require revenue.

Mr. GARDINER: Never mind the question of revenue; let us take up the other matter.

Mr. ROBB: When a company is manufacturing, in Oshawa, Ford City, Windsor, Toronto or Regina, cars which come within this regulation, we obtain a certain revenue from the excise tax. If we removed that excise tax we would be placing the manu-

facturer in the foreign country who might not be giving us any concession on our products, on the same basis as those in countries which were. We would be losing that revenue, and we need the revenue.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. minister is becoming more and more Conservative.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I think it has been demonstrated that there has been a certain amount of discourtesy shown to the minister by certain automobile people who did not reply to his letter.

Mr. ROBB: I agree with that.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not want to appear as a defender of any automobile manufacturer, but I would like to put a certain phase of this question before the house. Last year or the year before the Ford company put out a new car. It took them a long time to get this car on the market and they introduced it without knowing just what the car was going to cost them. The Ford company in the United States put a price on the car without knowing what it was going to cost them, and they lost $100,000,000 before they could get into production. For the same reason, the Canadian company lost $5,000,000. Is it any wonder that they did not reply to the letter of the minister? If I had been in their place I would have replied by telling the minister that we had lost money on our product and we were only beginning to make money. They are just getting into production, and it seems to me that that is a valid reason why the Ford company did not reply.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): I would like to know the price of a Ford coupe in the United States and in Canada. I believe in protecting the Canadian manufacturer, but when I pay $740 for a Ford coupe in Canada and I can go across to a town in the United States, which is three times as far from Detroit as my home town is from Ford, Ontario, and find that the same car is sold for $200 less, I begin to wonder what the tariff board are doing. If I were on the tariff board I would want to see that the Canadian purchaser was able to buy that car just as cheaply as the American purchaser. This talk about extra freight is a thing of the past as far as Canada is concerned. We have the right kind of buyers in Canada, because they pay for the articles they purchase. I have worked for different companies long enough to know that they do not lose much money in that way. I would like to know how it is we have to pay $200 more for a Ford car in Canada. What are the tariff board doing about it? If it is not there for the purpose of giving direct information to the Minister of Finance, I think it is an unnecessary expense. The Minister of Finance of this country is to my mind, bigger than any manufacturing institution either in Canada or the United States, and he is here to protect the Canadian purchaser. I am a Canadian purchaser, and I know I have been paying $200 more for a Ford coupe in Canada than the same car could have been purchased for in the United States. What is the reason?

Mr. GARDINER: As regards the information the Minister of Finance is giving to the committee to-night, it would appear from correspondence I have before me that only two of the automobile firms manufacturing cars in Canada have demonstrated that they have lived up to the understanding of 1926. I am very much surprised at the statement of the minister to-night. Let me say frankly, that prior to to-night I had a very high respect for the word of the minister; but after hearing his explanation respecting this matter, I am coming to doubt whether I was justified in having that high regard for him. Would the Minister of Finance, for instance, wish those of us who met him first when this particular question was brought to the committee who were cooperating with the government at that time, to give to the house all the information that was brought out at that meeting and all the promises he then made to see to it that, if this were granted, the companies would live up to their agreement? So far as I am concerned the statement which the minister has made to-night is actually rubbish in comparison with the statement he then made that he would see that those companies did live up to their agreements. At that time we knew, of course, the government needed support, and we were willing to support them on a policy agreed upon between ourselves. A good deal has been said in different parts of the country as to that agreement between the government and ourselves, but I am free to say that with the exception of this one proposition, the government have lived up to each and every item we agreed to. But the minister to-night has not given the committee one iota of information that would give us even the suggestion of an idea that he had tried to see to it that these companies lived up to their agreement as outlined in a letter by Russell. Is this all the minister has done in the matter—merely write to Russell: when he receives a reply, let it go at that, and, when the committee asks for information, blandly say: "The government needs revenue"? The minister's word is of

more importance to the house than the revenue is to the country. I do not want to see this item pass until we get some definite promise from the minister that he will keep his word, will keep the promise he gave and which we honestly believed he would live up to when he first brought that proposal before the committee which was working with the government in that cooperative arrangement.

Mr. ROBB: I can only repeat to my hon. friend that the evidence goes to show that I have kept my word. I have written to them all.

Mr. GARDINER: Is that all the minister has done?

Mr. ROBB: That is all.

Mr. GARDINER: That is nothing.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member for North Wellington has made a statement. I have heard it many times around the country, and perhaps there is something in it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does the minister not think he ought to find out?

Mr. ROBB: Well, we have a statement of a man who knows something about the business. He has not indicated that the charges are wrong. I repeat, that generally speaking, it goes to show that the prices have been fair; that the manufacturers have not been taking advantage of the 5 per cent.

Mr. COOTE: I think the evidence is almost beyond dispute. I have not been able to get the prices of Ford cars this year. I have not seen the Canadian price of a Ford car at the factory in any advertisement this year. It almost seems as if the Ford Company were very careful now not to advertise the factory price of their car, that is, without the sales and excise taxes added. But these are the prices of a year ago, and they have not been disputed. I gave them on March 6, 1928. The United States price which I shall quote, was taken from a motor magazine published in the United States, giving the factory price of every model of every make of car in the United States. There is no similar magazine in Canada that I have been able to find, and the Canadian prices were all taken from advertisements in Canadian publications. They are the prices without any taxes added in either case so that the prices in the two countries are comparable.

	Canadian price	United States price	Increase	Percentage of increase
Ford roadster .	$495	$385	$110	28.6

The tariff on these cars is 20 per cent. If it were not for the fact that there is no excise payable on the Canadian-made car, the Ford company would not think of having their price more than 25 per cent higher in Canada than in the United States, because if they did, people living near the border would go to the United States, drive the car across and bring it in cheaper. But as the minister remitted the excise tax on the Canadian-made car and did not remit it on the United States-made car, the Ford company have in effect a protection of 25 per cent. In addition to that there used to be in the United States an excise tax of 3 per cent which, when there was added the cost of securing a license in the United States in order that the car could be driven out, gave them really a protection close to 30 per cent. I have already quoted the increase in the Canadian price over the United States price of a Ford roadster. The other prices are as follows:

	Canadian price	United States price	Increase	Percentage of increase
Ford coupe . .	$510	$395	$115	29.1
Ford tudor . .	640	495	145	29.3
Ford fordor . .	740	570	170	29.8
Sport coupe . .	710	550	160	29.

If they were not taking advantage of the remission of the excise tax, how could the price of these cars in Canada in every case but one be more than 29 per cent higher? Neither the Ford company nor the Minister of Finance can convince this committee that there is any practical difference between a Ford car manufactured in Detroit, Michigan, and one manufactured in Ford, Ontario. They are practically the same car. How can the minister have the nerve to tell the committee that the largest manufacturer of low-priced cars in Canada has not been taking advantage of this? If he has to admit that they have been taking advantage—and I do not know how he can deny it—how can he square himself with this house? Here is his statement in 1926; I will read it again:

> We have, however, the right to reduce taxation, and if they do not live up fairly to this agreement we have the right to reduce the excise tax to all the trade of the world.
>
> Mr. Evans: Will that be inserted in the bill?
>
> Mr. Robb: It is not necessary.

May I say that I regret very deeply that at that time I as one member of this house did not insist that that should be put in the bill. I did not think it was necessary because I had a very high regard for the Minister of Finance and thought that his word,

"It is not necessary," could be taken in effect as a promise to this house that he would reduce the tax on the other cars if they did not keep their agreement. I am not asking him to take the excise tax off all cars. I have never suggested that, never even thought of suggesting it. All I want him to to do is to place cars valued at less than $1,200 coming from any country whatever on the same basis as cars made in Canada. The reason I am asking for it is because these manufacturers have shown that they are not entitled to the consideration they got in 1926. The man who was chiefly instrumental in persuading the minister to bring in this reduction is or was the president of one of the companies concerned, and he had not the courtesy to see that his company replied to the query of the Minister of Finance as to whether they were living up to this agreement.

I have often heard since I have been in this house the statement made from the government benches: This government has too much dignity to do this or to do that. But how much dignity has the government, I would ask, in a case like this, where the Ford Motor Company and the company of which Mr. Russell is president have not the courtesy to reply to the query addressed to them by the minister?

The Finance minister a year ago promised to take note of all the remarks that we made then regarding this tax, and to take the matter up with the companies concerned and see if they were living up to their agreement. He has brought down the correspondence to-night, but he has given absolutely no proof that the majority of the companies are living up to the agreement. It seems to me that the weight of proof is all against the companies except in the case of General Motors and the Studebaker company. A year ago I exempted General Motors from this charge, and later on, when I had secured correct information, I withdrew my statement so far as the Studebaker people were concerned. But not one of these other companies, even those that replied to the minister's query has offered any proof that it is not taking full advantage of the remission of the excise tax on their cars.

Again I ask the minister, what is he going to do about it? Is he going to make good his word given to the house in 1926? That is really more important to this house, as the hon. member for Acadia said, than the amount of money that is collected on these cars valued at less than $1,200 coming from other countries. So far as the loss of revenue is concerned, I think perhaps it would be good policy to take off this excise tax anyway. Cars to-day, especially the cheap cars, are a necessity, and I do not see any reason why they should be singled out for an excise tax. What other necessity that is in daily use in Canada is placed under the burden of an excise tax? Nothing that I know of. I do not think the minister has any justification for keeping that excise tax on, and if we ever had a good demonstration that the Minister of Finance is at heart just as good a protectionist as there is in the house it seems to me that we have had it to-night.

Mr. EVANS: I can well remember the promise which the minister gave in reply to a question I asked him when this matter was under consideration three years ago. To-night we are face to face with another instance such as I described yesterday where the manufacturer gets all the benefit of a tax reduction and the burden is put on the consumer. I do not know why public men at the head of affairs here should practically prostitute their reputations in making promises like this which are never meant to be kept. It is rather hard to say these things, but we are simply bringing the public life of this country down to a system of bargaining, and something worse, sometimes. It has been plainly shown that the manufacturers have not lived up to the promise given to the minister when this tax was taken off, and I think it is up to the minister himself and his colleagues either to replace the tax or see that the benefit is passed on to the consumer.

As to the statement made here to-night that certain companies are not making profits, I have in my hand the Financial Times for April 5 last, and I find that for the first quarter of 1929 up to March 31, the Canadian Ford Company made profits amounting to $2,954,000, made up as follows: January, $810,000; February, $944,000; March $1,200,000. That undoubtedly goes to show that undue profits are being made by these companies. Surely now we can expect either that this excise tax will be replaced for the sake of getting more revenue, and the necessaries of life relieved of some of the taxation placed on them, or that the government will see to it that these manufacturers live up to the promise they made.

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, we have an extraordinary situation here. In 1926 certain taxes were remitted or cancelled with regard to automobiles. Some members of this house were afraid at the time that the manufacturers would take advantage of that remission and not give the consumer the

benefit. The Minister of Finance promised this house that if they did not give the consumer the benefit, he would see that they were put up against the competition of the world. A year afterwards the matter was again brought up in this house, and an hon. member drew the attention of the Minister of Finance to his promise. The result was that the minister got into communication with the automobile manufacturers and asked them if they had failed to carry out their promise to him. Some of the manufacturers have replied, but in most cases they have given no proof that they have not charged the consumer to the hilt, or that they have passed on to the consumer the benefit of the reduction. Some manufacturers have not even had the decency to reply. The Finance minister to-night says that most of them have replied, but some have not, he admits. The Minister of Finance is the last person in this country who ought to be ignored in the matter of correspondence, and I cannot understand why he and the officials of his department did not go after representatives of these companies who had neglected to reply. It seems extraordinary to me. Again, the Finance minister says: "Oh, well, some of these companies, according to their own statements, have come across and given the consumer the benefit, but I admit that a percentage have not." He might just as well say: Ninety per cent of the people of this country are perfectly honest and not ten per cent are rogues, but let them go anyway because ninety per cent are all right. I cannot understand the attitude of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. McGIBBON: If I understand the position correctly, all export trade is exempt from this tax, is it not?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. McGIBBON: Also exports from countries with which we have trade agreements?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. McGIBBON: Then how can the minister arrive at the Canadian content of a car?

Mr. ROBB: That is administered through the Department of National Revenue. Their auditors go to the companies and audit their books and accounts. That system is required to establish not only the basis of the Canadian content, but also for export purposes.

Mr. McGIBBON: How does the minister arrive at the content of the domestic car in Canada, when the export and the domestic trade must be considered as one?

Mr. ROBB: It is done through the Department of National Revenue, who have officers making an audit from time to time. Let me say to my hon. friend that some of these companies are not qualifying for export business, because they do not come up to the requirements. Most countries now require that there should be a certain percentage of content of the country of origin in all imported cars.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister does not answer my question. I do not want to know the channel through which the work is done, I want to know what those officers of the Department of National Revenue do.

Mr. ROBB: I cannot tell my hon. friend that. I will have to ask my colleague, the Minister of National Revenue, when he is in his seat.

Mr. McGIBBON: Will the minister be good enough to give us that information before the item is passed?

Mr. ROBB: What has that to do with the passing of this item?

Mr. McGIBBON: I think it has a lot to do with it. How do you strike the average of the different cars? For instance, take General Motors; they have a number of low-priced cars under $1,200. Does the surplus Canadian content of one type of car go to reduce what I might call the lack of surplus Canadian content in the other?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend will have to get that information from the Minister of National Revenue, who administers the act.

Mr. BENNETT: I cannot agree with the hon. minister. He has told the house that this is a matter of revenue. I have listened with great attention to what he has been saying this evening, and while he has been treated with great disrespect and discourtesy by the failure of some of the motor companies to answer his letters, when he was making that statement I could not but recall the dramatic stand he took, how he "stood by his guns" down in the theatre before those thousands of Oshawa working men who descended on Ottawa and told them what he was not going to do. Now the hon. member for Macleod has exploded the whole affair by showing that the protection is really 25 per cent. My hon. friends to my left rather belittled us

when we endeavoured to make that clear at the time, but I felt perfectly certain that in the end they would realize that what we had said was sound.

But there is another matter of importance The minister said that these machines were not subject to excise tax if valued at less than $1,200, and imported from Britain or from other countries and containing fifty per cent of the labour of those countries. My hon. friend from Muskoka asked how that content was arrived at. I think we should know. I am satisfied that if the Minister of Finance will look up his portfolio he will find the information, briefed as he is by the officers of his department, having in fact sitting by him the most distinguished and the most experienced tariff officer in the government service, and so essential to the life of the ministry itself that it cannot get along without him. I am sure if the minister will ask that officer he will tell him whether the content is computed on each car, on an average, or how. We want to know in order to determine how the revenues of this country are arrived at.

Mr. ROBB: That is a reasonable request, but the information must come from my colleague who administers the act, the Minister of National Revenue.

Mr. BENNETT: Why?

Mr. ROBB: I will let the item stand until he is in his seat to give the information. Incidentally I may point out that we have received on cars that have come in under this provision excise taxes amounting to $862,241.90.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the drawback? That would interest me greatly.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 438b stands.

Mr. COOTE: May I ask the minister when this item is likely to come up again, and if in the meantime he will get some real proof for the house that the manufacturers have not been taking advantage of this reduction? If he cannot do that I think it would be only fair to suggest to him that we expect him to take the tax off these cars.

Mr. ROBB: I submit to my hon. friend that it is up to him to prove the manufacturers have been taking advantage of the reduction.

Mr. GARDINER: No. The minister is the person who made the suggestion to this house, and it is up to him to prove that the manufacturers are carrying out their agreement. There is no question about that.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend made the same speech last session or the sesion before, I do not recall which, when he paid me a similar compliment.

Mr. BENNETT: I would not call them "compliments" to-night.

Mr. ROBB: We both come from the same part of the country and I do not suppose these little brushes will hurt us. I am prepared to do my part. As I said a few moments ago, I shall write these companies to-morrow, with copies of Hansard.

Mr. BENNETT: Telegraph them to-night.

Mr. ROBB: But I submit my hon. friends have not submitted proof that the companies are not living up to their agreement.

Mr. COOTE: Then I should like to know what kind of proof the minister would like me to bring forward. If I bring proof that cars are sold in Canada at a price 29 per cent higher than similar cars are sold for in the United States, what more proof does he want?

Mr. ROBB: I will have that submitted to the officers to check up, because last session my hon. friend gave figures which he had to correct some weeks afterwards.

Mr. COOTE: On one car only, and as soon as I found that figure was incorrect, on a question of privilege I promptly put the matter right. But the minister has admitted that two of these companies have not even had the courtesy to reply to his letter, and the other companies, outside of General Motors—and they were not accused of breaking the agreement—have not offered any proof at all.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I think Studebaker does.

Mr. COOTE: Here is a letter from the Chrysler Corporation of Canada. A year ago I showed that the Chrysler two-door sedan sold at 31.3 per cent higher in Canada than in the States, and the Chrysler coupe at 29.8 per cent higher. When the Hansard containing that statement was sent to the Chrysler Corporation they replied:

> In this connection will say when the government discontinued excise tax on cars built in Canada under $1,200 June 8, 1926, we immediately discontinued collecting from dealers the excise tax on such cars in our line as qualified, in accordance with this government regulation, and have not since that time collected excise tax on such cars.

Of course, we do not suppose they would collect that tax.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. COOTE: No one accuses them of doing it.

It is the policy of our corporation to base our sale price on the cost of production, plus a reasonable percentage of profit, and it will be our policy to continue to do this in future.

There is no proof there that they have lived up to the agreement.

I assure you our records are open for the inspection of your department any time you might wish to check the manner in which we are handling our business; the returns we are getting on capital invested, etc. We would welcome going over these matters in detail at any time with anyone from your department whom you might wish to delegate.

The minister got this letter on April 24, 1928, almost a year ago. The question which naturally arises in my mind is, when did he go to this company and discuss these matters with them, or did he send someone up there to look into the records? The company suggest it in this letter. The minister says it is up to us to bring proof that the companies are not living up to this agreement. Will he delegate to those of us, who are complaining about this, authority to go into the books of the motor corporations and receive proof that they are living up to this agreement that they made three years ago? The minister is surely going too far when he suggests that it is up to us to bring proof that the companies are not living up to the agreement. The suggestion is made in the letter of the corporation that some of the officers of his department should go there and prove it, and if that is not done the representatives of this company should be compelled to come to Ottawa and submit proof to the minister that they are not taking advantage of the removal of this tax; in other words, that they are living up to the agreement which the minister himself assured the house they would be compelled to observe. I suggest that before the minister comes back and asks us to pass this item, under which it seems we have the only chance to discuss the matter, he should offer us more proof than has been produced to-night.

Mr. ROBB: Let the item stand.

Item stands.

Customs tariff—442. Printing presses, lithographic presses, and type making accessories therefor, also machines specially designed for ruling, folding, binding, embossing, creasing or cutting paper or cardboard, sheet feeding machines, extension deliveries, when for use exclusively by printers, by bookbinders and by manufacturers of articles made from paper or cardboard—including parts thereof composed wholly or in part of iron, steel, brass or wood; machinery and complete parts thereof for printing by photographic methods on plates for use on lithographic and offset presses; stereotypers' and typesetters' blankets or blanketing and press blankets or blanketing used on printing presses, of a class or kind not made in Canada: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 5 per cent; general tariff, 10 per cent.

Mr. ROBB: In the budget of 1928 a reduction in duty was made on stereotypes, type casting blankets and press blankets used on rotary printing presses, not made in Canada. It has been pointed out by the Canadian Daily Newspaper Association that the reduction thus afforded is not applicable to those publishers who continue to use the so-called flat bed press. The proposed amendment will make the reduction of last year apply to press blankets used on any printing press; and it goes further, in that it permits the importation of such press blanketing in roll or pieces. The imports for six months, 1928-29, amount to $32,000. Extension sets being an essential part of the press, they have been included in the item.

Mr. FRASER: I have picked up the information that this change has already gone into effect through a departmental ruling. Is that the practice of the department, and is this only to confirm such ruling?

Mr. ROBB: I suppose it might have been done the day after the budget was delivered.

Mr. FRASER: I am not talking about the day after the budget was delivered, but before. Is this a departmental ruling that has been in force for some time and which it is now being sought to make statutory?

Mr. ROBB: I had not heard of that. This was really the intention last year when the amendments were made, but I understand that it was ruled that under the act it would not be quite right, and this amendment was asked for.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has the department been levying duty on the item in the meantime?

Mr. ROBB: I could not tell you.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Cannot the minister find out?

Mr. ROBB: The information given by my hon. friend from Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) is new to me.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We all know. Is there any way of finding out? The hon. member for Cariboo says that he is informed that there was a departmental ruling allowing these items to come in free. It was not of statutory right; nor, I assume, was there any right to make the departmental ruling.

Mr. BENNETT: Was there not an order in council reducing the taxation?

Mr. ROBB: No. The commissioner tells me that the customs advise that they have been charging duty, and the Canadian Daily Newspaper Association have asked for this, alleging that they were being charged.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—448. Spraying machines, fruit or vegetable grading machines, apparatus specially designed for sterilizing bulbs, pressure testing apparatus for determining maturity of fruit; incubators for hatching eggs, brooders for rearing young fowl, pruning hooks, pruning shears, hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm or field rollers, post hole diggers, snaths, milking machines, milking machine attachments; centrifugal machines for testing butter fat, milk or cream; pasteurizers for dairying purposes; equipment for generating electric power for farm purposes only, viz: engine, generator, storage battery and switchboard; stumping machines, and other agricultural implements, n.o.p.; and complete parts of articles specified in this tariff item: British preferential tariff, 5 per cent; intermediate tariff, 10 per cent; general tariff, 10 per cent.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): In the latter part of this item reference is made to "other agricultural implements, n.o.p.; and complete parts of articles specified in this tariff item." What agricultural implements come under this particular head?

Mr. ROBB: I suppose, any others not mentioned; there may be a number. The memorandum I have on this item indicates that it is proposed to amend the present schedule to cover apparatus for sterilizing bulbs, and apparatus for determining the maturity of fruit, in accordance with applications made by the Canadian Horticultural Council. The sterilizing of bulbs consists in the removal of fungus diseases from bulbs and this apparatus is used by bulb growers on the Pacific coast. It is not made in Canada, being imported chiefly from the United Kingdom. The imports are not ascertainable. Fruit pressure testing apparatus is a device used by fruit inspectors. It is imported from the United States and, according to the evidence given at the public hearing, it is not manufactured in Canada. It enters under item 437. The imports are not ascertainable. The inclusion of fruit pressure testing apparatus in 448 necessitates the addition of an n.o.p. clause in the item under which it has been entering, namely, 437. This latter item is otherwise unchanged.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is this the machine the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) is going to use to spray his motor with?

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): The minister has not answered my question. I want to know what agricultural implements come in under the latter provision of this item, "and other agricultural implements, n.o.p.; and complete parts of articles specified in this tariff item." The machine which is called the harvester and which is now known as the combine is being extensively used in western Canada, and comes in at 10 per cent. That is my information from the department.

Mr. ROBB: This n.o.p. provision is the only item it can come under. My hon. friend has discussed the matter with me and, frankly, I am in sympathy with his point of view. But in the first discussion he did not give me to understand that he also included the motor. But the motor being included, as well as the thresher and the reaper, the matter becomes rather complicated. I have therefore asked the tariff board to investigate my hon. friend's inquiry.

Mr. BENNETT: That is a good way to put it off.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Probably I have received a little more information since the interview I had with the minister. I would ask him to turn to item 445, which relates to mowing machines and harvesters, self-binding or without binders. It is not necessary to read the item at length. It is free under the British preferential tariff, while under the intermediate and the general it is 6 per cent. This whole item was changed in 1924 to cover all harvesting machinery used in Canada. Going into the records with the Commissioner of Customs, I find that this word "harvester" was introduced back in 1897, when some American farmers who were operating in the southern part of the prairies near the Montana border brought over a harvester which was manufactured in California and which at that time was called the harvester. These are not new machines. They have been operating for forty-two years in some sections of the United States, and recently we have found that we can operate them successfully in western Canada. The designation "harvester, without binder" no doubt means the harvester without binding attachment. When this change was made in 1897 it referred to what we now nickname the "combine." There is no doubt that this machine has been wrongly classified; it should come in under item 445. There should be no difficulty in classifying it under that item just because some new implement company calls it a reaper-thresher in order to have something a little different from other companies;

that is no reason why this machine should be penalized 4 per cent as compared with other harvesting machinery. Item 447b relates to threshing machines, and the ordinary threshing separator has no motor attached to it. In western Canada to-day we can buy a motor which will operate any threshing machine with a cylinder up to 36 inches for less than $1,200, and that motor enters duty free. Here is the motor in a tractor coming in duty free, while a motor of the same horse-power attached to this particular machine pays a duty of 10 per cent. Right now, while this is before the committee, I think the minister should take steps to have any misconception cleared up with regard to the interpretation of this section. It is true that representations have been made that this machine should enter under the 10 per cent rate because it is partly a thresher, but if I took the necessary time I could show that part of the threshing machine is a fanning mill, some of the wheels belong to some other machine, and so on. This classification is not in keeping with the revision of the tariff in 1924, and I hope the minister will take this into consideration.

I might quote a few figures to show what this will mean to us in the west. As farmers in western Canada we must keep 100 per cent efficient or we cannot make a profit, and this is one of the machines we are compelled to use for economic reasons. In recent years our help has not been up to the standard of previous years; to-day we cannot get a threshing crew as competent as the crews we had ten years ago; they are also more expensive, so we are compelled to use this machine. Last year the use of these machines increased 611 per cent as compared with 1927; 3,657 of them entered Canada, some of them costing as much as $4,000. If we calculate from the increase in these machines in the last two years, a duty of 4 per cent means a tax of about $1,000,000 on the farmers of the prairie provinces for 1929, and possibly that will amount to $1,500,000. Of course that adds to the revenue of the country but it comes out of the pockets of the producers, who can least afford to pay it. I would like the minister to tell us to-night that from now on this machine, which is not specifically classified as a combine, will be classified as a harvester, which fully describes it.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend has pointed out the difficulty that it is also classified as a thresher. I asked the Department of National Revenue why this higher rate of duty was imposed, and they referred me to the Customs Act which says that when two rates of duty are applicable the higher rate must prevail. I can only repeat that I have already referred this matter to the tariff board for inquiry and I think they understand that I want to be able to make representations to the government in time to have the matter considered next session. My hon. friend knows that we cannot make these changes rapidly, and he has also said that the motor comes in free already.

Mr. BENNETT: No; it pays 10 per cent.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): The motor pays 10 per cent, but that is not the point. The thresher-separator, which comes in under a duty of 10 per cent under section 60 of the Customs Act, is a unit by itself, with no motor attached. The motor which operates that separator, which motor may be in a tractor, comes in free. If we took the motor out of the tractor and attached it to the harvester it would pay a duty of 10 per cent, and that is a wide discrepancy. When the word "harvester" was put in the act in 1897 it covered this particular machine, although of course it has been improved since that time. In the olden days the machine derived its power from a ground wheel, or what we call a bull wheel; there was no motor attached to the machine. However, the machine has been improved; a motor has been attached to it and that motor enters under a duty of 10 per cent, although when the same motor is built into a tractor it comes in duty free.

Mr. BENNETT: I am glad the Minister of National Revenue is in his seat. My friend the Minister of Finance is always asserting to hon. gentlemen to my left his desire to reduce the tariff. Rightly or wrongly a Conservative administration took off the duty on tractors and in 1924, as has been pointed out, the government reduced the duty on farm implements. This particular machine now known as a combine is more accurately described as a harvester; that describes it better than any other word in the English language, because it is a harvester in the true sense of the word. Not only does it cut the grain; it threshes the grain and finishes the job. With this machine you cut the stalks, thresh the heads and as a result of that operation you have the kernels of wheat clean and finished. I first saw one of these machines in Oregon some thirty-one years ago this fall; it was then being pulled by twelve horses, I think.

Mr. STEVENS: Was it not twenty horses?

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend thinks it was twenty horses, but my memory is that it was pulled by about twelve. Great improvements have been made since that time. I asked what the machine was and I was told

that it was a harvester which cut the heads, leaving quite a stand of straw, threshed them, bagged the grain and finished the operation completely.

So I put it to the minister if this is not what he is trying to do: He is trying to get protection by a classification which is at variance with the English language; he is trying to protect his friends by not classifying this machine as a harvester. He is simply using a classification which avoids a word he knows would give offence to his friends behind him—"protection". He says, "We are going to charge 10 per cent on this harvester because it is a combination of many machines, which makes it in every sense a harvester."

Mr. EULER: I am sorry I was not here at the commencement of this discussion, but I would like to know what the Minister of National Revenue is being accused of.

Mr. BENNETT: According to his colleague, the Minister of Finance, this machine is not classified as a harvester, because as a harvester it would come in under a 6 per cent duty under item 445. In order to afford protection they classify it under another item because there is a motor and something else connected with it. It has to pay 10 per cent because they say it is a threshing machine.

Mr. EULER: Exactly.

Mr. BENNETT: Is it a threshing machine?

Mr. EULER: It is a part of a threshing machine.

Mr. BENNETT: Is it a reaper? It is a combination of both, and therefore a complete harvester. In order to afford protection to their friends, and not having the courage to do it by means of a statute, they apply this classification, and do this violence to the English language. I see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) smiling.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Let us do away with all that protection.

Mr. BENNETT: Let us all go to Geneva; here are no threshing machines there.

Mr. ROBB: Does the hon. leader of the opposition recommend a lower rate?

Mr. BENNETT: I expected that question, but you are a little late. Why does not the hon. minister say, "Will you reduce it or increase it?" It is the old story; neither the Minister of Finance nor his government has the courage to face the situation, and they dodge behind every available excuse in order to make these gentlemen believe it is not a harvester because it has a motor in it. They say it has a threshing machine in it, and also a reaper in it. Of course, it is the combination of all those things which makes it a harvester. If the Minister of Finance looked at one how would he describe it? He would say, "That is a harvester." Would he say it is a thresher? He would not. Would he say it is a reaper? He would not. Would he say it is a motor car? He would not. He would say, "It is a harvester," and so would the Minister of National Revenue.

Mr. EULER: I would say nothing of the kind.

Mr. BENNETT: Because he had ruled the other way, but if he let his intelligence guide him, he would say, "It is a harvester." If he looked at a printing press in his office, which folded the paper, where an older press did not fold the paper, would he call it a printing press or a folder? Of course he would not call it a folder, nor would he call it a dynamo if it were run by electrictiy. I cannot imagine more violence being done to one's sense of what you might call consistency in the use of the English language. Suppose you go downstairs and look at the dynamo there; you would see there is a belt, brushes and various other things on it. But you would not describe it as a brush, as a turbine or as a belt; you would describe it as a dynamo. My hon. friends get up here and say, "This is not a harvester; this has a motor in it." If the Minister of Justice were not involved in this matter as a colleague of the minister I would leave it to him to say whether a combination of a thresher, a reaper and a motor would not make a complete harvester.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think I will find that out.

Mr. BENNETT: I think he would find with me.

Mr. ROBB: For the first time this week the House of Commons appears to be unanimous. Practically ever since the budget was brought down I have been urged by my friends around me to have this item reclassified so that these new machines could come in under the lower rate of duty. I have been urged by the hon. gentlemen opposite to do the same thing. We have taken it up with the Department of National Revenue, and although that department was willing to meet the wishes of all concerned, they were confronted by a section which has been in the act since 1907. Section 59 of the act reads as follows:

If any non-enumerated article equally resembles two or more enumerated articles on

which different rates of duty are chargeable, the duty on such non-enumerated article shall be the same as that on the enumerated article which it resembles, paying the highest duty.

They claimed that under that section they were compelled to charge the highest duty.

Mr. STEVENS: It is enumerated under 445.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friends are all in favour of having the duty reduced, so I will ask that the item stand and I will give the officers instructions to amend this act. It cannot be done just by putting in the word "combine"; we must take it out of the classification it is in.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Is there any machine coming in under item 445 which is designated as a harvester, or is there any machine which more clearly fills the bill than that which has the nickname of "combine"?

Mr. ROBB: I will have to direct that question to the Department of National Revenue, and they probably will be in a position to answer it to-morrow.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps this hybrid machine was mixed up with the hybrid ticket.

Mr. EULER: I regret that I was not present during the discussion, but I heard enough from the hon. leader of the opposition to be rather surprised at the language he used in attributing certain things to me, and even presuming to read my thoughts.

Mr. BENNETT: Impossible.

Mr. EULER: I will agree with him there. I do not pretend to be an expert in interpreting the word "harvester". During the course of the investigation into the Customs department, held some time ago, the minister was criticized for taking upon himself the powers which should be exercised by the heads of the departments. This matter came up through the representations of the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Fansher). I am in sympathy with what he would like to have done, and I do not see any reason why a combine should be treated any differently from any other piece of agricultural machinery. The matter was presented to the Commissioner of Customs, who pointed out that it was not a harvester in the strict sense of the interpretation of that word, because it was a combination of two different machines. In that case, as the Minister of Finance has pointed out, you must take the higher rate as applying.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister tell us what is meant in item 445 by these words:

Mowing machines, harvesters, self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers, and complete parts thereof.

What is meant by the word "harvesters"? It certainly is not a self-binding reaper.

Mr. EULER: For example, the old reaper was called a harvester.

Mr. STEVENS: The word "reapers" is here.

Mr. EULER: I do not pretend to be an expert on the nomenclature of agricultural machinery, but there are machines which are used in the business of agriculture and known as harvesters, and that description does not necessarily apply to a machine which is a combination of two other machines.

Mr. STEVENS: What are they?

Mr. EULER: A binder is a harvester.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is quibbling, absolutely. The word "reaper" is mentioned: the self-binder harvester is mentioned, but still the word "harvester" stands alone.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): It is a harvester without a self-binder.

Mr. STEVENS: What is a harvester without a self-binder?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): A reaper.

Mr. STEVENS: The reaper is mentioned. The harvester is a machine that, to my knowledge, has been used in Oregon, Washington, California, for twenty-five years.

Mr. EULER: I think I have the floor.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, but I asked the minister if he would interpret that word, and he cannot.

Mr. EULER: If there is a difference of opinion in this committee in regard to agricultural machinery, we are not experts with the exception of my hon. friends across the floor to the right, and some on this side; but I will concede that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, the leader of the opposition and myself are not experts in naming agricultural machinery. I admit I am not. When the question is one of the interpretation of a tariff item, I am quite willing to leave the interpretation pretty much to those who are particularly charged with that duty.

Mr. STEVENS: And they say that it comes under that item. My hon. friend is arguing about that and pleading with the minister.

Mr. EULER: I am referring to the officers of the department. They are tariff experts, and they make a pretty close examination of everything they propose to do. To make a long story short, I took the matter up with Mr. Breadner and he made exactly the same explanation as that given by the Minister of Finance. It is the combination of two machines, and in that case you have to take the higher rate of duty on threshing machines which is 10 per cent. I see no reason in the world why the tariff should not be altered so that that will come under the same rate of tariff as that on all other agricultural machinery. I do not wish to make any suggestion that might not meet with the approval of the Minister of Finance, as this is particularly within his province, but in order to prevent any danger of misinterpretation, any misunderstanding, if in the opinion of some of the hon. members this is a harvester—and the Commissioner of Customs says it is not a harvester, that it is a combine, that there is a thresher included with it—I make this suggestion: why cannot we describe it as a combine and put it in that item?

Mr. STEVENS: Why not?

Mr. EULER: The house seems to be agreeable to doing that.

Mr. FRASER: Why was that not done when the tariff was being arranged?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): These machines were not being imported then.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): If the minister is going on the assumption that it is part of two machines, I will tell him that it is part of more than two machines: it is part of four machines and one of the parts enters free.

Mr. EULER: That simply accentuates what I have already said. It makes it all the more doubtful what this hybrid machine is, and it may be more properly described by an amendment to the tariff. If I may say this without offence, I resent suggestions made by the leader of the opposition that there is some ulterior motive. The question is merely one of the interpretation of these words by officers of the department, and the Minister of National Revenue did not dictate in any way nor have any ulterior motive in the matter. I think the hon. member is doing me an injustice when he says that it was purely a bit of politics.

[Mr. Euler.]

Mr. BENNETT: I assure the hon. member that I had no desire to arouse the latent ire of the Minister of National Revenue. I merely suggested that the government was responsible for accepting this form of classification, and I would not have been so insistent upon that, had it not been for the explanations given by his colleague the Minister of Finance. If any injury has been done to the feelings of the Minister of National Revenue—

Mr. EULER: I did not take it very seriously.

Mr. BENNETT:—I assure him that it is entirely attributable to what his colleague said in explanation, because if the government so classifies it, then obviously the tax is one imposed by the government on that classification and the authority for the tax is based upon that classification. I sent for Murray's dictionary to find out what was meant by the word "harvester" and he says that the word "harvester" means:

> A reaping machine; especially one which also binds up the sheaves. Also, a machine for gathering in any particular crop, as a cane harvester. Harvester cutter, one of the section knives of a harvester.

And so on.

An hon. MEMBER: Does the dictionary mention in any place that it is also a thresher?

Mr. BENNETT: A machine that gathers in the crop.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Into the mill.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Weyburn has the brilliant idea that the harvester is a wagon. That adds greatly to the gaiety of nations. I am sure the minister will say the Commissioner of Customs has not had any more experience in dealing with classifications of this kind than anyone else, and we all know that if there is any doubt, the revenue is to be favoured; that is, the higher rate of duty shall prevail. But in this case no one has yet answered the question if it is not a harvester, what is it?

Mr. EULER: It is a combine.

Mr. BENNETT: A combine of what?

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Many combines include swathers that leave the heads on the ground. Then the thresher comes along with a pick-up attachment, picks it up off the ground, puts it into the threshing machine and turns it out on the other side.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am afraid the hon. member is not correct. The combine in the proper sense of the word does not leave the heads scattered on the ground. The swather does it.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): That is exactly what I said.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But the swather is not a part of the combine. A swather is a different development which I have seen running separately with a tractor. The swather used in the west in many parts runs altogether independently of the combine.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Certainly.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The combine comes along and picks the swathe up and threshes it.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): That is a pick-up.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would suggest, if there is any complaint about the name, it be called a combine-harvester, and you have the whole thing.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): I think the machine is advertised as a combine-harvester and thresher.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Many different names have been used in the last four years. The word "harvester", when it was first put into the schedule in 1897, was to cover exactly the same machine that is now designated.

Mr. EULER: How does the hon. member know that?

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): I got that information in the department. We went back into the records to find out when this was designated and for what purpose. There was no such machine as this.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Certainly there was.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): When this item is up again, will the hon. member be good enough to let us know the number of machines that are being imported or being designated under item 445 as harvesters? They are especially mentioned. I do not want to argue this again, but I want to draw the matter to his attention in order to clear it up. Mowing machines are specially mentioned and also harvesters, self-binding or without binders. It does not make any difference whether it has a binder attachment or not. Someone said it was a reaper. Reapers and complete parts thereof are specified. The question I ask is this: Will the minister be good enough, when the item is brought up again, to tell us how many classes of machines were imported under this item in the last three years?

Mr. EULER: I have no objection, but I think we are wasting time, because everybody is agreed that this machine should be brought in under the lower rate.

Mr. ROBB: I am just wondering whether hon. gentlemen want this to come in at the lower rate or want a grievance.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): I am not quite prepared to let the machine come in at the lower rate. Are any of these machines manufactured in Canada?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): Where?

Mr. ROBB: I understand the Massey-Harris people are making them.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): Where?

Mr. ROBB: I do not know, but I recall that a couple of years ago Mr. Bradshaw of the Massey-Harris Company told me that he was manufacturing these combines and was going to test them out in Kansas.

Mr. BENNETT: They were not made in Kansas.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): We have two of the largest firms in the world, with factories in Canada, manufacturing these machines. We have been told by the hon. member for Last Mountain that 3,600 of them valued at $4,000 came into Canada, or $14,000,000 worth. What is the tariff board doing? Do they know anything about this machine? They can be made in Toronto and Hamilton just as well as in the United States. Why does not the tariff board give the Finance minister some information? Why does not the minister get experts on the tariff board? This is not a political speech; I am interested in this business, because I have visited in the west during the last three of four years and I have seen the number of American machines shipped into Canada and sold to the western farmers, machines that could have been made just as well in Canadian factories. It is a shame and a disgrace to Canada, and we are paying a big price for it. I have sometimes seen whole trainloads of these American machines passing through the prairies.

I wish to bring this to the attention of the Finance minister. This is a very simple machine; I leave that to any man from the west

It is not more complicated than a seven-foot binder, and you can draw them with a tractor or with twelve horses if you wish. They can be made in Hamilton, Toronto and Brantford just as well as they can be made in Chicago and Batavia, and so I say to the minister, when his board of strategy or his tariff board gives him an interview on the question, just let him make them come across and have those machines made in Canada. Those American manufacturers would be delighted to come over here because they do not want to lose this trade, which is the best trade they have got.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. Minister of Finance has endeavoured to do the same thing in connection with this as he did last year in connection with Wabasso Cottons. He is not going to get away with it this time; he did then. Last year he endeavoured to blame me and those associated with me because he dropped the duty he was going to put on yarns for the Wabasso Cotton Company. He dropped it, he said, because hon. gentlemen want the duty reduced. The real fact is that between the time the house rose at six o'clock and when it met at eight, hon. gentlemen on his own side, headed by one who is not in his seat, saw to it that the minister was properly approached and told him that they would not stand for it, so the item was dropped. The president of the company came up to blame me and those associated with me for preventing his obtaining that duty. To-night the minister has sought to give the impression that we have favoured a reduction in the duty on combines, so-called. Did he hear anyone on this side say it? We said: We do object to an endeavour being made to afford protection to an industry by wrong classifications. If you are going to protect it, protect it honestly, fairly and frankly and make it clear that the industry requires protection, and it may. My hon. friend from North Wellington says that it does, and I am prepared to accept his view. All I know is this, that solid trainloads of agricultural implements from the United States pass through the Calgary yards—Calgary, mark you,—bound for points north and the outlying sections. I have passed solid trainloads on my way east, solid trainloads of agricultural implements from the United States, implements made in the factories owned by the Massey-Harris Company in the United States in some cases, and in other factories. Last year we bought $40,000,000 worth of these implements from the United States. A tariff would not have increased the price one cent, but it would have given work to thousands of Canadian workmen, and the internal competition would have been ample for the purpose of regulating the price, the same as it is in the United States. The greatest agricultural implements company in this country has two factories in the United States, one at Batavia, and then they bought the Case Company. They have one also in France, one in Germany, one in Canada, and one now in Australia, and that is in operation because of the Australian tariff. The Australians say: We are going to have labour at home for our own people and not give the labour to Canadians. But the minister is content to watch Australia, Germany and France build these factories and have Canada import $40,000,000 worth of these implements from the United States, as we did last year.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): And we are more prosperous than any of them.

Mr. BENNETT: That is delightful, and I do congratulate the hon. member for Weyburn upon being so prosperous. I am glad that he is reaping the reward of his very hard labours, and that his income tax contribution will be so large—

Mr. CLARK: His idea of prosperity is sending Canadians to the United States.

Mr. BENNETT: I want the minister to understand clearly that he is not going to do with this as he did last year with Wabasso Cottons, whose dividend has been passed and the price of whose shares has been cut in two on the stock exchanges. He is not going to get away this time by blaming the opposition for what it cannot do, for what can be done only by the government. None of us said to-night—nor do we propose to say, because that is not our business, without the opportunity to examine into the question—that this industry is or is not receiving the protection it is entitled to receive in order that it may be able to supply work to Canadians, rather than to workmen of the United States at Batavia and elsewhere. We have not said it, and we do not propose to say it. But if it is proposed to change that tariff item, it should not be done merely because of a discussion that takes place in this house as to the proper classification and designation of an article. That sort of thing should be played out. The minister has put that over this house before and he is trying to put it over the country. He tried it in Keith's theatre a few years ago, and then rushed up to the house and put on the record a letter that enabled him to give the automobile companies a larger protection. They said so themselves, with their tongue in their cheek. They said: We are getting a larger protection, but we will not say anything

about it, and the minister accepted the promise which they gave in regard to passing on the tax reduction and he cannot even get a reply to his queries. The minister tried this same thing with Wabasso Cottons last year, and he is trying it again this year, but he cannot do it. If this industry requires protection, the Conservative party would give it protection. Do you know what a manufacturer told me the other day, one of the largest manufacturers in this country? he said, "You can state in the House of Commons if you so desire, but I do not want my name mentioned, that if they will give me a tariff that is ten per cent higher than the present tariff, so that I am sure we will have the trade, I will reduce my prices ten per cent."

Mr. EULER: May I ask a question? I gather from what the leader of the opposition said in the last few moments that he was not sure but what he did want higher protection for this machine, yet when I entered the chamber he was interpreting the word "harvester" to mean this very machine, and it would necessarily follow that it would get a lower rate of duty under his interpretation. Does he want the duty higher or lower?

Mr. BENNETT: I was saying that the department, instead of facing the issue, whether it had protection or not said: It does not come within a specified classification. I say that it does come within the classification of "harvester," and therefore should be entitled to a lower rate of duty unless the minister with the knowledge he should have from his tariff board had the courage to put it where it belonged and dealt with it as a tariff item, not as a question of classification.

Mr. EULER: My hon. friend used the word "department." Does he mean the Department of National Revenue?

Mr. BENNETT: Both of them. They are so mixed up that I desire to ask the minister another question. He should have been here earlier in the evening.

Mr. EULER: Perhaps so. The hon. gentleman intimates that the Department of National Revenue in its interpretation of the tariff has an eye to whether they want to protect an industry or not. I want to say to him that the Department of National Revenue, whatever opinions the minister may have, deals with the tariff exactly as it stands and as it reads, whether it protects or does not protect. I should like my hon. friend to understand that.

Mr. BENNETT: I am very glad to hear it. Perhaps I may ask him one question. Under the tariff provision cars costing less than $1,200 are free from excise tax when they come either from Britain or from other countries and contain 50 per cent content of the labour of those countries. Now, how is that content computed—on the average, or by the car, or by the price, or by what method? The Minister of Finance says, "I know nothing about it; ask the Minister of National Revenue." He was not in his seat then; he is now.

Mr. EULER: I am not sure that I know exactly what information the hon. gentleman requires. Does he mean with regard to the drawback?

Mr. BENNETT: No, we know about the drawback.

Mr. EULER: I do not understand what my hon. friend is driving at.

Mr. BENNETT: I am asking as to the excise tax on motor cars. The value of the car must be under $1,200; that is point No. 1 Point No. 2: It must come from countries with which we have favoured tariff treaties, or from Great Britain, and must contain 50 per cent of the labour of the country of origin. Now, how is that content arrived at for the purpose of fixing the value? That is the question.

Mr. GOTT: Refer it to the tariff board.

Mr. LUCAS: During the war, in order to increase production, tractors up to a value of $1,400 were placed on the free list. I find that a number of municipalities desire to secure heavy tractors on which the duty is 27½ per cent, these being used for grading and other road work, but this duty very materially increases their cost. Could not the Minister of Finance do something to reduce the duty on these heavy tractors?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend spoke to me about the matter earlier in the session, and I have referred it to the tariff board for inquiry.

Mr. BENNETT: That settles it; he has "passed the buck."

Mr. LUCAS: Might we not expect a reduction this year?

Mr. ROBB: I am afraid I would be severely chastised if I attempted to make any tariff changes without having full information before me.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this item stands. As the Minister of Railways wants to proceed with some legislation, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister of National Revenue will, I hope, supply the information we require.

Mr. EULER: I will read Hansard.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS BRANCH LINES

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, to facilitate proceedings, would it not be possible to go into committee on all of these bills, all of which are Canadian National branch line bills? If we could do this instead of reporting each bill separately it would save time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Dunning moves, seconded by Mr. Veniot, that I do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole on bills Nos. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58 and 59. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion agreed to.

MURRAY HARBOUR—GEORGETOWN

The house in commitee on Bill No. 43, respecting the construction of a Canadian National line from a point on the Murray Harbour branch to a point on the Georgetown subdivision of the Canadian government railways in the province of Prince Edward Island —Hon. Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. BENNETT: This bill, I understand, has been before the railway committee and approved. Has any effort been made to provide for the uniform gauge of all the lines in Prince Edward Island? To extend this line and leave a part of it so that the farmers have to unload their cars and reload the contents into other cars is practically prohibitive in connection with potatoes, as I learned when I was on the island last year. It impressed me that before anything more was done the uniform gauging of the lines on the island should be completed, otherwise great inconvenience and expense will result to the farmers.

Mr. DUNNING: The Murray Harbour branch is the last of the Prince Edward Island lines to be standardized, and this very proposal is for the purpose of facilitating the standardization of the branch. This proposed new line will obviate the immediate necessity of building a somewhat expensive standard gauge heavy traffic bridge.

Mr. BENNETT: Over the Hillsborough river?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. The existing bridge will still remain in duty and will be standardized, but for light traffic only. The use of the branch line proposed in this bill will enable the standardization of the whole of the remaining Prince Edward Island lines for heavy traffic.

Mr. BENNETT: Then there will be no narrow gauge left?

Mr. DUNNING: Not when this work and terminal work at Charlottetown are completed.

The CHAIRMAN: Will it serve the purpose of the committee if I give the number and title of each bill?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. DUNNING: The bills are all identical, with the exception of the respective schedules, as hon. members will notice.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Is it the intention of the department to build to Hillsborough bridge?

Mr. DUNNING: I have just answered the leader of the opposition in that regard. I think I also communicated particulars to my hon. friend some time ago. At present the management does not propose to build the Hillsborough bridge, but to standardize the whole Murray Harbour branch, using the Hillsborough bridge for light traffic and the line provided for in this bill for heavy traffic.

Mr. FRASER: Is it the intention of the Canadian National Railways to construct the proposed line from Swift Creek to Tete Jaune this year?

Mr. DUNNING: We are not yet on that bill.

Mr. FRASER: I thought the minister said we would consider all the bills together.

Mr. DUNNING: Each one will be called.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): One of the reasons for my asking a question in this connection is the fact that an article appeared a day or two ago on the subject in the Island Patriot, the organ of the Liberal party in

Prince Edward Island. The statement is made among others that it has been definitely decided to rebuild the Hillsborough bridge. The article reads:

Railway Improvements

There has been considerable discussion in the press with regard to standardization of the Murray Harbour railway and the building of the proposed railway link connecting the Murray Harbour subdivision with the Georgetown branch. It must be borne in mind that the proposed link if placed between Lake Verde and Pisquid, is with the intention not of serving any particular persons but with the sole object of getting freight out so that it will not tie up the traffic when the bridge is rebuilt.

We have taken the trouble to communicate with the authorities at Ottawa upon this particular work, and we are now in a position to state the facts.

The delay in standardizing this branch of the line is caused by the uncertainty of what was required to strengthen and reinforce Hillsborough bridge, and to make it safe for standard freight and passenger equipment.

The Engineers branch of the railways have been convinced for some time that the superstructure or steel portion of the bridge would have to be rebuilt, and investigations carried on during the past two seasons have revealed the fact that the piers would have to be extended to make them suitable to carry a standard truss bridge.

To carry on such extensive rebuilding operations would necessitate the closing of the bridge to traffic for several months and possibly for a whole season. This would shut off rail communication on that branch of the line for that period, which is something that neither the railway nor the people served by it could consider. This made it necessary to find some way of keeping the line open, and after careful investigation and survey by railway engineers, the present proposal to build a connecting line between Murray Harbour subdivision and the Georgetown branch was decided on.

The location of this proposed connecting link was very carefully gone into by the engineers, and reconnaissance was made for the different routes that were proposed or thought to be feasible, namely:—

1. From a point at or slightly east of Mount Herbert to Burtt's Crossing.
2. From Kinross to Montague.
3. From Lake Verde to Pisquid.
4. From Hermitage to at or near Peakes' Station.

After a careful consideration of the reconnaissance of these various routes, a location survey was made on the latter two, as well as a short third line between them, and when the full result of the survey was considered by the railway management, they recommended that the line be built through Lake Verde to Pisquid.

Representations were made by our representatives, Messrs. Sinclair and Jenkins and others as well, to the engineers and to the railway, suggesting other locations, all of which were thoroughly examined and reported on by the railway, and when all was considered, the minister decided to accept the recommendation made by the railway management, regarding the location of the road, and a bill has been introduced into parliament authorizing the railway management to proceed with building the line.

It is the intention of the management to build this line during this coming summer and also to carry on all the preparatory work possible on the Murray Harbour branch, to prepare it for standardization.

It is not considered possible to complete the standardization of the road this season, but it is the aim of the management to complete it early in the season of 1930. This will include the standardization of the track across the Hillsborough bridge to Charlottetown.

A powerful Diesel electric car with a trailer will be operated daily to accommodate passengers, mails express and baggage from Charlottetown, over the Hillsborough bridge to Murray Harbour.

The freight service on the Murray Harbour line will be carried on by a special freight train connecting with the main line at Pisquid or Mt. Stewart. A "Y" will be built at the east side of the Hillsborough bridge. where the engines handling the freight traffic can be turned around.

This system will operate until the Hillsborough bridge is rebuilt.

I asked the minister the question in view of the positive statement here, in the official organ of the Liberal party in Prince Edward Island, that this bridge is to be rebuilt. There is a further statement made by the representative of Queens county at a meeting of the board of trade held in Charlottetown a few days ago. In large headlines the report of this meeting is thus introduced:

Will standardize southern railway and rebuild bridge. This announcement made at board of trade meeting on Thursday by Hon. J. E. Sinclair and Mr. R. H. Jenkins, M.P.

The report describes what took place at the meeting, and this statement appears.

It was announced among other things:

(1) That Messrs. Sinclair and Jenkins would press hard to get an amount in the supplementary estimates for the hotel this year, if not, next year.

(2) That the Hillsborough bridge is to be rebuilt.

This information, conveyed to us through the Patriot, purports to come from the authorities in Ottawa as well as from the representatives of Queens county and is at very considerable variance with the statement of the minister. Not only does it vary from the minister's statement, but it is also at variance with the outline of plan as proposed in the railway committee. It is very important in connection with a large section of country in Prince Edward Island that this bridge should be rebuilt, and naturally the whole province is looking forward to the undertaking. I hope that the statements of the representatives of Queens county and in the Patriot are correct, that these hon.

gentlemen have been informed, after consultation with the authorities, that the bridge is to be rebuilt. I shall be glad to learn that the minister is mistaken in the matter

Mr. DUNNING: I regret I cannot trace the degree of divergence which my hon. friend appears to detect between my statement and the articles he has read. As to the use of the term rebuilding, of course the Hillsborough bridge will require a certain amount of reconstruction to accomplish the end I indicated in my first remarks, namely, the provision of such accommodation as will allow the use of standard gauge equipment over the bridge. I pointed out what the railway officials had indicated before the committee—that it is not at the present time contemplated so to fit the Hillsborough bridge as to enable it to carry heavy traffic. It is a matter of safety. A degree of rebuilding will be required to enable standard equipment to be used on the bridge, but it is not the present intention to rebuild the whole bridge. I am sorry I cannot go further than that.

Mr. BENNETT: Without any necessity for retranshipment.

Mr. DUNNING: There will be no necessity for that. A certain degree of rebuilding will be required to enable Diesel equipment to use the bridge.

Mr. BENNETT: To haul a carload of potatoes for instance.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. There is still some uncertainty in the minds of the engineers as to the ability of the sub-structure of the bridge ever to carry heavy traffic. I do not want to be too positive on that point and I hope my hon. friend will bear with me in that connection, because the engineers are not quite certain about it. However, the intention is to supply the people of Prince Edward Island served by that branch with standard gauge accommodation over the bridge so far as passenger traffic and other light traffic are concerned, having available at all times the branch proposed in this bill in order to enable heavy traffic to be moved in case anything happens which renders it undesirable to use the bridge.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I think the minister is confused about the situation. I understand what he means by standardizing the bridge. That was explained in the railway committee and we understand it; one of the Diesel equipped cars with a trailer will be enabled to cross the bridge after the rails are standardized. But that does not mean rebuilding the bridge; it has nothing to do with rebuilding the bridge. All the engineers' reports with which I am familiar have stated that the bridge is not suitable for standard equipment, and at Charlottetown about a year and a half ago Sir Henry Thornton made the positive statement that standard equipment would never cross that bridge. I think that clears up the situation very well, but it does not account for the statement made by the Patriot and purporting to come from Hon. John E. Sinclair and Mr. Jenkins, M.P., that the bridge is to be rebuilt, followed by the statement made by the newspaper on its own authority that they took up the matter with the authorities at Ottawa and were assured that the bridge would be rebuilt. I want the minister to remember that rebuilding the bridge is quite different from standardizing it, and certainly there is a very wide divergence of opinion between the statements which I have read and the opinions held by the Department of Railways, the railway engineers, Sir Henry Thornton and the minister himself.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): There is not much reason for prolonging this discussion, but if my hon. friend looks at the article from which he quoted he will find nothing in the text to support the headlines he has read. However, the manner in which newspapers may wish to headline articles is their own business, and I do not think any government or any individual can be held responsible. If my hon. friend will go carefully over that article he will not find anything to substantiate his statement.

The minister has explained the matter carefully; the main object of this branch is to complete the standardization of the Murray Harbour branch of the Prince Edward Island division of the Canadian National railways, in order to make it possible to give standard service to that part of the system. The present service is entirely inadequate for the needs of that part of the country, which is one of the most productive districts of Canada. During the last few years a great development has taken place along that line in the growing of potatoes, and in shipping those potatoes it has been necessary to transfer them from the narrow gauge cars at Charlottetown to cars of standard gauge. That has hampered the proper development of that kind of farming, as well as the production of other perishable goods, which were damaged and delayed because of this transfer. These facts have made it necessary that the railway undertake at once the standardization of this branch; the present line is proposed in order to carry

out that work in such a way that it will not interfere with traffic for a season or part of a season, and the heavy traffic can be carried on until this bridge is rebuilt. I do not want my statement to be taken as meaning that the bridge is not to be rebuilt, because that is a different thing. The standardization of the bridge is necessary in order to enable the railway to carry on the lighter traffic of mails, passengers, baggage and express by a Diesel electric service from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour; at the same time the heavy traffic, for which the engineers say the bridge is not safe, can be taken over the spur line which it is proposed to build to the main line, and thence to any part of Canada.

My hon. friend raised the question of rebuilding the bridge, and he asked about certain statements. We cannot say now what the future may hold in store, but we know that it is not the intention of the railway to begin the work by rebuilding the bridge, as many of us thought was the proper way. When it was found that it would be necessary to close the road in order to rebuild the lower part of the bridge so that it might be strengthened and extended, which at first was not thought necessary, it was recommended by the railway engineers that this connecting link be constructed in order that the immediate benefits of the broad gauge service could be extended to that part of the road. If that is done the third rail system now in operation at the terminal will be done away with, and the completion of the terminal can be carried on so that the general running repairs which it is necessary to make at Charlottetown can be looked after more efficiently than is the case at present because of both narrow gauge and broad gauge rolling stock coming into the terminal. The building of the terminals necessitates quite an expenditure for a new roundhouse and machine shops, and that work is partly in hand at present.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, and I do not think there is any doubt in the minds of the railway management, that when this stage of the standardization program is completed we will have to face the question of rebuilding the bridge so that it will carry standard rolling stock both for the movement of freight and the movement of other commodities which it will be necessary to carry over it. The importation of coal to Prince Edward Island is increasing from year to year in a way that demands the very best service to all parts of the island and that, together with the increasing exportation of potatoes, makes it necessary that standard gauge service be given to this portion of the line as soon as possible. I think the minister is well advised in meeting the recommendations of the railway management and making provision at this time to carry on that important work.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I quite understand the statement of the hon. member for Queens; it is quite in order and quite correct, but it does not clear up this situation as we have it. I understand that the hon. member repudiates the big headlines appearing in his own newspaper in Charlottetown, which states:

> Will Standardize Southern Railway and Rebuild Bridge. This Announcement Made at Board of Trade Meeting Thursday by Hon. John E. Sinclair and Mr. R. H. Jenkins, M.P.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): What newspaper is that?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): That is the Patriot of March 30, 1929, and Mr. Sinclair and Mr. Jenkins were both in Charlottetown at that time. They did not repudiate this statement then, by which people all over the country were led to believe they had said that the Hillsborough bridge will be rebuilt. While of course I am prepared to accept his word that the report appearing in the Patriot may be garbled or may not represent his statements accurately, at the same time he left Prince Edward Island with that statement before the people and did not make any effort to clear it up. Then there is the further statement made by the Patriot on its own authority, as follows:

> We have taken the trouble to communicate with the authorities at Ottawa upon this particular work, and we are now in a position to state the facts.

Then they say that one of the facts is that the Hillsborough bridge is to be rebuilt.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): Would my hon. friend just read that portion of the editorial to which he refers?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I have already read the article; I do not want to read it again.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): I do not want my hon. friend to read the whole article, but he said it stated the bridge was to be rebuilt.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Yes. I will give my hon. friend the article. I do not want to read it again; it will appear in Hansard. The statement is there positively made that they have taken the matter up with the authorities at Ottawa and have been so advised.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not recall having had any communication with any newspaper on the subject.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): One article reports the statements made by the hon. members for Queens; the other is apparently prepared by the newspaper on the strength of information which they claim they received from Ottawa. I am prepared to accept the minister's statement that he never gave any authority for this article.

Mr. DUNNING: I did not say that; I said that I did not recall having received any communication from any newspaper on the subject. I am neither repudiating nor endorsing the article, for I can find little fault with it.

Mr. BENNETT: One article says that the bridge is going to be rebuilt; is that the case?

Mr. DUNNING: I did not understand the article to say that.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): It states that in specific terms.

Mr. DUNNING: I have no doubt the bridge will have to be rebuilt.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): If it will have to be rebuilt I do not see any reason why the minister should not say so. The report we had before the railway committee stated that the cost of this ten-mile branch would be $370,000. The member for Queens has stated already that the proposed branch is to make a connection for the carrying of freight from one line to the other. But the article goes further, and says that this is to be an alternative for the rebuilding of the Hillsborough bridge.

Mr. DUNNING: It is an alternative to the present rebuilding of the Hillsborough bridge. The proposal deals only with the three-year program presented, and I think the hon. member will be fair enough to the railway authorities to admit that. But for anyone to say that we cannot at any time in the future abandon the Hillsborough bridge, on account of any structural defect which may develop, and carry the traffic by a roundabout route, which would be necessary if all the traffic followed the route which the new branch will follow, is I think going farther than the railway authorities are prepared to go at the present time. I merely wish to point out that the proposal before the railway committee covered the three-year period.

Mr. BENNETT: And which does not contemplate the rebuilding of the bridge within three years?

[Mr. J. A. Macdonald.]

Mr. DUNNING: It does not contemplate the rebuilding in the three-year program, but it does include the equipping of the bridge with sufficient strength to carry standard gauge light equipment.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): It does not require any further equipping or strengthening to carry that equipment; it is merely a matter of spreading the rails to the standard width. The statement of the minister clears this up as well as we can get it cleared up at the present time, but it shows very clearly that an attempt has been made by the Patriot—I would not like to say, to fool the public, but it looks very much like it. Although I hesitate to blame my friends from Queens county when such positive statements are made in their own organ, I think they should give the public the truth with regard to the matter. Any person reading these articles would infer that it is a part of the program at the present time; those of us who are here and see what is going on know differently, yet the hon. members for Queens allow these statements to be broadcast all over the country. For what purpose? I do not know. The statement of the minister is quite satisfactory, and I brought this matter up only for the purpose of having the whole situation clarified so that the people of Prince Edward Island who are particularly interested in this branch line will know where they stand.

There are other points in connection with this matter which might be referred to. There are a great many people who are of the opinion that the present route of this line is a mistake. There are two other points between which a six-mile connection could be made, either of which would serve the public equally well, if not better. One of the lines suggested would run from Uigg to Montague. This line would be only six miles in length and would give the connection which the railway authorities require. There is another connection which could be made from Hermitage to Peake Station, which would give the same connection over a six-mile route. The construction difficulties are no greater than, if as great as would apply on the line proposed from Pisquid to Lake Verde, and this branch will entail a route ten miles long. The public is interested in knowing just why the longer route is proposed, especially as it will cost $150,000 more. I have been wondering whether the reason is not to keep the whole of the line within Queens county. If either of the other routes were taken at a saving of $150,000 or more, part of the line would have to go through Kings county. Again I hesitate to impute any such motive to the hon. mem-

bers from Queens county, but there is a natural inference you cannot get away from in connection with these matters. I think it is up to the minister to let the public know why a longer route is being taken.

Mr. DUNNING: In all matters bearing upon the question whether a particular line shall or shall not be built, I do not rely upon my hon. friends' statements, or upon the statements of my hon. friends on this side of the house; I rely upon the technical officers and the management of the Canadian National Railways. This bill came before the railway committee, and if the hon. member had had any suggestion to offer whereby the Canadian National Railways would save $150,000, that was the place, I submit, to make it. The management were present in the committee and they could have given the hon. member their reasons for proposing this line. I am sure the hon. member knows that the Canadian National Railways are not deliberately wasting $150,000, either to please me, my hon. friend, or the members on this side of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not know about that.

Mr. DUNNING: In fairness to the hon. leader of the opposition I would suggest that any time he feels that that is being done in a particular case he have the railway committee examine into the circumstances. The officers of the company could be present and could give their reasons for any proposals they were making for the expenditure of money. It is only in that way, so far as parliament and the country are concerned, that we can ensure that the officers of the railway are doing as they should do. There will always be differences of opinion as to matters of engineering and railway economics, but I do not think we should adopt the view that there is any other than the best motives in the minds of those who are responsible, unless we are prepared to come forward and discuss the matter quite frankly with those who are placed in charge. I do not attempt to go behind the recommendations of the officers with respect to any ordinary piece of work such as the construction of a small branch line.

Mr. CLARK: What will be the cost of this line?

Mr. DUNNING: $375,000.

Mr. CLARK: Is that amount included in the estimates which were tabled yesterday?

Mr. DUNNING: No. We take a three-year program, and the proportion proposed to be expended in any particular year is taken into the budget for that year.

Mr. CLARK: The cost of all the branch lines which we were considering is not included in the $53,000,000 of estimates tabled yesterday?

Mr. DUNNING: The proportion to be expended within the period of the estimates would be included.

Mr. CLARK: The proportion to be spent within the next twelve months on this line is included in the $53,000,000?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: Is the cost of the Montreal terminals included in the $53,000,000?

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Mr. CLARK: Or this year's proportion?

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member should not ask me to anticipate the introduction of a bill which is not even on the order paper.

Mr. CLARK: I just wanted to get some idea of next year's expenditure by the Canadian National Railways, and I think we are entitled to know that when we are considering these bills. I should like to know the total amount. What are we facing next year in the way of capital expenditure?

Mr. DUNNING: What the country is facing next year is included in the budget of the Canadian National Railways; they cannot go beyond the budget.

Mr. CLARK: That is the $53,000,000?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): Many of these details can be thoroughly brought out in committee in regard to surveys and location of the line, particularly the one under discussion.

Mr. DUNNING: Perhaps my hon. friend will permit me: If there is to be further discussion on this bill, I wonder whether those who desire to engage in it will allow me to report progress on this bill in order that we can report out a number of others in regard to which there will not likely be any discussion, to enable them to go over to the senate and be proceeded with there.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): There was a motive imputed to me in regard to a report which was in the press, and I think I have a right to clear that up, although I have every regard for the wishes of the Minister of Rail-

ways. Just a moment ago the hon. member for Kings quoted a newspaper despatch and he came to the conclusion and so stated, that he did not know what the motives were for that report.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): It was not my conclusion. It was the conclusion of his own newspaper.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): I beg to differ. Hansard will show, and my hon. friend stated clearly that he did not know what the motives were for a statement like that. Does he deny that? If he does, the matter is cleared up.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): The statement was by the newspaper purporting to report my hon. friend.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): My hon. friend said that he wondered what the motives were for such a statement. I want to tell him plainly in the house that, as regards reports in the press, we are not bound to accept them or to stand by them. If what he read was correct, it was not said to the board of trade by me, and I did not hear my colleague say it. What I said to the board of trade, I said in this house and I would say it in any other part of the country just the same. If it is a matter between my hon. friend and the Patriot, he can clear it up with that newspaper. He is quite at liberty to do that. But as regards imputing motives in connection with reports which in many cases have not been read by me before being printed, I want to say to him directly and plainly that my statement is as I made it here a few moments ago, and the same as I made to the board of trade. I think it is quite in keeping with the news item which he read. His preparatory statements to that item were not borne out by the lines he read as being the item in question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): They are fully borne out.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): I asked my hon. friend, when he was speaking, to read the paragraph in the news item stating that the bridge was to be rebuilt. He did not do that.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): The hon. member can see it in Hansard.

Mr. JENKINS: I would like to ask a question of the minister. When I was in Charlottetown a short time ago, it was currently reported that when the traffic was diverted by this new route, the bridge would be abandoned. Is there any truth in that report?

Mr. DUNNING: There is no intention of abandoning the bridge.

[Mr. J. E. Sinclair.]

Mr. JENKINS: If there is no intention of abandoning the bridge, it certainly must be rebuilt, just at what particular time, of course, it is not now necessary to mention; it is self-evident.

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister of Railways to-night made an observation which I regard as one of very great importance as affecting not only the railroad but all the branch lines of the Canadian National system. An impression is getting abroad in this country—and I encounter it from many sources, including correspondence addressed to myself as well as to other members of the house—that these railroads are political railroads. That is detrimental to the interest of the system. Not that I am charging the Minister of Railways with any offence, but supporters of the administration seem to be able to get branch lines in localities they desire in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and other sections of Canada, and then they go to their electors and say: "Look what we have been able to do for you!" The very article read from the newspaper dealing with the observations made to the board of trade—and I notice the hon. member for Queens was very careful and modest in what he said, because he had to justify what he said to the board—that the bridge was to be rebuilt—

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): I did not make that statement.

Mr. BENNETT: It was his colleague to whom I referred.

Mr. JENKINS: I said that it was self-evident.

Mr. BENNETT: What he said to the board of trade is quite evident too. He said to the board of trade that he had provided them with a new bridge over the Hillsborough river. The hon. member for Kings is endeavouring to point out that that is hardly what we expect in connection with a national system. Nothing could be more fatal to this system than that the impression should get abroad in the constituencies that log-rolling will secure branch lines or any other expenditures not warranted by economic conditions. It is all very well for the minister to say that he takes the word of officials; but he has had some experience in connection with the politics on that system, especially in the lower provinces, and he knows exactly what has been done in relation not only to that railway but to other portions of the system. We know the Postmaster General sent a telegram to a section foreman to have two section men dismissed, and they were dismissed. It

is true they were later put back on their job. The Minister of Railways had nothing to do with their dismissal; he would be beyond that sort of thing; he would not be capable of doing it; but we all know that happened. There are other matters that we shall have to discuss in connection with the neighbouring province of Nova Scotia and political patronage in connection with the national system. As to the observation of the Minister of Railways in that regard, I have no doubt he made it in all good faith, but he must know there are other methods of accomplishing the end desired without having any reference to him at all. That is, while he is Minister of Railways, there are ministers for the province and the Prime Minister, I think, made it abundantly clear on one occasion that he took the recommendation of the minister for the province wtih respect to matters pertaining to that province. Probably any prime minister would do the same thing with respect to the appointment of judges and matters of that kind. Now we have the national system which we are dealing with in much the same way, and therefore great care must be exercised in connection with the administration of the road under present conditions.

Mr. DUNNING: I presume the remarks of my hon. friend relate almost entirely to that part of the country served by what was formerly known as the Intercolonial?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. I would like to go a step further. In regard to the section terminating at Riviere du Loup I happen to know one of the members of this house issues instructions to the assistant superintendent and superintendent. I hesitate to mention his name as he is not present. I refer to the hon. member for Rimouski.

Mr. DUNNING: When a piece of railway which for years was operated by the government, whichever party was in power, somewhat on a patronage basis—I am speaking now of the portion which was part of the former government railways—is transferred to the operation of the nationally-owned system—and I say that the management of the Canadian National is entirely free from political interference—it is bound to take some time to convince the people of the area concerned that conditions to-day are different from those which formerly obtained. My hon. friend's remarks would lead one to believe that such interference as he refers to comes wholly from members presently supporting the government but I can assure him from my personal experience that that is not the case, that there are men sitting on his own side of the house who do exactly the same thing. I am speaking now of the problem generally, something that is outside the range of ordinary political patronage as we understand it. There remains in the minds of the people of the maritime provinces the idea that they can go to their member, no matter on which side of the house he sits, with respect to ordinary matters of business and employment particularly on the Canadian National railways. I ask my hon. friend to accept my assurance that I have learned of at least as much of that sort of thing from that side of the house as from this. And that is intensified, of course, by the fact that at the time the Intercolonial railway was taken over as part of the national system a government other than the Liberal government had been in power following 1911 and administering that property, and that being the case, under the conditions which formerly prevailed, one can appreciate what the system was at that time.

I am not making any statements calculated to arouse the political ire of my hon. friends opposite. I am simply speaking of a condition, and I am appealing for the sympathy of the house for the Canadian National railway management in their endeavour to show the people of the maritime provinces that they are better off by having this part of the system an integral part of the national system administered in the same manner as the rest of the government-owned property, with the same freedom from political interference that we are proud of in connection with the national system as a whole. I make that kind of answer to my hon. friend, not for the purpose of creating any political argument or to cause recriminations, but simply in the interest of this asset of Canada which is so important to all of us.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not think I should let the reference to the Postmaster General in connection with the old Intercolonial railway pass without notice. My hon. friend says that I sent a telegram demanding the dismissal of two section men.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: That was hardly correct. I did send a telegram in connection with two temporary employees.

Mr. BENNETT: Working on the section.

Mr. VENIOT: They were not working on the section; they were working over the whole line. My reason for that was this. Having been home one week-end, I was

called upon by the temporary foreman in question, who showed me a list of names and asked me if I had any objection to these men being employed. Among the names was that of his own son. I said no, I had none. He asked me if taking these men on the work on Monday would be all right. I looked over the list, and he went away assuring me that these men would be taken on. I left home on Sunday, and on the following Wednesday I received a telegram that two men on that list had not been taken on, but that two others had been put on in their places. These two who had been employed in place of two of the names the foreman showed me on that list had got the train at Caraquet and went to the hotel, each with a bottle of whiskey, and they held the whiskey up telling the people congregated around the hotel that this was the way Veniot paid them for going on the road, by sending them two bottles of whiskey from Ottawa. I received word of that from very reliable people, and I wired back asking them to confirm their information in another telegram. They did so, and I then wired the foreman asking for his reasons for taking on men who would act in that way, and asking him to dismiss them. Those are the circumstances. That is the truth of the whole situation, and I think it is about time the matter was explained.

Mr. CLARK: What did you have to do with Canadian National Railway employment?

Mr. VENIOT: Nothing more than you and your friends in New Brunswick would have when your party was in power.

Mr. CLARK: I would not do what you have done. I never had anything to do with employment on the railways.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): I am glad this subject has been brought up, because there are cases of this sort of thing right in my own constituency. The Intercolonial touches at Point Tupper, and we have a boat called the Scotia which refits every year and goes to Prince Edward Island. That boat carries a large crew of men, and every man going on that boat for the last three years has had to have a document from the defeated Liberal candidate in that constituency before he can receive employment. Another heeler who has been on that boat for some years goes out and visits everyone seeking employment and sends him to Liberal headquarters, and he has to have his document before he can receive employment. Not a man gets on that boat unless he bears the stamp of Liberal.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. DUNNING: I really do not want to follow this kind of discussion. I could bring statements of an exactly similar character relating to the Conservative party, but I deprecate following this discussion further for that very reason. What I plead for is the elimination of this kind of discussion all round, and so far as my influence goes it will be eliminated all round.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): There are a couple of other cases at Point Tupper, in fact, a dozen such cases, and if the minister intends to follow that line, I would say that it is immediately up to him to notify the captain and mate of the Scotia.

Mr. DUNNING: No. My hon. friend is just now expressing what I call the maritime point of view, which I am not complaining of, but which does exist. The minister cannot and should not communicate with the captain of that ship. The minister communicates with one man in the system, and one man only, and that is the president, except that certain officials are sometimes sent to the minister to give him technical information or to place before him plans of one kind or another.

Mr. BENNETT: Executive officers.

Mr. DUNNING: Exactly.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Monday, April 15, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE— MR. POULIOT

Mr. J. F. POULIOT (Témiscouata) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege with reference to an article published in the "Evénement," on April 12, last.

With large headlines this newspaper publishes what follows: Mr. J. F. Pouliot interrupted by cries of "Taschereau, Taschereau" and "who placed the bomb."

The question of privilege refers to the following extract:

An incident

An ever youthful member from our province distinguishes himself at Ottawa by wild sallies against the Prime Minister of Quebec. Last night, the House of Commons clearly manifested that he would be the gainer by becoming somewhat more discreet. His speech interrupted by a devil of a noise, became almost as unintelligible as unintelligent. The opposition having taken up the cry of Taschereau, the Govern-

ment side replied by applauses. While our fiery member once more sat down, happy of having created a storm. But it was a storm of laughter.

The "Evénement" passes for a business newspaper.

Has it not an upward scale of rates for costly publicity?

Is it true that the first come, in that newspaper, may be bombarded. Your Honour, for one dollar; Your Lordship, for two dollars; Your Excellency, for three dollars; Your Highness, for four dollars, and Your Imperial Highness, for five dollars.

The downward scale for cheap and popular publicity is in that newspaper very amusing.

Is it true that one may be called a Governor for half a dollar; Colonel for a quarter; that for ten cents they shine your boots, and for five cents they lick them?

From July 1, last, the Quebec government has paid for printing and publicity $9,961.38 to this newspaper, whose president, Mr. J. H. Fortier, the directing soul of the P. T. Légaré establishment, loudly clamours for protection so as to sell agricultural implements dearer to farmers.

If this is a business paper it is a slot machine paper.

Mr. BENNETT: A what?

Mr. POULIOT: A slot machine paper. It insinuates that on Thursday last I attacked the Premier of Quebec in the house. In fact I did not. When I asked—referring to Sir Robert Borden—"Who was the greatest man in the Tory party?"—the gentlemen on your left, Mr. Speaker, answered, "Taschereau, Taschereau". I said nothing unpleasant in reference to him that evening because one of his children was married in the morning of the same day, and it is on account of that social function that I observed that truce which L'Evenement has not seen fit to respect.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING COMMITTEE

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved:

That standing order 63 of the House of Commons, relating to appointment of the select standing committees of the house, be amended by adding to the select standing committees of the house for the present session, a select standing committee on railways and shipping owned, operated and controlled by the government, to which will be referred the accounts and the estimates of the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Government Merchant Marine for the present session, for consideration and for report to the house, provided, however, that nothing in this resolution shall be construed to curtail in any way the full right of discussion in committee of supply; and that the said committee consist of Messrs. Bell (St. Antoine), Cantley, Chaplin, Duff, Dunning, Fiset, Geary, Gray, Hanson, Jelliff, Jenkins, McLean (Melfort), Milne, Power and Stevens.

I may say that the motion is in exactly the same terms as similar motions adopted in previous sessions.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Before the motion is put, I wish to observe that, looking through the proceedings in past years, it occurs to me that as this house represents the shareholders of the Canadian National system and sets up this committee as a committee of those shareholders to deal with the accounts and the transaction of the business of the system, no limitation should be placed upon the right of the committee to deal with the whole of what I might call the operations of the system during the year, which would arise out of the discussion of the accounts, if construed in a large way, with respect to employment and many other matters which it is unecessary for me at the moment to mention, but which any shareholder would have the right to discuss in the case of a private company. I take it that this committee should have all the powers which the shareholders of a private company would have in discussing the business of such an enterprise in which they were interested; for the real weakness of our system of government ownership lies in the difficulty of the shareholders in making themselves articulate so far as the transaction of their business is concerned. In other words, this parliament is the nearest approach we have to the shareholders in a private enterprise, and this committee should be regarded as a committee of shareholders to discuss the accounts, the estimates and the transaction of the business of the enterprise during the twelve months for which those accounts are placed before the committee.

Mr. DUNNING: I think the description which my hon. friend has just given of what the activities of the committee should be is a correct description of what the activities of the committee have been in fact in the past—

Mr. BENNETT: With some limitation.

Mr. DUNNING: —with one qualification which arises from the peculiar condition to which my hon. friend has just referred. The shareholders of a private company would of course be free at all times to discuss any matter affecting the business of the company, but they would also be free to determine that it

was not wise for publicity to be given to any particular item of that discussion. More or less frequently in connection with the proceedings of the special committee during my experience of it—and I presume prior to that time also—there have arisen for discussion matters respecting which the management desired that the committee should have full information but which the management did not desire to become public property. In all such cases the committee has, I think, agreed to have the information given to the committee itself but not made a matter of record. That has very frequently happened. Perhaps I am exaggerating when I say "very frequently," but at any rate it has happened on numerous occasions, and I do not think there will be any disposition on the part of the management to adopt any other attitude in the future. It is of course a little embarrassing, as my hon. friend will see, because of the broad right of inquiry which parliament undoubtedly has. Parliament could publish from the housetops any and every detail of the Canadian National's business if it so desired; but this is not considered desirable for the same reason that it is not considered desirable in connection with some aspects and details of an ordinary private corporation's business.

Mr. BENNETT: While it is improper under the rules for me to make further observations, I desire to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I entirely agree with what the minister has said. So far as the shareholders of a private company are concerned they do not keep records of their speeches to be transmitted to the public; it is merely a shareholders' record. As regards the record, therefore, I am not so much concerned about that as about the powers of the committee to represent the shareholders in their entirety in dealing with the business of the system.

Mr. DUNNING: Undoubtedly.

Motion agreed to.

REFERENCE OF ESTIMATES TO RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING COMMITTEE

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): I desire to move that the estimates relating to the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, previously tabled, be referred to the select standing committee on railways and shipping, owned, operated and controlled by the government.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Dunning.]

BRANCH LINES—METHOD OF PROVIDING FOR COST

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): I desire to make a statement, which I suppose is a question of privilege. I find that the other day I gave a wrong answer to my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Clark) with respect to an important matter, and I should like to make the correction now. The discussion appears at page 1557 of Hansard. The hon. member asked me whether the cost of all branch lines we were considering was not included in the $53,000,000 of estimates "tabled yesterday." I answered that the proportion for the current year would be so included. I find that answer to be an error. The estimates, which are the authority from this parliament for the expenditure of money, do not contain provision for matters which have been provided for elsewhere by this parliament. I want the error noted so that my hon. friend and others will not be under a misapprehension.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 130, to amend the Canadian National Railways Act.

Mr. STEVENS: Explain.

Mr. DUNNING: This bill is designed to make a number of minor amendments to the Canadian National Railways Act, most of which were brought about as a result of the revision of the statutes. Changes must be made in the references; I think there is only one change which would not fall within that classification, a change relating to the method of expropriation.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN YUKON TERRITORY

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 131, respecting the administration of justice in the Yukon territory.

He said: On account of its geographical location the northern part of the Yukon territory is difficult to control from Dawson; in certain cases it is almost impossible for the mounted police to take prisoners to Dawson or for a judge to proceed to that part of the territory. The object of this bill is to authorize the Minister of Justice to issue an

order that trials for offences committed in a certain part of the Yukon territory may be proceeded with before a court of the Northwest Territories when it is more convenient to do so.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

Mr. FRASER:

1. Has the government received the final report of the Auditor General mentioned on page X of his report for 1927-8, vol. I, commencing at "page 216" near middle of page?
2. If so, will the government table the report?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1. Yes.
2. Yes. I wish to table the report accompanying the answer.

Mr. FRASER:

When will a copy of the order in council, mentioned on page XI, second paragraph, of the Auditor General's report for 1927-8, vol. I, commencing at "payment of grant of $5,000 from vote 294, page 228," be laid upon the table of parliament?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Answered by tabling a copy of the order.

PAYMENTS WITHOUT PRE-AUDIT

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

What is the amount each year in each department that is paid out of the treasury without pre-audit by the Auditor General?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): This question may be dropped, as I intend placing an amended question on the order paper.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Dropped.

IMMIGRATION—MEDICAL EXAMINERS

Mr. MANION:

1. What are the names of the medical examiners retained in England by the immigration department?
2. How many of them are Canadian and how many British practitioners?
3. Have any changes been made since 1927, and if so, what changes?

Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. (a) The following medical officers have been appointed to the immigration medical inspection service of the Department of Pensions and National Health and are stationed in England: Dr. H. B. Jeffs, Dr. W. Egan, Dr. W. B. MacDermott, Dr. C. H. Archibald, Dr. Margaret Parks, Dr. C. MacLeod, Dr. R. S. Henderson, Dr. J. S. Douglas, D. J. E. Grant, Dr. H. A. Chisholm, Dr. A. Turnbull, Dr. W. J. Boyd.

(b) 284 roster doctors.

2. (a) 12 Canadian; (b) 284 British.

3. 1928—Dr. C. MacLeod, new appointment; Dr. R. S. Henderson, new appointment; Dr. G. J. Boyce, new appointment; Dr. W. J. Boyd, new appointment; Dr. F. S. Parney, temporarily transferred to Canada.

255 roster doctors appointed to conduct medical examinations on a fee basis.

1929—Dr. G. J. Boyce, resigned; Dr. H. A. Chisholm, employed temporarily.

29 additional roster doctors appointed.

RESTRICTED AREA PLAN—SLAUGHTER OF CATTLE

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. From February 1, 1928, to February 1, 1929, how many cattle have been slaughtered under the restricted area plan in each of the provinces of Canada?
2. During the same period what was the total amount of money paid to owners of slaughtered cattle in each province?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1 and 2.

Province	Cattle Slaughtered	Compensation
Prince Edward Island	1	$ 38 00
Nova Scotia..	3,589	124,427 10
New Brunswick... ..	—	—
Quebec..	20,434	691,396 12
Ontario..	14	500 00
Manitoba..	5	222 00
Saskatchewan..	26	620 00
Alberta..	—	—
British Columbia. ..	206	8,254 00
	24,275	$825,457 22

Note:—The amount of compensation shown above is the amount awarded on account of the animals slaughtered during the period indicated. A certain proportion of this amount has not yet, however, actually been paid owing to the one-twelfth of the estimates recently voted not being sufficient to take care of all such accounts.

BURNS GRAZING LEASE

Mr. SPENCER:

1. Was a grazing lease granted for territory in township 18, range 21-20-19, west of the 4th meridian, commonly known as Burns lease?
2. If so, when, and to what date does the lease run?
3. Is this land fit for growing grain?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1. Yes.

2. A renewal lease covering approximately 30,880 acres in this area was issued for a

term of twenty-one years from the 1st April, 1926. A similar lease for approximately 20,640 acres was issued for a term of twenty-one years from the 1st February, 1929.

3. Upon inspection none of the lands leased were found to be suitable for agricultural purposes with the possible exception of 640 acres which was considered essential to the leasehold for growing winter feed.

HIS MAJESTY'S MAIL

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What was the cost of redecorating post boxes, mail wagons and other post office equipment in the city of Toronto with the words "Canada's Mail" substituted for "His Majesty's Mail"?

2. Was this work done by contract or otherwise, and at what cost to the government?

3. What was the cost of replacing the words, "His Majesty's Mail", on the aforesaid post office equipment, in Toronto?

4. What official or other officer ordered such changes on aforesaid, at Toronto, and by what authority or on whose authority?

Mr. VENIOT:

1. (a) Post boxes—

No record of the words "His Majesty's Mail" being used on post boxes.

(b) Mail wagons or other equipment—

No record of words "His Majesty's Mail" being used. The words "Royal Mail" have been used and are still being used on some post office trucks. The words "Canada Post Office" have been used and are still being used on other post office trucks.

There is no case on record where the words "His Majesty's Mail" or the words "Royal Mail" have been removed from any equipment and replaced by the words "Canada Post Office" or any other designation.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

CALL LOANS

Mr. GIROUARD:

1. What amount of money was loaned by the Canadian banks in call loans on the different United States stock exchanges for the year 1928, and for the months of January, February, and March, 1929?

2. What rate of interest was received by the banks on the amounts so loaned?

3. What is the total amount of money received by the banks on the money so loaned?

4. How much of the amount so loaned was the property of the depositors?

5. What rate of interest was received by the depositors on their money so loaned by the banks?

Mr. ROBB:

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. This information is not reported under the Bank Act. Call and short loans are shown under two headings only (a) in Canada; (b) elsewhere than in Canada.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

WATERPOWERS—REFERENCE TO SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITE (London):

1. What amounts have been paid to each of the various counsel who represented the Dominion government before the Supreme court in 1928 regarding the reference concerning ownership of water-powers and other matters?

2. What amounts are still to be paid each of these gentlemen?

3. What will be the total cost of the reference to the Dominion?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Hon. N. W. Rowell, K.C., $2,500; H. J. Symington, K.C., $3,925.54; Chas. Laurendeau, K.C., $3,931.62; Vincent MacDonald, $9,221.

2. Mr. Rowell, $12,002.74; Mr. Symington, $9,071.21; Mr. Laurendeau, $7,145.55; Mr. MacDonald, nil.

3. $60,719.50 according to present estimate.

DRUMHELLER, ALTA., CUSTOMS PORT

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What amount of business has been done at the customs port of Drumheller, Alberta, in each of the years 1927 and 1928?

2. How many persons are employed?

3. What are the total salaries and wages of the said persons?

4. What amount of rent was paid each year, 1926, 1927, and 1928, for the accommodation of the Drumheller port of customs?

Mr. EULER:

1.

	1927-28	1928-29
Import Duties.. ..	$28,829 14	$39,847 27
Excise taxes..	8,188 14	10,622 79
Excise duties.	—	—
Sundry collections..	—	—
	$37,017 28	$50,470 06

2. 1.

3. $1,560.

4. 1926-27

April 1/26 to October 31/26, 7 months at $50.. .. .. $ 350 00

1927-28

Arrears November 1/26 to November 30/27, 13 months at $50=$650; December 1/27 to March 31/28, 4 months at $50=$200.. $ 850 00

1928-29

Unexpired lease on old quarters, 1-20 April, 1928, at $50=$33.33.
New quarters, April 1/28 to March 31/28, 12 months at $40=$480. $ 513 33

$1,713 33

DRUMHELLER, ALTA., MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What amount was paid for the accommodation of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in the town of Drumheller, Alberta, in each of the years 1926, 1927 and 1928?
2. How many persons are employed?
3. What is the total of wages and/or salaries?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. 1926, $540; 1927, $540; 1928, $540.
2. One.
3. 1926, $882; 1927, $821.25; 1928, $821.25.

DRUMHELLER, ALTA., SOLDIER SETTLEMENT OFFICE

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What amount of rent was paid for the accommodation of the soldier settlement office in the town of Drumheller, Alberta, in each of the years 1926, 1927 and 1928?
2. How many persons were employed?
3. What were the total salaries of same?

Mr. FORKE:

1. Nil.
2. One supervisor.
3. Salary for 1926, $1,815; 1927, $1,770; 1928, $1,890.

DRUMHELLER, ALTA., POST OFFICE

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What business has been done by the Post Office Department in the town of Drumheller, Alberta, in each of the years 1927 and 1928?
2. How many persons were employed?
3. What was the total of salaries and/or wages?
4. What was the total amount of rent paid in 1926, 1927 and 1928, for the post office buildings or any buildings used for post office purposes?

Mr. VENIOT:

1. 1927, $16,541.79; 1928, $18,121.13.
2. Four in both years—in addition to postmaster.
3. Salaries and allowances: 1927, $5,768.13; 1928, $5,876.21.
4. For the fiscal years ended 31st March, 1926, 1927 and 1928, $1,030 was paid each year for rent, light and heat for the post office.

DISTILLERY PRODUCTS

Mr. STEVENS:

1. What is the gross value of the products of all distilleries of Canada during the years 1925, 1926, 1927 and 1928?
2. What is the amount of revenue paid by the distilleries of Canada in regard to the said products for the said years: (a) excise duties; (b) sales tax and (c) other fees or charges?

Mr. EULER:

1. No record kept in the department of values of Canadian distillery products.
2. Amount of revenue paid by the distilleries of Canada during the fiscal years ending 31st March, 1925, 1926, 1927 and 1928:—

(a) Excise Duties:

1925	$ 3,974,076 18
1926	5,274,993 59
1927	7,096,107 24
1928	11,635,649 64

(b) Sales tax figures not available, as no records are kept of sales tax by commodities.

(c) License Fees:

1925	$4,125
1926	4,500
1927	5,000
1928	6,125

PETERBOROUGH COUNTY—RURAL MAIL ROUTES

Mr. PECK:

1. What are the contract prices paid to the rural mail carriers, respectively, for carriage of mails; (a) from Indian river; (b) from Keene; (c) from Norwood; (d) from Lakefield all in the county of Peterborough?
2. What is the length of each route?

Mr. VENIOT:

1 and 2 (a) Name of route	Per annum rate	Distance Miles
Indian river No. 1 R.R.	$552.63	21
Indian river No. 2 R.R.	$720.00	20¾
Indian river No. 3 R.R.	$815.00	21
(b) Keene No. 1 R.R.	$780.00	18¼
Keene No. 2 R.R.	$698.00	22½
Keene No. 3 R.R.	$574.00	20¼
(c) Norwood No. 1 R.R.	$724.05	20
Norwood No. 2 R.R.	$900.00	23⅝
Norwood No. 3 R.R.	$800.00	20
Norwood No. 4 R.R.	$900.00	12
(d) Lakefield No. 1 R.R.	$1,200.00	38
Lakefield No. 2 R.R.	$1,400.00	45
Lakefield No. 3 R.R.	$860.00	24½
Lakefield No. 4 R.R.	$856.64	21⅞

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What number of, (a) officers; (b) non-commissioned officers; (c) other ranks; of the Department of National Defence were employed at Ottawa for the years 1912-1913 and 1927-1928?

2. What number of officers of all ranks were in civil employment in said department at Ottawa for the same periods?

3. What was the total number of all ranks in the permanent force in the years 1912-13 and 1927-1928?

4. What was the extent of military units in the years 1912-1913 and 1927-1928, as to, (a) number of units; (b) total personnel of all ranks in said units?

CIVIL SERVICE—SUPERANNUATION

Mr. PETTIT:

What are the number and names of persons on the old superannuation list numbers 1 and 2?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

CALGARY POWER COMPANY

Mr. ADSHEAD:

For a copy of the interim license granted to Calgary Power Company for the development of hydro-electric power on the Ghost river, province of Alberta.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE—PURCHASE OF COAL

Mr. QUINN:

For a copy of all letters, contracts and all other documents, relating to purchases of coal made by the Department of National Defence required in Halifax and the surrounding district during the season of 1927-1928.

PORT HOWE, N.S., POST OFFICE

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland):

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents relating to the removal of the post office at Port Howe, Cumberland county, Nova Scotia.

COLLINGWOOD CORNER, N.S., POSTMASTER

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland):

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, and other documents, including the evidence taken and report submitted by J. Frank Outhit, barrister, relating to the dismissal of Neil Mooring as postmaster at Collingwood Corner, Cumberland county, Nova Scotia.

CUMBERLAND COUNTY, N.S., CUSTOMS OFFICES

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland):

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents in connection with, or relating to the closing of the following customs offices in Cumberland county, Nova Scotia: the port of Oxford; the port of Pugwash; the port of Wallace; the port of Advocate; the port of Apple River; the port of Tidnish.

[Mr. Veniot.]

BRITISH PREFERENCE—FIFTY PER CENT REQUIREMENT

Mr. M. N. CAMPBELL (Mackenzie) moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and any other documents in connection with protests made by importers, consumers or any other parties in Canada to the government against its application of the regulation effective February first last, and which regulation calls for fifty per cent empire labour and material in goods entitled to the British preferential rates.

Mr. ROBB: I believe that all available information has been tabled already, but I have no objection to this motion passing if it is passed with the reservation that permission be received before we table any confidential correspondence between the British government and this government, or between any of the self-governing dominions.

Mr. CAMPBELL: If the minister will read the motion he will find that it contains no such request. I am asking for the production of correspondence between the government and certain parties in Canada. Sessional paper No. 172, which I received some time ago, covers the correspondence between the government and the British High Commissioner and also between the government and the British Federation of Industries. I am only asking for the protests registered by the consumers.

Mr. ROBB: With the reservations I have made, there is no objection to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—MR. MARCIL

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, an article appears on page 14 of the Montreal Star of Saturday in which a question put by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) appears under my name. That is an error and I wish to correct it.

Mr. BENNETT: I would think the hon. member would be delighted to have a matter of such public interest attributed to him.

PRIVATE BILLS

PROCEDURE RESPECTING APPLICATIONS FOR DIVORCE

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Vancouver-Burrard) moved the second reading of Bill No. 85, for the relief of Effie Margaret Hill.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: On several occasions last year I objected to divorce bills being

passed in this manner. I know nothing whatever with regard to the bill now before the house—and that indeed is one reason why I think I should oppose its passing the house. The member who moved this bill may have some information with regard to it, and if so I think he should give it in detail to this house. Later on I shall insist upon such a statement being made and until that information is forthcoming and the house is fully apprised of the details, I do not think we should be asked to pass the bill.

Mr. GEARY: The hon. member must have the evidence.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have in my desk the evidence relating to some sixty divorce cases, and I venture to say that no member of the house has read every bit of that evidence. If he has, I would suggest that he is very much in the position of a garbage can and would hardly be fit to participate in the discussions of the house. I frankly confess that I have not read the particulars relating to any one of these bills, and I know nothing whatever about the particular bill now before the house. I venture to say that nine-tenths of the members are in precisely the same position.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Ninety-nine hundredths.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: And yet we are asked to vote in favour of the bill. I am rather sorry for the parties concerned in this bill, because it may be inferred by the general public that there is some outstanding reason for the challenging of this particular case. I assure them that I select this bill simply because it is the first one on the order paper. I desire to test the house on a question of principle rather than on the merits of this particular case.

A few weeks ago the house rejected a bill which provided for a divorce court for the province of Ontario. Under the rules of the house I am precluded from discussing that bill, but I would point out that the rejection by the house of that bill puts us in a different position from that in which we were last year. In the debate on the Senate bill the majority of the members of the house took a very high moral stand with regard to divorce when they rejected that bill on the ground that it was improper that any divorce should be granted. All I can say is that if it is wrong on principle to grant divorces we should reject this bill and the many others which follow it. On that occasion members on both sides of the house took the high ground of maintaining the sanctity of the family. Their argument places some of us in the rather awkward position of seeming to condone the evils of divorce and thus assisting in loosening the family ties. I think I could make out a very good case if I should attempt to prove that those who opposed that bill are the people whose action is tending to loosen the family ties and further increase the evils of divorce.

I am opposed to divorces as granted by this parliament. There has been a greater increase in the number of divorces in the province of Ontario, where there is no divorce court, than in the other provinces of Canada which have such courts. That is one ground for asserting that those who opposed the establishment of a divorce court could easily be accused of increasing the number of divorces. In making that statement I do not consider the number of divorces which have been granted in Detroit and other American cities to residents of the province of Ontario. I will be very frank and say that I am not opposed to divorce under certain circumstances, but I know there are friends of mine here in the house who are opposed to the granting of divorces under any circumstance. We talk about the evils of divorce, but I think we ought rather to talk about the evils of marriage, because, after all, it is the failure of marriage that makes the appeal for divorce necessary. In my view, to force people to live together where there is infidelity, and I would go further and say, where all affection has ceased to exist, is very little less than to force them to live in what I might term a state of legalized prostitution. I do not want to be guilty of forcing anyone to continue to live such a life, and hence, under certain circumstances, I am in favour of divorce. It is an intolerable situation that a woman should be compelled to continue to be the wife of a man whom she must despise and where her private life must be simply an inferno on earth. If the opportunity occurred in a properly constituted court, I should be glad to do anything I could to relieve the condition of women or of men so placed.

I should like, as briefly as I can, to enumerate some of my objections to the passing of this bill and of other bills of a similiar character which are before us. In the first place, I object to being a mere rubber stamp, and under the circumstances which now exist, that is the position in which all the members of the House of Commons are placed. Let us examine the procedure for a moment. In Ontario and Quebec and, until further action is taken by Prince Edward Island, also in that province, the only way

in which a divorce can be obtained is by coming to parliament and presenting a bill which must be passed through the regular stages, the three readings in this house and the three readings in the senate. As we all know, these bills in practice go first to the senate and are examined by the Senate committee. I believe this year two senate committees are running concurrently and if space were available, there would be three committees, so great is the pressure of these bills. These are reported by the senate committee to the senate and afterwards in due course they come to the House of Commons. At the present time I am not a member of the private bills committee, but for some years I was, and I know that when these bills came before the private bills committee of this house, they passed in batches just as they are passing their first and second readings in this house. Except on very rare occasions there was no examination whatever of the merits of the bills. In fact often, we even had to go to considerable trouble to secure a sufficient number of the members of the private bills committee to constitute a quorum in order that in five minutes we might pass twenty, thirty or forty private bills. As every hon. member knows, we have never had a discussion in the house as to the merits of a particular divorce bill; a few days ago there was placed in our mail boxes the evidence in the case of forty-five bills, and this morning I received something like twenty additional bills. This would indicate that sixty-five divorce bills are now before us, and I understand that in the course of the session we shall have over two hnudred more than that. This procedure is becoming a veritable farce. We simply go through the motions and it seems that that is inimical to the best interests of the country as well as demoralizing to the house itself.

In the second place, the laws of evidence are not very closely adhered to in the senate committee. In so saying, I am not casting any reflection upon the senate committee. I have heard the members of that committee freely discuss the matter. In a properly constituted court the judges have had a good deal of experience in sizing up evidence. On the senate committee there are members who have not been judges, some who have not been lawyers, and who are not accustomed to the careful weighing of evidence. I do not pretend to be a legal expert, but on one occasion when I sat for a short time in that committee, I think the procedure would have been considered in any court to be very lax. I would hate to be tried for my life or to have my liberty at stake and to be tried under the laws of evidence which often prevail in the divorce committee of the senate.

Mr. GEARY: The hon. member would not have a chance.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That may be. I think the hon. member for South Toronto is quite right. I would have no chance at all. Further than that, the evidence so-called is all printed and is circulated among the members of both houses. This involves a very heavy expenditure which would not be involved in the ordinary courts where, as I understand the matter, the evidence is frequently taken down in shorthand but is not extended, unless there is some special reason for doing so. Not only is there a greatly added expense, but the evidence so published consists really of obscene literature. I ventured to say last year and I repeat to-day that those reports could not go through His Majesty's mails if what they contained were known. We could not discuss the details of that evidence on the floor of the house without ordering that the galleries be cleared, and it may be necessary before we are through with this matter to ask that we have a private session in order to discuss some of these cases. That evidence is circulated among the members and is generally thrown into the waste paper baskets. I confess I have some qualms of conscience in doing that because members of the cleaning staff, pages and others, may pick it out of the waste paper baskets and get free obscene literature such as could not be offered for sale in the bookstores in any city of Canada.

Mr. RENNIE: The hon. member said he had not read the evidence.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have not read it this year. I have looked into it in other years. Last year I read several cases with very great care. I have heard members remarking jocosely that this was very spicy literature. I think, on the other hand, it is revoltingly, disgustingly—

An hon. MEMBER: Rotten.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: —yes, rotten. That is a very good word which an hon. member has suggested. The evidence consists of sordid details, stripped of all romance of every kind and presented with a stark reality that is absolutely repellent to any except the most morbid minds.

I object to the present procedure because poor people cannot come to Ottawa to avail themselves of the divorce court here. It remains a privilege of the better-to-do, unless people happen to be located close to Ottawa.

Supposing somebody resides in Windsor: it means a very heavy expenditure to travel and to bring witnesses all the way from Windsor to Ottawa. It means the employment of a lawyer in Windsor and, under present practice, the employment of a local lawyer in Ottawa. In this way the drain upon the purse of the poor individual seeking divorce is very heavy.

Further, the poor man who is charged with being guilty of a crime that calls for divorce has no opportunity of defending himself. The other day a man wrote me from a town in western Ontario alleging that he had been framed by his wife, who sought a divorce. He said, "I am a poor man. I cannot afford to leave my job and travel to Ottawa. The only evidence against me is that submitted by professional spies, professional detectives," and so on the evidence of two professional detectives the wife was granted a divorce, the husband having no opportunity whatever of appearing in his own behalf. I do not think that is fair. The senate committee may be all right in the case of the wealthy, but it is not fair for the poor people in this country.

I am told that in some of the provinces such as Nova Scotia there is an official connected with the divorce court known as the king's proctor, who represents the public. He is there to draw out any evidence that he sees fit, to see that fair play is being accorded. We have no official of that kind whatever, and it seems to me that here again our procedure facilitates divorce much more than is the case under the ordinary procedure of the courts where certain safeguards are provided. Again, in some of the provincial courts—I do not know whether this is true of all the provinces—there is a period of delay after the case has been tried and before the decree is granted. It is sometimes found that when people have got to the point where a divorce is imminent, the trial brings them to their senses as they realize the alternative, and it is possible to effect a reconciliation. But in the case of divorces by this parliament, once the evidence is heard, the decree immediately goes into force and a divorce from that time is inevitable. I would say that the practice of the provincial courts is highly preferable to the practice we have in this parliament.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Would my hon. friend permit me? I have been away a long time this session, but if I am not wrong this question has been settled by parliament at this very session, and therefore it is hardly in order for my hon. friend to plead for the establishment of divorce courts when parliament has already declared against them at this very session.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not know that I am pleading for the establishment of such a court, but I am pointing out the weaknesses that inhere in our present practice and that pertain to the very case upon which we are asked to decide to-day. I will, however, try to confine myself as closely as possible to the matters that are before the house at this time. I would say that in this case, and in all these cases, we are making no provision whatever for alimony. In the case of the wife being granted the divorce, she goes out without having any claim whatever on the man who was formerly her husband.

Mr. FORKE: How about the man?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The man is in the same position, but he is supposed to be able to support himself, and perhaps under our existing social conditions he can support himself a little more easily because he has no longer a wife who is dependent upon him.

Mr. FORKE: Sometimes.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I was given an instance the other day by one of the members of the senate divorce committee. A poor little woman was granted a divorce from her husband. It came out in the evidence, which is locked up in our desks now, I presume, that her husband had communicated to her a venereal disease. The woman is to be granted a divorce under the recommendations of the senate divorce committee, but she goes out without having any redress whatever, without having any provision for alimony, and I presume that if she is to secure anything she will have to take a civil action in the regular way in the provincial courts. It is not right that that should be the case, and I intend to do this year as I did last year in regard to some of these cases, and that is to offer amendments making some provision for alimony. I know that hon. members may rise and object that that is ultra vires of the Dominion parliament. Someone asks me why. Because it would trench upon civil rights, but it appears that we ought to do what was done in at least one case in the earlier history of this house and make some provision for alimony.

More serious still, there is no provision whatever in these cases—and we have forty-five of them before us in this list—for the maintenance of the children.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Is it beyond our powers to do so?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is a matter for constitutional lawyers. It is a question whether or not if we pass a measure of this kind it would be an infringment upon civil rights, which under the British North America Act is a matter of provincial concern. That is another of the anomalies under the British North America Act.

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine): Is it beyond the powers of the senate committee?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I understand that in the very early days of divorce legislation by this parliament there was at least one case in which alimony and maintenance for the children was granted, but I think there were only one or possibly two such cases.

Mr. ADSHEAD: But they have the power.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is not clear. That power has been challenged by constitutional lawyers. I do not know that any test case has been before the courts.

Again, I pointed out in at least one case last year that the man, according to the evidence, was nothing less than a brute, and had committed a crime that made him liable to a penitentiary life sentence. That man was allowed to go free, but as a matter of fact I understand he skipped out to the United States, but he was allowed to go there with, inferentially, the right to marry again and repeat his crime and ruin another life. The senate committee took no action in that respect, and we took no action. There is no provision that action could be taken in those circumstances.

It has been stated by the newspapers that I intended to talk out these divorce bills. That is not the case, but this is what I do propose to do. I intend to ask that a roll call vote be taken. The many members of this house who on conscientious grounds are opposed to the granting of divorce salve their consciences by having the Speaker repeat, when the motion is carried, "On division." I intend to make that a reality and to insist on a division being called, and then those members who are opposed to divorce, if they are in earnest, will get up and say so and take the responsibility of that divorce not being granted. As things now stand, upon some of us who are in favour of granting divorce under certain circumstances is thrown the responsibility of divorce not being granted. I do not think that is fair. I would say, let that responsibility be assumed by those who on conscienticus grounds say that under no circumstances should divorce be granted.

I admit that I am somewhat at a loss to know whether to vote in favour of or against these divorces. I would say that I could justify my action in either case because I am opposed to this manner of granting divorces by this parliament, but I am not opposed under certain circumstances to the granting of divorces. I think on the whole that probably the way in which I can best express my own position in this matter will be for me to vote against the granting of these divorces, and that for two reasons. I want this to be clearly understood: First, that I know nothing whatever about the merits of the individual cases; and knowing nothing of those merits, in voting for them I am as I have said, simply a sort of rubber stamp. Secondly, I vote against them mainly on the ground that I want this to be a protest against this manner of granting divorce. It may be that if I knew the merits of this particular case under discussion I would vote in favour of the bill; but I do not know the merits, and therefore I am quite clear that I ought to vote against it.

However, I would say there may be exceptions to that course of action, and I want to leave myself free as to this. One day, desirous of observing personally the procedure in the senate divorce committee, I sat through the hearing of one entire case. If I can locate that case in the mass of these divorce bills I intend to vote in its favour, because I think the poor woman who sought divorce absolutely deserves it. Having a knowledge of that particular case I would make an exception of it, just as I might have to make an exception of other cases, if in committee their merits are demonstrated. This may not appear entirely consistent: I admit it. But on the whole in taking this attitude of opposition, I want it to be clearly understood that I do so, not because in my judgment there is necessarily anything wrong about granting a divorce in the particular case that comes before us, but primarily because I want to protest against this procedure.

I feel very sorry indeed that in some of these cases to which we are objecting the parties may be put to unnecessary expense and hardship and delay; I feel very sorry for the individuals. On the other hand, I would say that those responsible for this condition of affairs are the people who year after year and year after year refuse to provide proper courts where these matters can be dealt with.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I shall be very sorry unnecessarily to delay the house. I do not think any of us want to prolong the session. But in my view the responsibility for such delay does not rest on those who insist upon giving reality to the proceedings of this house; it rests rather upon those who, ever since I

have been a member of parliament, have refused frankly to face the issues involved in these cases that come to us in such large numbers.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, last year this same question was before parliament, and was discussed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) pretty much as he has discussed it to-day. On that occasion I was in entire agreement with him, as I am to-day. I think he has admirably covered the whole situation, and there is very little to be added; but I wish to make clear, as he has done, that while I am glad to have the opportunity to vote against every divorce bill which comes before this house, I do so exactly for the reason that he has pointed out, not that I am opposed under certain circumstances to the granting of divorce, but that I am opposed to this house doing so.

That is, I am opposed to the absurd procedure which year after year is followed in this house. The absurdity cannot be made any more evident than it is at this time. If we were actually to take a vote on the approximately three hundred divorce bills which will be presented to the house this session, provided that the senate committee can hear that many cases, it would hold us here for several months. In order to dispose of them we put them through their various stages like frozen corn is put through a chopping mill—we do not even take time to read the bills, we call them by number; and we do not even stand up to record our votes—we vote in silence. This procedure appears to me to be absurd. In this house we have no facilities for discovering the true facts in respect to any one of these bills.

Mr. SANDERSON: What about the senate committee?

Mr. IRVINE: I was going to mention that. I have a great deal of respect for the divorce committee of the senate. I believe it works very hard and very conscientiously, but that does not relieve this house of its responsibilities. How does my hon. friend know that the senate committee has done justice, for instance, in this particular case? I have as much faith in that committee as he has, but I am not going to have its members think for me; he can have them do that for him if he wishes. No senate committee is going to think for me, even if it can do it better than I can myself. If I am to vote on these bills I want to know what led to the conclusions drawn by the senate committee; like my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre, I want to know what is going to become of the children; like him, I want to know what is going to become of those people who are given the right to marry again, which in some cases may mean our permitting the commission of a social crime. I refuse to be a party to that sort of thing.

And I am opposed to this procedure because it has become a real problem for the senate. The senate divorce committee is overworked. In fact, I understand that a second committee has had to be appointed to deal with these cases. The senate has protested against this condition of affairs, and it gave point to its protest by sending to this house a bill to establish a divorce court in Ontario. This house refused to endorse the bill, which would have provided a properly constituted court to deal with these cases the majority of which come from this province. So while the senate divorce committee may be perfectly efficient in dealing with these cases, in the first place, it is overworked; in the second place, even although it were all the time efficient in its work, it cannot take the place of this house; we have no right to rely on it to do our business for us.

I think it is only fair to point out Mr. Speaker, that there are but two provinces from which petitions for divorce come to parliament, Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. BOURASSA: Practically one.

Mr. IRVINE: I am corrected by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa): he says "Practically one." Perhaps the Minister of Justice will permit me to refer to the bill which was discussed in this house merely to point out that some of the leading members from both these provinces were most active in its defeat. I think the hon. member for Labelle pointed out that to pass the bill would be to press upon the people of Ontario something that they did not want; and I think his point was well taken. But are we not pressing upon the people of this province something that they do not want when we continue granting divorces that hon. members from that province protest they do not want? So I for one am not going to embarrass those hon. Canutes who strove to stem the tide of divorce by opposing the bill to which I have referred, and by refusing to vote bills of divorce for their constituents. I want them to-day to take the responsibility which they did not take the other day. So far as I am concerned, I am not going to sit mum and be counted as voting for divorce bills that I do not know anything about, and that I do not want or care to know anything about. On the other hand, hon. members whose constituents want divorce, and who make long platitudinous speeches about the

honour and sanctity of the home, which they say I want to destroy by establishing a divorce court for Ontario, will not now be able to sit silent while their bills are going through this house.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat what I said at the beginning, that I am not unfavourable to granting divorce under certain circumstances. I deeply deplore the principle on which divorces are granted, even in our courts to-day, and as they are granted in this parliament. I hope if we are going to continue to grant divorce, the evidence will have to be based on the unhappiness of the people concerned, and not on the filth which fills these reports to-day. That is the ground upon which I should like to see divorce granted, if it is granted at all. I am opposed to any single case that is before parliament. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, I do not know what are the merits of any individual case, and therefore I am not in a position to vote for any particular bill. I can only vote against these divorce bills in the hope that ultimately these cases will be dealt with by a properly constituted court. I am glad to have this opportunity of voting against every divorce bill that comes before this house.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): In the long period during which I have been a member of this house I have consistently opposed the granting of divorce, and in those thirty years no application has come from my constituency for a dissolution of marriage. I am not objecting to this bill in particular; I am objecting to the principle of the bill. We spend days and nights, weeks and months, years and decades in discussing the material interests of the people, discussing our railway situation, our tariff, our finances, everything that concerns the wealth and prosperity of the country. But how much time do we devote to protecting the home and the generation that is to come afterwards? Grave mistakes have been committed on this question of divorce, and to begin the argument I wish to lay before the house I shall cite the opinion of the outstanding statesman whom Canada had produced up to confederation, the father of confederation—Sir John A. Macdonald—who declared that in 1857, when the British parliament enacted the divorce law there, it committed a serious blunder. I wish to read these words from Sir John because I know they will have some weight in this house and in this country. This is what he said:

> I am convinced that the establishment of a divorce court in England has been productive of much mischief. In former times, the procedure with respect to divorce was the same as in force in Canada to-day—that is, it could only be obtained from the upper house of parliament. In those days divorces were rare, expensive and hard to get, and the morals of the community were spared the columns of scandal with which the English papers are occasionally filled. The establishment of the divorce court in Canada would mean cheap and easy divorces, which would lead to great laxity in the marriage relations. They are beginning to see that in the old country. I hope it may be long before we have anything of the kind in Canada.

Mr. BOURASSA: What year was that?

Mr. MARCIL: I have not the exact year in which these words were uttered, but evidently it was after confederation. The British parliament has enacted within the last two or three years a measure to prohibit the publication in English papers of columns upon columns of scandal which were perverting and demoralizing the youth of that country. We publish such matter now in the evidence which is taken in such cases and circulated through these corridors, and which finds its way among young people who should never read it. Unfortunately the thing is going from bad to worse.

I have given the opinion of Sir John Macdonald with reference to a previous generation; let me now give the opinion of another outstanding Canadian, one of the sons of Ontario, who commands the respect of this house and is now Chief Justice of that province. Sir William Mulock has said:

> I think the facility with which divorces are granted in England and in other countries does go a long way to interfere with the sacredness of the marriage tie. There is no reason that justifies, in my opinion, the establishment of a divorce court for the province of Ontario.

Such were the opinions expressed by men who command the respect of the Canadian people, and I have no hesitation in saying that, no matter to what religion people may belong, the immense majority of the Canadian people, 95 per cent of them, still want the home preserved and the marriage tie respected. We are a Christian country, thank God. Canada is surely not going to follow in the footsteps of our neighbours to the south, where the marriage relation has fallen so low—the lowest in the scale of all great nations. Statistics speak. Let us look back and see what happened when divorce was imposed upon us. We know how it came about; after the adoption of the divorce law in England in 1857 Nova Scotia and New Brunswick established divorce courts. Prince Edward Island never took advantage of that law; and let it be said to the honour of that province that to-day it is the only province in the Dominion in which but one divorce has been granted since 1867. What has been the

result of the institution of divorce in Canada? When the question of divorce came before the fathers of confederation, Sir Hector Langevin, speaking for the government of that day, said:

> Let us now examine the question of divorce. We do not intend either to establish or to recognize a new right, we do not mean to admit a thing to which we have constantly refused to assent. But at the conference the question arose which legislature should exercise the different powers which already exist in the constitutions of the different provinces. Now, among those powers which have been already and frequently exercised de facto, is that of divorce. As a member of the conference, without admitting or creating any new right in this behalf and while declaring, as I now do, that as Catholics we acknowledge no power of divorce, I found that we were to decide in what legislative body the authority should be lodged which we found in our constitutions. After mature consideration, we resolved to leave it to the central legislature, thinking thereby to increase the difficulties of procedure which is at present so easy.
>
> We found this power existing in the constitutions of the different provinces and not being able to get rid of it, we wished to banish it as far from us as possible.

What has been the record since confederation? In the first decade, from 1867 to 1877, 7 divorces were granted. From 1877-87, there were 16; 1887-97, 36; 1897-1907, 53; 1907-17, over 200; 1917-27, 1,070; and in 1928 alone parliament granted 238. So that the total number of divorces granted by parliament in that period was 1,620, for the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. And the total for the whole of Canada from 1913 to 1928 was 6,052.

There are in this house fathers of families, men who will be responsible to another generation for what we do here; and our records will stand up against them. Are we doing what we should do now to safeguard the sanctity of the home and to render marriage indestructible, or are we not rather going about it in a slipshod manner, allowing divorces to be granted automatically by a few senators on the other side? Indeed, we go so far as to lump them together and pass them en bloc. Surely that is not the sort of legislation which this parliament should give to the Canadian people. This is a serious, a grave question; it is not a party question. The responsibility lies on all sides and on all members of the house. I know the present government will have to consider the question because we cannot allow the present state of things to continue. Some means will have to be found to change the present situation.

I want to give another illustration of what has taken place as a result of the legislation passed in this house whereby the provinces in the west were allowed to introduce—into Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba—the English law in respect to this matter. What has been the result? How have divorces increased since 1913? By years, the total figures for Canada are:

1913	60
1914	70
1915	53
1916	67
1917	54
1918	114
1919	376
1920	429
1921	548
1922	544
1923	505
1924	543
1925	551
1926	608
1927	748
1928	785

This makes a total in fifteen years of 6,055. Homes are broken up, children are thrown out on the street, and that responsibility weighs upon us and will weigh upon us until other methods are found to bring about the indissolubility of the marriage tie.

In the short time at my disposal I have no opportunity to discuss the attitude of the Roman Catholic church in this regard. That church is the mother church of all christianity; it was the church of all Christians for fifteen hundred years and it always stood for the teachings of Christ as it understood them. Since then there have been changes; Christians do not agree upon the interpretation of certain passages in St. Matthew, but surely no man in this house to-day would pretend for one moment that our Lord and Master declared that a divorced person could marry again within the lifetime of the other party.

I hold in my hand a book entitled Divorce in America, which contains an introduction by the Right Reverend William T. Manning, Bishop of New York, in which he describes in a few words the horrible condition now prevailing in the United States. Are we to follow in the footsteps of that country, where the people themselves are trying to have the marriage tie respected and the homes saved? After referring to the enormous increase in the divorces granted in the United States, where the average is one divorce in five marriages; after calling attention to the fact that fifty-two different reasons are given for the granting of divorce, and after stating that divorces granted in one state are not recognized in another, this Episcopalian bishop says:

> It is our duty to face this situation, to consider its causes and its consequences, and to ask ourselves how it can best be remedied.
>
> The separation of man and wife, and their living apart, for grave cause, is not forbidden by the church. The church allows, and in extreme cases even advises this. It is the use

of divorce as a doorway to remarriage which the church opposes, and which is bringing such disastrous consequences upon us.

There are only two alternatives possible. Marriage must be held to be a permanent relation, or it must be held to be not necessarily permanent, and if we choose the latter its sacredness and meaning disappear. If marriage may be ended by any passing quarrel, if the man and woman are united by nothing more fundamental than mutual consent and agreement to continue together while things go happily, if the principle of monogamy is abandoned.

And yet this is the position to which, as a nation, we stand committed by our present laws, and which some who call themselves reformers, are seeking to carry still further. What can we do to meet the present situation?

We must arouse public sentiment, and we can all help to do this by our own personal stand in the matter. We must acquaint ourselves with the facts and call upon others to realize them. We must appeal to all Americans who love their country and care for the future of their race to take their stand against this great peril to our life as a nation. The life of America depends upon the stability and integrity of our homes. It is there that the character of our boys and girls is formed and moulded. What is the situation of the children of our multitude of homes broken by divorce?

Every word of this introduction applies to Canada with even more force than to the United States. Bishop Manning proceeds:

The church must give far more careful and faithful teaching as to what marriage means and involves. We must show more care and consideration for our young people by helping them to understand the sanctity and the significance of marriage before they enter upon its responsibilities.

The next paragraph, while it refers to creeds with which I am not connected, contains some good advice:

It is time for all churches of every name to act together in this matter. At present the influence of religion against divorce and remarriage is weakened immeasurably by the varying standards of different churches and even in different ministers of the same church. Those whom one church refuses to marry go immediately to another and are married without question. In a matter of such vital importance to society, this ought not so to be. In these days when so many are working and praying for Christian unity, it should certainly be possible for us to cooperate in upholding the sacredness of marriage. All religious organizations—Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish—might well agree upon common action for the preservation of the home. Think what the effect would be if the whole united influence of religion should be exerted in this great cause.

The concluding paragraph, which I wish to impress upon the house with all the force at my command, is as follows:

We must all of us do our part for a revival of religion in our land. I believe that this revival is now taking place among us. There is among people of every sort, and especially among the younger people, a deep stirring of faith, and of desire for closer touch with God.

It is this above all else that is needed to check the evil of divorce. It is religion that is the bulwark of the home. If Jesus Christ had the place that belongs to Him in our homes, there would be fewer homes in our land without children, and the present crisis in regard to marriage and the home among us would not exist. For our own sakes, and for the sake of our country, we must bring Jesus Christ back into His true place in our own lives, and in our homes.

That, Mr. Speaker, is an appeal as strong as could be made to any right thinking man no matter what his faith might be. Whether he be Catholic, Jew or Protestant, this is a question of saving the nation, saving the homes of our people and saving our young men and women. Is there anything more pathetic than the situation pointed out by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), the breaking of the marriage tie, casting the children out on the street without any profession, with no responsibility and without any of the precautions which would be observed by the most elementary court of justice? We, the parliament of Canada, acting on behalf of the Canadian people and for this great Canadian nation, have a grave responsibility. Canada sends missionaries to every part of the world; Canada is doing its share in the great moral uplifting of the world; Canada is sharing in the work of the League of Nations and in all philanthropic and social work looking to the peace and contentment of the nations of the world. Is it possible that this parliament of Canada is reflecting the opinion of the Canadian people when it allows divorces to be granted in this shameful manner under our present system?

I will say no more, Mr. Speaker; I will leave it to others more competent to discuss the question from a legal standpoint, but I have sought to give expression, as strongly as possible, to my opinions in this regard, knowing that in speaking as I do I represent the views of a very large section of the Canadian people.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I do not apprehend that this is the time or place to discuss the principle underlying divorce; the fact of the matter is that we have divorce in Canada and that this parliament has been charged under the British North America Act with the responsibility of granting divorce. That is the situation prevailing to-day, whether we like it or not.

I am quite well aware that it is not in order to reflect upon a bill which has been presented to the house already during this session or upon a vote which has been taken here, but

I will say that I believe those who have brought this matter before the house have done a service in that they have shown the absurdity of the position taken by the house on a former occasion this session. We are not discussing the theory of divorce; we are face to face with certain conditions, and I think it was because the house failed to realize that fact that we acted as we did a few weeks ago. That is all I wish to say upon that point because, as I have stated, I am well aware that it is not in order to discuss a question which has been before the house already or a vote which was taken on a previous occasion. The question which confronts us now is this: a large number of divorce bills have come before this chamber during a long period of years; how we shall conduct ourselves with regard to that condition? The hon. member who introduced this matter has rendered a service to the house, in that he has placed before us the condition which exists. I cannot follow him, or the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine), who supported him, to the extent of going as far as they have gone. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) stated that he proposed to vote against this bill because he did not know anything about it; the hon. member for Wetaskiwin said that he would vote against these bills because he did not know the particulars and did not wish to know them. I would say to the hon. members that they are negligent in their duty in that regard. I am not saying that I am better informed than they are with regard to this particular bill, but when they advance that as the reason for their action, then I say to that extent they are negligent in their duty. They say that they do not propose to discharge their duty as members of parliament because they have not informed themselves on the question before the house.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Has the hon. member read the evidence relating to this case?

Mr. BROWN: I have already confessed that I have not read the evidence, but I do not propose to make that an excuse for not doing my duty.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: On what ground does the hon. member propose to support the bill?

Mr. BROWN: The hon. member will have heard me when I have finished; I propose to give very good reasons for the course of action I propose to take.

As I have said on former occasions, I do not think the present system is the best possible system we could have. However, it is the system in existence at the present time, and I intend to act in harmony with it. I have said that the senate committee deal with these questions, within the limits which are imposed upon them, in manner which commands the approval of those who have seen them taking evidence. I know that they are handicapped; I know that they cannot go as far in the way of granting redress to injured parties as we would like to have them go, and as we believe a properly established court could go, but, at the same time, I think it is a mistake to give the public the impression that these questions are not being dealt with seriously by a body of men competent to deal with them. Whether or not I read the evidence taken in connection with these cases, I have confidence in the senate committee before whom that evidence is adduced, and when they submit these questions to us I believe we are justified in assuming that they have reached the proper conclusion. I shall not vote against these bills because I have not read the evidence, but will assume that the senate committee has properly discharged its duty; that these bills come to us after being properly considered, and, therefore, should be endorsed by the house.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Brown) when he says that this is not the proper time to discuss the broad issue of the principle of divorce. I also agree with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) when he says that it is not in order to discuss the question of the establishment of divorce courts because, as he says, that question has been decided, for this year at least, by a vote of the house. At the same time, I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) has justified the course he has taken when he points out, by way of exemplification, the consequence of the attitude taken by the house on a previous occasion. I think we are all agreed that the hon. member for Lisgar is a very sensible man. He said that he did not want to discuss the theory; he admitted that the system was bad, but he wanted to deal with the system as it is. Carried to its logical conclusion, the position taken by the hon. gentleman would only mean that every time the house found that something was wrong, it could do nothing to remedy the condition complained of because of its being the system then in effect.

An hon. MEMBER: No, no.

Mr. BOURASSA: Fortunately, parliaments very seldom act logically.

Mr. FORKE: He wanted to point out that a mistake had been made on a previous vote.

Mr. BOURASSA: I would advise the hon. minister, who is a canny Scotchman, not to come to the rescue of the hon. member for Lisgar, who is just as canny a Scotchman as he is.

In connecting the words of the hon. member for Lisgar with those of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, my construction is that this parliament is not empowered to deal with the civil rights when it grants a divorce; that it is not empowered to deal with property belonging to the divorced parties or to the children; that it is not empowered to decide what shall be granted to the divorced party who may be in the right in asking for the divorce, or to his or her children. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in connection with this bill, and all similar ones, is very well taken. The point raised that under subsection 26 of clause 91 of the British North America Act we are dealing with questions upon which we have no power to pass final judgment and do justice to all parties, is a very grave constitutional point.

Mr. ADSHEAD: No power to grant money or alimony.

Mr. BOURASSA: Of course not. It may have been done in one case or another, but many things are done occasionally by parliament or occasionally by a provincial legislature which are against the letter of the constitution. Such a thing stands so long as it is not challenged, but look at what it means. It means that things are done haphazardly which may be challenged ten or fifteen years later in a court of justice and upon which the Supreme Court of Canada or the Privy Council will pass final judgment, doing away with the whole of our jurisprudence. I do not want to go too much outside this debate, but this has happened with regard to mariage jurisprudence in Quebec. Year after year the superior court, the court of review and the court of appeal of Quebec rendered judgments in a certain sense, when all of a sudden, in the year of grace 1921, the Privy Council gave what some consider as a judgment but what others merely call an opinion, which has practically upset the whole of our jurisprudence in Quebec since confederation. The more I have studied the question—and I have given a good deal of time to it—the more I have become convinced that that judgment of the Privy Council is, legally speaking, the right one. But what does it mean? That for years and years the legislature of Quebec and the tribunals of that province acted upon a delusion which that final judgment of the Privy Council simply dispelled. So much for the constitutional issue.

Are we going to take the position that, because certain things have been done for ten, twenty-five or thirty years, we are to go on doing the same? Let us carry that also to its logical conclusion. Let us apply it to any principle or practice of policy in connection with public affairs or private interest. Are we going to consider ourselves bound by what has been done from year to year or from decade to decade by the house or by the senate? Is so, why have a parliament? Why not adopt a final act of parliament in the form and terms of the laws of the Medes and Persians and say that what is law shall be law for all time to come?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We have that under the British North America Act.

Mr. BOURASSA: That some old-time Tories who no longer exist even in this house, should have upheld the principle that certain laws or practices should always remain unaltered, I can understand; but that any man, calling himself Liberal, Progressive or Liberal-Conservative, should stand up in the house and say: I will not consider the merits of a concrete issue, or I will not consider the principle of a certain form of legislation, because it depends upon a system which has been practised for fifty years, is something I cannot understand. For my part I do not think I was elected in the year of grace 1926 by a portion of the Canadian electorate to come here and do something because it had been done from session to session for the last fifty years.

To apply those considerations to the question at issue, I said before, and I repeat now—

Mr. CLARK: I rise to a point of order. This is a bill before the house and the hon. member is not discussing the merits or demerits of it. He is discussing the principle whether parliament should deal with such bills or not. That matter has been dealt with already by the house at this session, and I submit that the whole discussion is out of order. The only matter which the house can discuss is whether this particular bill is one which should be passed by the house.

Mr. BOURASSA: Speaking on the point of order, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman: I think the whole discussion is out of order. But why should the point be raised when I am endeavouring to clear up the issue brought before the house by three hon. members who preceded me?

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member is now applying the principle he has just condemned.

Mr. BOURASSA: Quite so. I prefaced it by saying that logic had nothing to do with our procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question before the house is the second reading of a particular bill in regard to divorce. It is very hard to make a distinction between the principle contained in that bill and the general principle of divorce; but as the hon. member for Labelle admits that he is out of order, I hope he will confine his remarks to the particular subject before the house. I repeat, however, it is very difficult to establish a distinction between the principle of divorce that obtains in this particular bill and the general principle itself.

Mr. BOURASSA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, because that will cut short the discussion, and I hope the decision will stand against further speeches.

With regard to this particular bill, it is a divorce bill. It is a divorce bill framed in the same language as that in which all divorce bills are framed, adopted by the senate and brought before the house. If you go through the statutes of the last fifty years or about so, you find that every divorce granted by parliament, for whatever reasons or causes, is granted in the same form. There is a printed formula in both languages, French and English, and there are blank spaces for the name, the date, the date of the marriage, the date, I think, at which the case has been brought before the senate, or something to that effect. A few words are filled in and the form is adopted by a committee of the senate, sent to this house and passed upon by us without our reading the evidence. I think that will be admitted by every fair-minded man. At least nineteen out of twenty members do not read the evidence; at any rate they do not read the evidence of all those bills, so that, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) has said, we act as rubber stamps in order to ratify what has been done by the senate committee under those conditions. I claim that is a bad system of legislation.

With regard to this particular bill we have to look first to the principle upon which it is based. We have to consider the principle upon which we act upon this bill or any other similar piece of legislation. Are we acting as a sovereign parliament, as a branch of this sovereign parliament equal in power to and exercising the same responsibilities as the other branch, or are we acting as a court of justice? It is one or the other, or both, perhaps. Under subsection 26 of section 91 of the British North America Act, parliament has the sole and exclusive power to deal with marriage and divorce, either from a legislative or from a legal point of view. In other words, no divorce can be granted except by leave of this parliament, directly through private bills as is the case now, or indirectly through the decisions of courts of justice empowered by parliament to act in this regard, with the exception of those courts of divorce which existed in the maritime provinces prior to confederation. Let there be no mistake: the divorce courts that have been established and are working now in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, have been established and are adjudicating under the authority of parliament, under the authority of law passed by parliament.

With regard to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which had no divorce courts prior to Confederation, and in which this parliament has not thought proper to establish divorce courts, this parliament acts directly upon every divorce bill, first as a legislative power, and second as a court of justice. It is a great axiom of British jurisprudence that where a right is created by parliament, rightly or wrongly, some court of justice must exist to adjudicate upon the concrete issues which are raised in connection with that right. I think that has been an uncontradicted principle of British government, British legislation and British jurisprudence for centuries past. Therefore, this parliament having received from the British parliament, at its own request, the exclusive power to legislate on marriage and divorce, it has taken a moral or an immoral pledge towards people who believe in divorce to give them a means to exercise that right, which I consider a contradiction of social right and social duty, but of which nevertheless this parliament has accepted the responsibility.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Does the hon. member mean to say that under subsection 26 of section 91 of the British North America Act this parliament is bound to act on matters of divorce when it is applied to?

Mr. BOURASSA: That is the construction I put upon that principle of British jurisprudence, that where there is a right there must be an adjudication upon issues in connection with that right by some form of tribunal. I think that is contained in our code of civil procedure in the province of Quebec as one of its first principles. I am not a lawyer—

Mr. CAHAN: It is elementary law anyway.

Mr. BOURASSA: Of course. How can a parliament which in the name of the sovereign exercises all powers of legislation without limitation, including the creation of courts of adjudication, claim to itself and have put into its national charter the exclusive power to deal on certain subjects unless it is prepared to grant to every citizen of the country a recourse to see whether or not he has the right to invoke that principle of law? It is for that reason that I repeat to-day what I have always said that the one great moral and social crime of the fathers of confederation was to introduce the principle of divorce into the constitution.

I come back to this bill, and my remarks will apply to the next bill and to all these other bills. I cannot understand how anyone who is opposed to divorce on principle, who believes that divorce is wrong morally and socially, can vote for any one of these divorce bills that are brought before parliament. You may say that I have done it. Yes, in a way. We all well know that all of us have done things that had better not have been done. Let us have a little humility. All of us in the course of our political lives have done things which we would like not to have done; but am I to be told in this year 1929, when age is coming upon me, that because I have been wrong or unthoughtful for many years, I am now precluded from being a little more thoughtful and thinking more of my responsibilities to my God, to my country, to my own children and to the children of others? If I have been lightheaded and unreflective in letting pass for years bills of divorce, "carried on division," I am not going to do so in the future. I said last year and I repeat it now—not in any spirit of enmity to this house, to any party in this house or to any individual—the more I grow in age, the more I reflect upon the evolutions of human society, and the more I am convinced that the cankerworm which is eating into the entrails of modern nations is, as the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has said, the destruction of the sanctity of the home.

Reference has been made to individual sufferings, to the men and women who occasionally are victims of a bad marriage. But can you point to one single law which does not carry with it some individual suffering? Can you point to one single law upon which society rests, and upon which rests the magnificent political fabric of which we are so proud, which has not multiplied martyrs all through the centuries of the glorious history of the British Empire, and of the world at large? No. When it comes to the foundations of society you have to choose between social principles upon which no concessions should be made, in regard to which no transactions should be consented to, and the suffering of some few individuals.

As to those who do not agree with me on this point, I respect their views. But if they think as does the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) and apparently the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) although he was not as clear, if they admit that on certain occasions and for certain causes divorce ought to be granted, then I come back to the other point, that such action should be taken in a judicial manner, and divorce should never be granted unless all the rules of equity and justice and evidence are applied to each case.

Mr. BROWN: Why did you not vote that way when the bill was before the house?

Mr. BOURASSA: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The hon. gentleman does not have to, of course, but if he had listened to me or had read my speech, I am sure that with his keen mind he would see that I am taking now exactly the same position that I took last year, and this year again.

Mr. BROWN: There is the record of your vote.

Mr. BOURASSA: I voted against the establishment of divorce courts by this parliament, after I had put to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre the question, "Are you prepared to amend your bill by introducing into it a clause saying that any divorce court established in any province of Canada shall not come into existence before the people of that particular community shall have expressed their will in favour of it?" That is exactly my stand to-day.

When my hon. friend interrupted I was going on to make this point. As regards those members of this house who are opposed to divorce on principle, whether you call it religious principle, social principle or political principle, I do not see how they can go on voting for all these divorce bills, and for my part I propose to vote against every one of them every time it is possible to get a division in the house. As to those who think it is their right and their duty to look into the merits of each case, then it comes to a question of their exercising judicial duties. It is admitted that divorce cases are coming to this parliament only from those provinces in which there are no divorce courts. As a

matter of fact, as I pointed out to the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine), they are practically all coming from Ontario. This parliament, therefore, having taken upon itself the responsibility of acting as a divorce court for the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec, I claim that those hon. members who are of the opinion that each case should be decided on its merits must hold the view that both branches of this parliament should make full use of all their powers of inquiry before any divorce bill is granted, just as a court of justice would do before giving the decision of the court in favour of this, that or the other party. You must apply all the rules of evidence that are in force in all these courts which this parliament has created, whether it be the supreme court, the exchequer court or any other court which has been created either by this parliament or by the legislatures of the various provinces, some under their own authority, and others, such as the Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba divorce courts, under the authority of this parliament. You must see that the truth is vindicated as far as you can vindicate it. You must see that the principles of equity and social justice are applied to all parties.

One hon. gentleman, I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, told of a correspondence he had last year with regard to one of those divorce cases. I also had letters from one of the leading legal offices in Toronto pointing out to me the abominable injustice that was done in a certain case. Whether it was true or not, I do not know, I had no power to inquire into the matter. But it turned out that the senate committee ruled that it had no power either, or did not choose to exercise such power if it had any. Thereupon the woman protested that being too poor to come here to vindicate her honour, a gross injustice had been done to her, that her life had been broken by a decision of parliament which precluded her from being heard. The senate committee passed judgment upon the case; this house passed, not judgment, but ratified the decision of the divorce committee of the senate apparently for the reason—surprising to me—that we have such confidence in one committee of one branch of this parliament that we renounce our responsibilities, we put our conscience, our intelligence and our will into the hands of the eight or ten gentlemen composing that committee. Capable as they may be, learned as they may be, I am not prepared to say, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think I could justify myself before the people who have sent me here by saying: I may have done wrong, I may have been a party to a mistaken decision by the senate committee, but the case was in the hands of that committee, and although the bill could not pass without my vote, I gave my vote without inquiry, blindly, and without knowing anything of the circumstances, because I had confidence in those gentlemen. I cannot agree to do any such thing.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, opposed as I am to divorce in principle, whatever reasons may be advanced in favour of it, believing that marriage is essentially a social principle before it is a question of contract or civil rights, believing, apart from the individual suffering that may arise from the maintenance of any particular marriage, that the great interests of society at large require the maintenance of the natural law and of the evangelical doctrine based upon it and sanctified by the word of Christ, that a marriage once contracted is contracted for life, I propose to vote against every divorce bill. In the next place, not believing that under the present system I can properly exercise those powers of judicial inquiry and judgment which we are called upon to exercise in these matters, I do not propose to sit as one of the judges on any divorce case; consequently I rule the case out of court by the only means I have at my command, and that is by voting against this bill, against the next bill, and against every other divorce bill that may come before this parliament.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, I am as desirous of preserving the sanctity of marriage and of married life as any member of this house could be. I was born and bred and I practised in the early years of my profession in the province of Nova Scotia, where we had a divorce court prior to confederation, a court which still continues to function. On that court sit judges appointed from time to time, both of Roman Catholic and the Anglican faith, who in their inmost hearts are opposed to the principle of divorce. And I presume that every judge finds the duty imposed upon him from time to time of administering laws to which he may be in principle opposed, and, if he were a member of the legislative assembly or parliament upon whom the responsibility is placed of enacting those laws, he would have voted on principle against their enactment. But the judges of that court find themselves in this judicial position, that they are bound by the solemn oath of office to administer the law which comes before them, although they are not morally or personally responsible for enactment of the law. Their sole duty is to pronounce a decision in accordance with the law which is then being administered by the

court. It is in a similar position that I sit here as one of the members of the high court of parliament of Canada.

The constitution of this country has placed the duty and the responsibility upon the members of this house of administering and carrying out the purpose and intent of that constitution as expressed in the British North America Act. Section 91 declares:

> It shall be lawful for the queen, by and with the advice and consent of the senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Canada, in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this act) the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say,—

And number 26 is:

> Marriage and divorce.

In respect of marriage and divorce parliament sits as a high court, both the commons and the senate. In times past it has been the custom for these divorce bills to be introduced in the senate and thoroughly investigated by a committee of the senate—I presume because that chamber has more time at its disposal—and the pronouncement of the senate committee has generally been accepted by this house. So long as that judicial function is imposed upon parliament, I regard it as my bounden duty to vote on the merits of each divorce bill that is brought before this house. I confess, as hon. members have stated this afternoon, that it is impossible for me to give adequate consideration to the evidence in each case which is printed by the senate committee and sent to every member of this house. I feel reluctant, really, to devote the time necessary to reading that evidence. Occasionally I have taken up at random the evidence in connection with some divorce bill and in the majority of cases, under the law which prevails in this country, I consider the applicants entitled to divorce. In other cases, not having heard the evidence, and perhaps construing it differently from those who heard it orally —because there is a great difference in my experience between reading the printed report of evidence and hearing the witnesses as they give that evidence before the committee—I should be doubtful whether I, sitting as a member of the committee in such cases, looking at the evidence as it is printed and not having heard it, would have rendered the same decision as that rendered by the senate committee. Therefore I have felt that it would be far better for parliament, and far better for the country, to impose on one of the courts of justice of the land the consideration of these petitions for divorce; because I believe that the judges of this country are far better qualified to render decisions in such cases than are we as members of the high court of parliament. But parliament in its wisdom has decided against relegating this judicial duty to the courts of the province of Ontario, and therefore so long as these bills from Ontario, relating to that province particularly, come before this parliament I feel in duty bound, under my responsibility as a member of this parliament, which is the high court of justice in Canada, to determine according to my conscience and according to the evidence given as to whether I will vote in favour of or oppose each particular bill which is brought before the house. It is very difficult, I repeat, for one to perform in this house that conscientious duty; but under the constitution of the country I think the duty is imposed upon us until such time as parliament decides in its wisdom to relegate that duty to the courts of justice. The divorce court—in the English-speaking provinces which have such courts—not only grants divorces on certain grounds of which we are all aware, but also nullifies marriages which have not been contracted according to the law. In the province of Quebec our courts exercise that jurisdiction of nullifying marriage contracts under certain circumstances, and that to a certain extent relieves those who are domiciled in Quebec from making application for divorce to the parliament of Canada. In the province of Ontario, so far, it appears that there is no consensus of opinion on the part of members representing that province as to whether divorce proceedings are better administered by this high court of parliament or would be better administered by the courts of Ontario. I have no doubt as to that; I think divorce should be relegated to those courts. And as regards the province of Quebec, with all due consideration for the views of my hon. colleagues from that province, whose religious convictions I understand and appreciate, and whose conscientious objections to divorce I also thoroughly understand and appreciate, I say that my own personal opinion is that it would be far better that the duty should be relegated to the courts of justice in that province, and that fewer mistakes would be made in administering the law if its administration were within the jurisdiction of its provincial courts.

Mr. MARCIL: Knowing the sentiment of Quebec as he knows it, and knowing that the

immense majority of the people inhabiting that province are opposed to divorce, would my hon. friend undertake to impose it on the province?

Mr. CAHAN: No, I certainly would not; because many policies which, in principle both my hon. friend and I might advocate, are nevertheless inexpedient, if it is suggested that we apply them to the whole Dominion generally. Therefore I should be opposed to imposing the administration of divorce upon the province of Quebec so long as it objected to divorce. And in the same way I would oppose—at least I would not favour —the imposition of the administration of divorce upon the courts of Ontario so long as there is any strong public opinion against it in that province. That is my position.

I think that we are above ordinary sectarian prejudices in this high court; and as, one who has a sincere respect for the religious convictions of his fellow men, I therefore, would not impose upon any province the administration of a law, which was not acceptable to that province, either in respect of marriage or in respect of divorce. But, so long as the constitution of this country remains as it is, I feel it is my duty to give a judicial decision in respect of every petition for divorce that comes properly before this house and this parliament. So that irrespective of my own personal views with regard to divorce—and, I repeat, I believe in the sanctity of the marriage relation as deeply and sincerely as my hon. colleagues from the province of Quebec—I say that so long as the duty is imposed upon me by the constitution of this country, I feel I must administer the law, whatever my personal predelictions may be. It may be very distasteful to me, and in many cases it may not be in accordance with what I think should be accepted as the better way of administering the law. Therefore, so far as this bill is concerned, on which apparently the evidence is conclusive, holding these opinions, I regard myself as in just the same position as a judge of the court of Nova Scotia, of the Catholic faith, who would feel, when the evidence was brought before him, that it was his duty and responsibility to administer the law in accordance with that evidence, although the principle of granting divorces might be utterly distasteful to him. That is the position which I intend to take in this house. So far as the province of Ontario is concerned I see no hope of relegating the duty of administering the law of divorce to the judiciary of that province, until the province actually requests it so clearly as to persuade us to legislate accordingly. At the same time I may add that so long as we sit as a high court of parliament, exercising judicial functions, I hope I may have sufficient moral strength and personal courage to administer the law, even though sometimes I would not favour the enactment of the law under which that administration takes place.

Mr. W. K. BALDWIN (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the House of Commons for a good many years and I have heard the question of divorce discussed on many occasions. I venture to say that no member of this house is more opposed to divorce on conscientious grounds than I am, because I believe a man and wife contracted to live together and that no legislative body has the right to dissolve that contract.

I have attended only one divorce court in my life, and to me it was a pathetic scene. The husband, a young man of fine appearance, brought charges against his wife, who was present in the court, and during the progress of the case the husband brought out what his six year old boy had said with regard to what he had seen his mother do. This young man seemed quite prosperous and had given his wife valuable rings and other jewellery; in fact he was so devoted that he deeded his home and made over stocks to her. During the progress of the case the husband charged that the wife drank champagne, scotch and other liquors and went about the country with other men; later I heard the wife say that her husband was a drunken creature, and so on. Each had had an illness, and each claimed that during those illnesses the other had been untrue. It was very pathetic to think that the husband would not attend to his sick wife or that the wife, while her husband was ill, went around the country with other men drinking intoxicating liquor. If I had been given an opportunity to speak to those people I believe I could have brought about a reconciliation, because in the United States I have known of people being separated and then remarrying after having been brought together again by their children or by friends.

I can remember when, so far as I knew, there was not a divorce court in the United States. Now they are located everywhere, and some of the wealthiest women take their children to those nasty places to listen to this terrible evidence. In the United States there are over fifty grounds for divorce; they even grant divorce in some states for incompatibility of temperament. In my opinion divorce is a cancer which eventually will destroy any country; many of the best thinking people of the United States say that divorce will bring about the downfall of that great country. In Canada we can boast of a virile people; we

are a great nation, recognizing all the moral laws and the laws of God, but as the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has stated, divorces have increased in Canada from only seven in one year to about two thousand, and every divorce means broken hearts. If the parties to the divorce do not suffer so much their relatives and their children are disgraced and shamed. Our homes are the bulwarks of our nation, and when we destroy the homes we weaken the moral fibre of our Canadian people. So when we grant divorces we take a tremendous responsibility upon our shoulders.

As a member of parliament I have been accused of assisting to procure divorces. No member of this house assists in that way; divorces are railroaded through the house and we must accept the responsibility. I want it distinctly understood that I will oppose in every way any divorce law or measure which may be brought up in this house at any time. What an example we are setting the rising generation, the children who are the hope of the world for the future. We should picture the broken homes, the broken hearts, the disappointed fathers, mothers, sisters and brothers when we consider the question of divorce.

I am not speaking from the constitutional standpoint, which was dealt with by the speaker who preceded me; I believe divorce is destroying our nation, and if this parliament accepts responsibility for aiding and abetting such conditions, I propose to make my stand known. I have not read the evidence in a divorce case for over five years; when these reports come to me I tear them up, and I tried to burn them but I could not do so.

There was one case of divorce in my county and not more than a dozen words appeared in the reports in relation to this case. The man had deserted his wife when the children were quite small. When the children were about twenty-one years of age, the wife finally located him. She, with her sister, discovered him living with another woman in the state of Vermont. There were four children and the wife was told that her husband was the father of those children, which he acknowledged in the presence of his wife and her sister. That is all that would be required to be proved in order to obtain a divorce. The granting of divorces will increase in number because a contaminated thing grows fast, and it would be a terrible misfortune for the youth of this country should they come to realize that members of parliament would support legislation that would destroy the sanctity of the home.

Mr. A. M. CARMICHAEL (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything on this question, but I would like to call the attention of the house to the matter under consideration. This is the second reading of Bill No. 85, letter E of the senate. By saying yes or no with regard to the second reading of this bill, we either register our opinion in favour of advancing the bill one stage, or register our opinion against such advancement. In order to give my own personal opinion, I might say that I am not opposed to the entire bill. I might go further and say that I am not absolutely opposed to the granting of divorces, but I am opposed to certain portions of the bill now before us. We find the bill divided into three parts, the first of which is the preamble. The preamble reads:

Whereas Effie Margaret Hill, residing at the city of Chatham, in the province of Ontario, factory worker, wife of Charles Henry Hill, clock repairer, who is domiciled in Canada and residing at the city of London, in the said province, has by her petition alleged that they were married on the first day of September, A.D. 1920, at the said city of Chatham, she then being Effie Margaret Borland, a spinster; and whereas by her petition she has prayed that, because of his adultery since then, their marriage be dissolved; and whereas the said marriage and adultery have been proved by evidence adduced and it is expedient that the prayer of her petition be granted: Therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

There is nothing in the preamble which should meet with opposition. We take it for granted that the senate committee has thoroughly considered the evidence adduced, and has come to the conclusion that the adultery has been proven. Relying on the thorough investigation which has been made, I am prepared to agree to the preamble. If adultery has been committed, it is possible that these two parties are not living together, and, therefore, I am quite willing that this part of the bill should pass. Clause 1 of the bill reads as follows:

The said marriage between Effie Margaret Borland and Charles Henry Hill, her husband, is hereby dissolved, and shall be henceforth null and void.

Up to that point I am in favour of that clause, but I would think that the next clause, "to all intents and purposes whatsoever" might be omitted. If something has come between two parties who have been legally married and which prevents them living together, then I have no objection to legislation being passed which will permit them to live apart. I do not claim that it is necessary that they come here to obtain that right, they could go before a court and get a judicial separation. Of course, it is

not always possible to arrive at an amicable settlement in a court, which I think is necessary in order to have a satisfactory judicial separation. We might have parties coming here and asking for a bill of divorce whereby they could be eternally separated, as the saying goes. The next clause in this bill reads as follows:

2. The said Effie Margaret Borland may at any time hereafter marry any man whom she might lawfully marry if the said marriage with the said Charles Henry Hill had not been solemnized.

I am not prepared to sanction that part of this bill. In giving my reason for arriving at this conclusion I need only say that we have a Book which is used in this so-called Christian land, a Book which is an authority prior to any statute which might be passed by this parliament. In the twentieth chapter of Exodus there are certain commands given to us to obey. One of those commands is, "Thou shalt not steal," and we take it for granted that when people do steal they commit a wrong and we pass laws to bring them to task.

Mr. BOURASSA: It depends upon the amount of money they steal.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Without a doubt, the punishment is according to the offence. Another command in that same chapter is, "Thou shalt not kill." When people go out and violate that command they are punishable by either imprisonment for a term of years, or possibly by death.

Mr. BOURASSA: Again it depends.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Another command is, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." The one Person who is partly responsible for that written message in the twentieth chapter of Exodus was here upon earth, and he told us in very plain language—language which I cannot discard or get around in order to explain away—"Whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." How can these injunctions be reconciled with what is proposed here? I cannot reconcile them myself, and, therefore, I refuse to sanction the second clause of this bill. I feel that if we as a parliament sanction such a bill we, in effect, legalize adultery. We override what, to my mind, is a greater authority than any law that we could pass in parliament.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I suggest, though, that we have never considered the possibility of bringing in a law against adultery?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Well, that is the opinion of the hon. member, but—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, I say that as a matter of fact, parliament has no law against adultery.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Quite true. We have laws against stealing; we have laws against killing, and it is quite possible we may advocate a law against adultery. Somebody may be prepared to say that the Founder of the Christian religion more or less sanctioned divorce when He was asked the question in regard to the practice of Moses. I do not believe He did. He was asked: Why did Moses allow divorces in his time? And his answer was that Moses, because of the hardness of their hearts suffered them to give writings of divorcement and to put away their wives, but from the beginning it was not so. That is the attitude I prefer to take, namely, that from the beginning such was not so and was not intended to be so, and I feel that we, in this year of Our Lord, 1929, instead of getting further away from the beginning, should make some attempt to get back to what was the intention in the beginning. Therefore I am going to vote against this bill for the reason that I think the right to marry again should not be included in any of these bills.

Some hon. members have advocated that this matter should come before a court; that the courts are more capable of inquiring into the details and adjudicating upon such matters than we in this house are. I gather that parliament is a court above every other court in the land and we should give the lead as to what course we would expect our courts to follow in similar cases. Our lead should be against passing any bill that gives the right to marry again.

The question was raised whether or not adultery could be made a punishable offence. Why could it not be made an offence? Adultery is taken as the absolute ground for divorce in Canada. If adultery were made a punishable, a statutory offence—and I am not going to suggest to what extent the punishment should be made effective—I am not so sure but that we would curb our divorce evil much more readily than we are doing even by opposing divorce bills. If adultery were made a punishable offence on the part of the person who was the cause of the divorce proceedings, and then if we followed that a little further and classified any person who married after being granted a divorce, as being guilty of adultery and liable to such punishable offence, I am rather of opinion that we would curb our divorce evil to a greater extent. For these various reasons I am going to vote against Bill No. 85, and every other divorce bill that comes before the house.

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Vancouver-Burrard): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member desire to speak?

Mr. CLARK: The hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael) has given some very good reasons for the establishment of a divorce court, but he has given no reasons for a change in a principle recognized by law. If an applicant such as the one involved in this case, were to come before a court and the evidence which is before parliament were given, any court in the land would give that woman the right to remarry. Therefore I suggest that while the member has given a very good reason for the establishment of a divorce court, he has given no good reason why we should change the principle of the granting of divorce by parliament.

At confederation the principle upon which we act was decided by the constitution; the principle upon which we act was reaffirmed a few months ago during this session, and that principle was accepted by the house. Every member of the house, by deciding that there would be no divorce court established for the province of Ontario, assumed the responsibility of sitting in his seat here as he would if he sat upon the bench as a judge. When a lawyer accepts a judicial office in Canada, he assumes the responsibilities that go with that office, and one of the responsibilities of that office is hearing petitions for divorce. Regardless of his religion, regardless of his convictions, he is bound to administer the law as it stands. That is the exact position of every member of the house. He has been elected by the electors of his constituency to come here and do his duty. One of the duties of the individual member is to act in a judicial capacity and in every case that comes before the house he is obliged to give his decision in accordance with the facts of the particular case, not in acordance with his belief upon a principle, because that principle has been established for us. During this session we attempted to rid ourselves of that particular principle, and we failed. I for one was quite willing that another body should deal with applications for divorce, but the house decided otherwise. Therefore it is my responsibility now to look into this case and into all other divorce cases, and to give my decision just as I would give it were I sitting upon the bench of the country. My obligation is just as strong as that of any judge, regardless of my personal convictions.

It only remains for us to consider whether the facts of this particular case merit the granting of a dissolution of marriage. I have read the evidence in this case and it is very simple. I do not think it would be out of place to cite the facts. The applicant was married in 1920 and she fell ill very shortly after her marriage. Her husband deserted her. He has lived for some years with another woman by whom he has had three children. The applicant has been forced to earn her living during these years and she is now applying for dissolution of marriage. The evidence is simple and clear and any court in the land would grant the divorce. Personally I do not know the parties in the case and I do not even know the lawyer. It happens that my name is there as the sponsor of the bill. I have looked into the facts of the case and I believe it is a meritorious one. I believe that we are bound to adjudicate upon it just as though we were sitting as a court of law.

Mr. ADSHEAD: From what the hon. member has said, is it not a question whether this lady ought not to be awarded alimony or some compensation for the conduct of her husband in deserting her when she was sick? This parliament has no power to do that.

Mr. CLARK: As far as the petition is concerned, I did not observe whether the wife is asking for alimony. In any case, as I understand it, she could not get it from this court, though she might from a provincial court. But that does not alter the situation. We are a court, and we are governed by the principles of law as they now exist. We are bound to administer the law as we find it. We cannot at this sitting make a new law. We are confronted with a situation, and we are bound in honour and conscience and in justice and in every other way to administer the law as we find it at this moment. We may, it is true, change the law. I have no objection to the law being changed, but as long as the law stands as it is we are bound to consider the merits of this particular case, and give our decision upon it, regardless of our religious faith or personal convictions.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Might I ask my hon. friend as a lawyer whether he would expect any jury to decide upon a case in which they had not even heard the evidence?

Mr. CLARK: I do not think the question has any point. We are merely a confirming court. There is a committee which has heard the evidence and we are now, as I understand it, merely determining whether or not we will send this case to a committee of the house for further consideration. I will go this far and say that if a jury heard the evidence as the evi-

dence is printed, I have no doubt in the world that any jury sitting in any part of this country would grant the divorce.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Clark) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Adshead,
Anderson (Toronto-High Park),
Anderson (Halton),
Arthurs,
Bancroft,
Barber,
Bennett,
Bird,
Black (Halifax),
Blatchford,
Bock,
Bothwell,
Brown,
Cahan,
Campbell,
Cayley,
Chaplin,
Clark,
Cowan,
Dickie,
Dunning,
Edwards (Frontenac-Addington),
Ernst,
Euler,
Fansher (Lambton East),
Forke,
Foster,
Fraser,
Geary,
Gershaw,
Glen,
Gray,
Hall,
Hanson,
Heaps,
Howden,
Hubbs,
Jenkins,
Johnston (Long Lake),
Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria),
Jones,
Kaiser,
King (Kootenay East),
Ladner,
Lovie,
MacLaren,
MacLean (Prince),
McLean (Melfort),
McPhee,
McPherson,
McQuarrie,
McRae,
Milne,
Neill,
Pettit,
Plunkett,
Price,
Ralston,
Rennie,
Robb,
Ryerson,
Sanderson,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Queens),
Sinclair (Wellington North),
Speakman,
Steedsman,
Stevens,
Stewart (Edmonton West),
Stirling,
Telford,
Thompson,
Thorson,
Totzke,
Vallance,
Ward,
Young (Weyburn).—77.

NAYS

Messrs:

Baldwin,
Beaubien,
Benoit,
Bissett,
Blanchard,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bourgeois,
Carmichael,
Delisle,
Descoteaux,
Dubuc,
Dussault,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fansher (Last Mountain),
Fiset (Sir Eugene),
Gardiner,
Girouard,
Goulet,
Irvine,
Kennedy,
Laflamme,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Letellier,
Luchkovich,
Macphail (Miss),
McMillan,
Marcil,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Motherwell,
Pouliot,
Power,
Prévost,
Roberge,
Ross (Moose Jaw),
Spencer,
Veniot,
Woodsworth,
Young (Saskatoon).—42.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Clark, seconded by Mr. Hanson, that the said bill be referred to the select standing committee on private bills.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, at this stage I desire to oppose such a reference to the private bills committee. It does not seem to me that the principle has been clearly decided, and I have—

Mr. BENNETT: Six o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: When the house rose at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was about to call attention to the fact that whereas we have heard a great deal about the high court of parliament, the vote after all would show to anyone who knew the position of this parliament, that it was not based on the evidence in the particular case—

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member allow me. The principle of the bill was carried on the second reading. The present motion is that the bill be committed to the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills. Under standing order 50 it is provided:

> A motion to refer a bill, resolution or any question to the committees of the whole, or any standing or special committee shall preclude all amendment of the main question.

And under the same rule the following appears:

> To "commit" a bill means to refer it to a committee, to be considered and reported.
>
> A bill may be committed either to a standing committee, a select committee, a committee of the whole house or a joint committee of the house and senate.

I would particularly direct the hon. member's attention to the next paragraph, 427:

> This motion is not debatable under standing order 38 unless it be an order of the day; but, upon the motion for the third reading of the bill, an amendment for the recommittal of the bill may be debated.

The motion now before the house is one of a purely formal character, following as a logical consequence from the adoption of the principle of the bill. I may observe to the hon. member that he will have many opportunities to discuss the present bill and even to propose thereto any amendment he sees fit when the bill is reported from the committee. Under the circumstances I must rule the motion not debatable. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to and bill referred to the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

FRANCES GWENDOLYN SNOW LOTT

Mr. W. F. GARLAND (Carleton) moved the second reading of bill No. 91, for the relief of Frances Gwendolyn Snow Lott.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): In the discussion of the last bill the mover, the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark), was good enough to give us an outline of the evidence in the case. It seems to me that in the course of the debate we are now to have we ought to get from the hon. member for Carleton the main facts of the evidence in the case now before us. Only as we have such facts can we approach even to a semblance of doing things in a judicial manner. We have been told by those who represent the law to-day that we are a high court of parliament and as such, I take it, we ought not to act without sufficient evidence having been presented. In connection with the last bill we had some second-hand evidence as given out from the senate; we had no original evidence presented to us. However, we did have some statements made by the promoter of the bill, and I think at this stage we should at least have that much before us.

Then it was suggested that we were acting in the capacity of jurymen. I would say that when jurymen are present in a court they are required to be present at the time the decision is made, but half of our jurymen ran behind the curtains. So I am inclined to think it was a political rather than a judicial decision which was given. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to give a judicial decision on the bill before us all the members of the jury should remain in the room and vote on the merits of the case and on the evidence as it is presented by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Garland). Further than that, suggestions were made during the course of the debate which I think influenced the vote of some of the members of the house; some thought they should have the authority of some church for acting as they did.

Mr. DUNNING: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is not discussing the bill before the house but is discussing the manner in which members voted on a previous bill. I was one of those who remained here, so his remarks do not affect me, but if this sort of thing is to be continued I think the discussion should be kept strictly in order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am happy indeed that my remarks have not affected the

[Mr. Speaker.]

Minister of Railways, since he was in his place. I am referring, and I think I am quite in order, to the fact that it was stated that we dealt with these matters as a sort of jury, and I directed attention to the fact that a number of hon. members retired at the time the vote was taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. gentleman to confine his remarks to the bill now before the house.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In dealing with this matter, Mr. Speaker, I think we cannot come to any decision without involving the principle of divorce. Again and again hon. members have stated in this house that they are definitely opposed to granting any divorces; that means that they are definitely opposed to granting these divorces, and I submit that any bill coming before us involves the principle of divorce and that we have a right to speak on that principle.

In the discussion which took place certain members felt that it was against their conscientious beliefs to vote for any divorce bill; some felt that their church authorities were opposed to it, and to support that view certain authorities were quoted. One of the bodies mentioned was the Anglican church, but I hold in my hand a copy of a resolution which was sent not long ago to the Minister of Justice by the Toronto Anglican Diocesan Council for Social Service, and which is as follows:

> This council, being ever anxious to uphold the sanctify of marriage, and deploring the increase of divorce, is of opinion after careful consideration that, there being no extension of the existing ground of divorce, the establishment of a divorce court for Ontario (in lieu of the present divorce proceedings before parliament) dealing with the subject according to the recognized procedure of the courts and including the question of the custody of the children and provision of alimony for a deserving wife (and mother), would make for the better administration of the existing law of divorce.

That resolution clearly shows that one of the leading churches, which was quoted during this discussion, is not fundamentally opposed to the principle of divorce but would urge that provision be made, as some of us have suggested, for the custody of the children and for alimony.

Let me repeat what I said this afternoon: I am opposed to these particular bills as they come along simply because no provision whatever is made for the care and custody of children or for alimony for the wife. Later on, if these bills are returned to committee of the whole, I may propose certain amendments similar to those which I

proposed last year, in order to provide for alimony. Those amendments may be turned down by this house, but on the other hand they will serve to direct the attention of the public at large to the gross injustice which we are perpetuating by this manner of dealing with these bills.

Mr. GEARY: Why provide for alimony?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Because I think it is cruel to grant a divorce to a woman while making no provision for her sustenance afterwards. Under present conditions she must take action in the civil courts, and I would take it that the general principle should be that the court granting the divorce should be the court which could grant alimony.

Mr. GEARY: I quite agree with the latter statement, that the same court should make provision for alimony if alimony is thought desirable, but the law in regard to alimony is that it does not necessarily follow separation in any form. Alimony is intended to put a wife into the same position of life she would have occupied if she had not married.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Quite so; that is one of the points I tried to bring out last year, that we have absolutely no way of ascertaining whether or not alimony should be granted.

Mr. CAHAN: You cannot have any means of ascertaining that so long as alimony is not claimed by the petitioner.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I know that, and the claim is not made simply because it has not been the practice. It is doubtful if we could grant such a claim, but if there were a regular court that could be done.

Mr. GEARY: The woman might be much better off without alimony.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Possibly so, but in other cases she might be better off with it and those are the cases I have in view. I would like to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that those of us who are opposing these bills are not in any way anxious to break down home life. I do not think that inference would be willingly placed upon our action by any hon. members who are opposed to divorce, but nevertheless again and again it has been put in that way. One would think that by proposing divorce or, as some of us did a while ago, suggesting the establishment of a divorce court, we are necessarily breaking down the homes of Canada. I believe that in many cases the present system is breaking down the sanctity of the home, and the present insistence on adultery as the sole ground for divorce is lowering our moral life. I have the testimony of such an eminent jurist as Lord Birkenhead, in his treatment of the whole question of divorce, in support of that latter statement. By concentrating attention on the physical act of adultery we lower the whole conception of marriage.

In addition to that, there is one province of Canada from which applications for divorce rarely come; that is the province of Quebec, and there are people from that province who seem to think that they are particularly virtuous because so few applications for divorce come from Quebec, while we are less virtuous who reside in other provinces where there are divorce courts or from which come many more applications for divorce. I do not believe that for one moment; I think in my own province of Manitoba we have a regard for the sanctity of the home as great as that held by the people who reside in the province of Quebec.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Does not my hon. friend realize that the citizens of Quebec believe in our Canadian courts and are bound by their judgments?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Quite so, but that does not enter into the question at all. During the discussion the implication came from some quarters that we are less earnest in our desire to maintain the sanctity of the home because in other provinces we have divorce courts, and I state emphatically that I would resent any inference of that kind. If we are to discuss the purity of the home and the general morality of the population we must take into account general illegitimacy, which is very prevalent in some provinces which boast of their higher state of morality. I do not want to enter into any discussion as to the relative morality of the different provinces; I do not think that would get us anywhere, but I do resent the suggestion that merely because I live in a province which has divorce courts we in that province are less moral than the people who live in other provinces where there are no divorce courts. Further, I resent the suggestion that because there are more applications for divorce from the province of Ontario it necessarily follows that the people of Ontario are less moral than the people from the provinces from which fewer applications for divorce arise. I do not think that follows at all, and I do not think we should have these implications put upon the arguments of the members who are speaking on this question.

I yield to no one in my desire to maintain the sanctity of the home. I believe that marriage should be sacramental in character. Whether it be in a Catholic or Protestant

community, or a community where the people do not adhere to any faith, marriage is sacramental in character where there is true affection between husband and wife. Certain particular religious beliefs should not be brought in to decide this great question of divorce. It is for this reason that some of us feel that divorce cases should be decided entirely aside from such political considerations as have obtained in the past and which were very largely responsible for the rejection of the bill to grant the province of Ontario a divorce court.

I merely reiterate my former position that I shall have to show my protest in what seems to be the only way open, by voting against this bill unless specific evidence is brought forward to show that it is desirable that such a bill should be passed. I would ask that the promoter of this bill, the hon. member for Carleton inform the house of the reasons for the granting of this particular divorce.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound) moved:

That the question be now put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I might explain to the house the effect of this motion. Standing order No. 55 reads as follows:

The previous question, until it is decided, shall preclude all amendment of the main question, and shall be in the following words, "That this question be now put." If the previous question be resolved in the affirmative, the original question is to be put forthwith without any amendment or debate.

In other words, it is the parliamentary closure to reach a decision on the main motion.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Arthurs) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Toronto-High Park),
Anderson (Halton),
Arthurs,
Bancroft,
Barber,
Bell (St. John-Albert),
Bennett,
Black (Halifax),
Bock,
Bothwell,
Brown,
Cahan,
Chaplin,
Clark,
Dickie,
Dunning,
Edwards (Frontenac-Addington),
Embury,
Euler,
Forke,
Fraser,
Garland (Carleton),
Geary,
Hall,
Hanson,
Johnston (Long Lake),
Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria),
Jones,
King (Kootenay East),
Ladner,
Lawson,
Lovie,
Macdougall,
MacLaren,
MacLean (Prince),
McMillan,
McPhee,
McQuarrie,
McRae,
Neill,
Pettit,
Plunkett,
Price,
Robb,
Ross (Kingston City),
Ryerson,
Sanderson,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Queens),
Sinclair (Wellington North),
Stevens,
Stewart (Edmonton West),
Stewart (Leeds),
Stinson,
Stirling,
Telford,
Thompson,
Young (Weyburn).—58.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead,
Beaubien,
Benoit,
Bissett,
Blanchard,
Blatchford,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bourgeois,
Campbell,
Carmichael,
Casgrain,
Coote,
Delisle,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Dionne,
Dubuc,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fansher (Last Mountain),
Fansher (Lambton East),
Fiset (Sir Eugene),
Foster,
Gardiner,
Gershaw,
Gervais,
Girouard,
Glen,
Gray,
Heaps,
Howden,
Irvine,
Jenkins,
Kennedy,
Laflamme,
Lapierre,
Letellier,
Luchkovich,
McLean (Melfort),
Macphail (Miss),
McIntosh,
McPherson,
Marcil,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Mercier (St. Henri),
Millar,
Milne,
Motherwell,
Power,
Prévost,
Ross (Moose Jaw),
St-Père,
Séguin,
Smith (Stormont),
Spencer,
Thorson,
Tobin,
Totzke,
Vallance,
Veniot,
Ward,
Woodsworth,
Young (Saskatoon).—65.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I can understand how many hon. members will feel impatient at having to discuss these things which hitherto have passed en bloc without any discussion at all; but I think on more mature consideration they may even thank the left wing in this section for bringing these matters to their attention, if for no other reason than for the dignity of the house itself. I cannot understand how we can allow these things to go on without making a protest. The bill now before the house is just a bill. Nobody knows anything about it. Nobody has risen to explain it. For all we know, it may be to hang this woman and this man. We do not know anything about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the motion that the question be now put, that is, the previous question, had carried, the house would imme-

diately, without debate, have considered the main motion for the second reading of the bill in the name of the hon. member for Carleton. But the house has just decided that the question be not now put. Therefore the question is superseded and cannot be put now. It is superseded and it will come up another day so that we shall have to pass to another bill. This is from Bourinot, page 326:

If the previous question be carried, the Speaker will immediately put the question, without further debate. But if the previous question be resolved in the negative—

Which is the case here.

—then the Speaker cannot put the main motion which is consequently superseded, but which, however, may be revived on a future day as the negative of the previous question merely binds the Speaker not to put the main question at that time.

So I may console the hon. member for Carleton by informing him that he may come back another day and put the motion.

Main motion (Mr. Garland) stands.

EDWARD GEORGE CROUCHER

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound) (for Mr. Casselman) moved the second reading of Bill No. 92, for the relief of Edward George Croucher.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the sponsor present?

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion can be moved by another member.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the hon. member explain it.

Mr. SPEAKER: In that case we will say: Stand.

Mr. ARTHURS: Many bills have been sponsored by members for other members who are absent, and no objection has been taken I would ask the Speaker to note the objection in this case.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would allow the motion to be put, but the hon. member for Bonaventure is justified in saying that he has some questions to ask.

Motion stands.

ELSIE ALICE HERVEY

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Vancouver-Burrard) moved the second reading of bill No. 93, for the relief of Elsie Alice Hervey.

Mr. H. E. SPENCER (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I voted against the last motion before the house, and I intend to vote against all like motions when an attempt is made to force legislation through the house without discussion. The hon. member who introduced the bill, although invited by another hon. member to explain it, refused to do so. I am sorry that I do not know anything about the bill that is now before the house, owing to the fact that on Saturday morning only I received from the senate copies of the evidence in regard to some forty bills, and I have had no time to peruse them. I am certainly not going to vote for this bill until I know something about it. If the hon. member who is fathering this divorce bill will give an explanation which will in my opinion justify the motion for its second reading, I shall be glad to support it. But unless he can, I shall be obliged to vote against it for lack of knowledge, and also because I object to the principle of bringing these divorce bills before the house. This is not the proper quarter. I am not against the principle of divorce. Under certain circumstances I think divorce is the proper thing, and that in certain cases a couple is far better divorced than held together legally. At the same time so far as I personally am concerned, before I can agree to the passing of this bill, I want to know what are the reasons why this divorce should be granted.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): Just before the sponsor of this bill rises, I would point out that this house by its vote decided that in three of the provinces of Canada divorce could only be obtained through the parliament of Canada, and regardless how any of us may have voted on that motion, the decision of the House of Commons is that there shall be no divorce court for Ontario, Quebec or Prince Edward Island at the present time.

Mr. CLARK: With regard to this bill—

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): Is the hon. gentleman closing the debate, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, if he speaks now he closes the debate.

Mr. IRVINE: It seems strange, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have the explanation of the bill until the hon. gentleman promoting it closes the debate. Is it presupposed that if there is an argument against the passing of this bill we shall not be allowed to put it forward? This is indeed more strange than the procedure which we have hitherto followed.

The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Arthurs) has advanced as a reason why we should vote for this bill that the House of Commons has decided that for the

present there shall be no other way of securing divorce except through the parliament of Canada, and therefore we must continue to grant it. If that be a good reason, then this house had better decide to investigate what it is granting, and if it will do that, I shall be partially satisfied at least. I think that any hon. member in whose name a bill stands ought to be in a position to tell the house what it is about. I am not clear whether the relief this woman wants is to hang the man or to put him in prison, or if it is a divorce that she is seeking, I do not know whether she should be freed from her present marriage and no explanation has been forthcoming so far.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to deal with these matters in a way that will be creditable to this house and do justice to the intelligence of hon. members, we shall have to find a better way than this. I hope that in the division on this bill, hon. gentlemen in this house, who are the judges of judges, sitting in the highest court of the land, will actually stay in and vote. If I were assured that the majority of the members of this house wished to accept the responsibility for granting these divorces, even wrongly, it would not be so bad as it is, but when those who wish to do these things stay out of the chamber when the vote is on and leave other members to take the responsibility, I do not like that way of doing things.

We on this side of the house have been charged to-day, and presumably we shall be charged also in connection with this bill, that we have been remiss in our duty as parliamentarians as we have confessed that we did not understand what the case was about. Hon. gentlemen have made that charge to-day. Now I want to put this to the thought of the house: If all the divorce applications now before this parliament are to be considered this year, approximately three hundred cases, what would my constituents say if I told them that instead of reading the Bank Act, the Railway Act, the budget and all the other important business that is to come before parliament, I had spent my time reading the evidence in three hundred divorce cases?

An hon. MEMBER: Dirty dog.

Mr. IRVINE: I think they would probably say that, and yet I am told by reputable hon. gentlemen opposite that unless I sit down and read the evidence in three hundred divorce cases I am remiss in my parliamentary duty. That one thing in itself is a sufficient reason why these bills should not be considered by this parliament and why this bill should be killed.

[Mr. Irvine.]

For fear that you should call me to order, Mr. Speaker, I must say that it appears that the only way in which we can get any constructive action with respect to this matter is to force a discussion on every one of these bills and get a proper explanation of them, and then when they get into the committee stage, to ask for an investigation. But we shall be told that the senate committee has already investigated these cases. Very well. But do we take the same attitude with respect to all other legislation? Legislation comes from the upper house after passing through their committees, and then when it gets into committee in the House of Commons the matter is again investigated if it is thought necessary. After we pass these motions with respect to divorce bills, it is true that the bills go to a committee, but the members of that committee simply go in there, say good morning, and go out again, and nobody asks any questions about these divorce bills and no consideration is given to them. I give credit to the senate divorce committee. I think the senate committee does its business well, and if we did our business in this regard as well as the senate committee we would not have to make such speeches as I am now making. As it is now, we are simply taking it for granted that the senate has done its duty and that we can afford to be remiss in ours. I hope that the hon. gentleman in whose name this bill stands will give a clear statement of the case to parliament, and if that involves the discussion of matters which should not be made public for moral reasons, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, in that case to clear the galleries and let us enter into this discussion and face the issue like men. If I am to judge of the merits of this case I insist upon hearing the evidence, and I hope that every other member will take the same stand.

Mr. GEORGE H. PETTIT (Welland): It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this house sits in judgment upon these divorce cases in the capacity of a court of appeal, and unless some hon. member can convince this house that the judgment of the senate committee is contrary to the evidence, I submit that we should confirm the judgment of the senate committee. The law is there, and these petitioners for divorce have a right to come before the senate committee. They have gone there and have produced their evidence, and the senate committee have rendered their judgment, and this house, I submit, is bound to confirm that judgment unless it can be convinced that the verdict is contrary to the evidence.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): Just from the point of view of the dignity of this house and of the necessary requirement that its business be conducted with order and despatch, I desire to say a word or two.

I listened very carefully to the indictment of the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine), who has just sat down, with respect to the manner in which the house should discharge its duty. If his argument means anything, it means that with respect to every individual matter which comes before this house each member should carefully study it and form his own individual judgment upon it. That I gather to be his argument and his reason for opposing the acceptance by this house of evidence taken in another chamber as a means for forming a judgment upon these cases. I would respectfully point out to him and to hon. members that part of the machinery of this parliament and of every parliament is committees, which are appointed for the very purpose of going into matters in greater detail and hearing evidence from people outside of this house which it would be impossible for us to hear in this house of commons chamber. We are going a little further in connection with divorce. Why? Because this house determined, rightly or wrongly, that there should not be other means of obtaining divorce in three of the provinces of Canada save through the parliament of Canada. For many years one chamber of this parliament, the senate, has been the court of inquiry with respect to divorce matters, and it has been the custom in this house to accept the evidence there given, the reason for that being partly the knowledge on the part of all members of the care with which the senate divorce committee goes into these matters,—partly that, I say, and partly also the fact that it would be inconvenient and cumbersome and equivalent to denying divorce altogether, even in necessitous cases, to have a similar inquiry with all the attendant expense to the applicant conducted also by this house in its turn. I submit to the judgment of hon. members that in accepting the evidence, which is printed and can be obtained by any member who cares to ask for it—

An hon. MEMBER: It is sent to all members.

Mr. DUNNING: I am not sure of that.

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. DUNNING: But in any case the evidence is available, evidence taken by a body against which no one has cast any reflections; there is no question from any quarter that the senate committee either this year or in years past has not functioned laboriously and efficiently in dealing with the work assigned to it as a result of the method determined by this parliament for securing divorce.

I submit, sir, that this is not the time or the place to discuss whether or not we believe in divorce. This house determined on another occasion that there should be no method of securing divorce in three of the provinces other than by act of parliament. If hon. members desire that this chamber should set up duplicate machinery to that now existing in the senate, I submit that the proper place to argue that point is in the private bills committee to which these bills are referred. It is possible for any member to move in the private bills committee that witnesses be called the same as in connection with any other private bill. But I think such a proceeding would be absurd because of the care with which the matter has been dealt with in the other chamber.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this house is attaching proper importance to the work which we are here to do by spending what appears likely to be days, if not weeks, debating these matters, which after all are merely matters of procedure. It is quite within the discretion of this house to determine what procedure shall be adopted in inquiring into the bills referred to it by the senate, whether or not it shall set up duplicate machinery, as in relation to a number of other matters the senate sometimes does set up duplicate machinery when it is not able to accept the conclusions reached by this house. I submit the question is a very simple one. It is whether we should or should not set up duplicate machinery to hear again evidence which has already been adduced before the senate committee. There is no need to take up the time of this house with lengthy discussions on the principle of divorce, because already in so far as it relates to the setting up of divorce courts, this house has determined the question this session and said that the only means of securing a divorce is through the medium of the Senate and House of Commons assembled. That being the case, the decision is really whether we should or should not set up duplicate machinery.

Mr. IRVINE: Before the minister takes his seat may I ask him this question: Is it not so that we already have duplicate machinery in respect to all other legislation? That being so, why not in respect to this matter?

Mr. DUNNING: No, not in respect to all other legislation. In connection with very

much of the legislation the senate does not undertake an exhaustive inquiry to supplement that which has been undertaken by committees of this house. The record of the proceedings of the senate is sufficient evidence of that. My hon. friend will see I am careful not to state that the senate has not that power just as we have in this chamber in relation to anything submitted to us from the senate. I think, Mr. Speaker, we could shorten these discussions by agreeing, if possible, that the question is really one whether we shall or shall not set up duplicate machinery to deal with divorce.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Dunning) on having done what I consider it was the duty of the government to have done early this afternoon—declare its attitude upon this matter.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend will pardon me. I was speaking purely as a member of the house. This is not a government matter at all.

Mr. BENNETT: I wonder if my hon. friend realizes that the government has control of this house and is responsible for the conduct of the business. It is because of that fact that we on this side declined this afternoon to discuss what we conceived to be a great loss of time and a great injury to the dignity of parliament as a result of the discussions and votes that have engaged our attention. I think my friends to the left have failed, and I am sure my friend from Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine) has failed, to appreciate just what this house is now being asked to do. It is being asked to give second reading to a bill, a private bill, for the purpose of divorcing two people. Antecedently to that motion being made in this house, a bill was introduced into the senate, a committee having taken evidence on a petition praying for divorce and having determined on that evidence that a case had been made out for the relief sought. It is hardly necessary for me to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is only one ground upon which this parliament acts in granting divorce, that ground being unfaithfulness on the part of one or other of the spouses; and when the evidence was heard it established to the satisfaction of the senate committee the guilt of the offending party. On the bill coming into this house, as the Minister of Railways has said, if we give it second reading it is referred to the committee on private bills—a committee of which my friend the member for Wetaskiwin is a member, and I think my friend from Battle River (Mr. Spencer).

Mr. SPENCER: No.

Mr. BENNETT: My friend is not a member?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, he is.

Mr. BENNETT: The course pursued before the private bills committee is very simple. The committee can do one of two things: they can call witnesses, hear evidence and determine the action to be taken; or they can do what the probate division does in England, take the depositions already made under oath, read them and determine whether or not the bill shall be accepted.

Now, I wonder if my friend from Wetaskiwin realizes that this parliament consists of two houses, the senate and the commons. A divorce bill is not an act of parliament until it has been approved by both houses. The commons, giving the bill its second reading and referring it to a committee, the committee takes the sworn depositions that were made before the senate committee, and upon reading those depositions it dispenses with the calling of the witnesses. The probate division in England in a very important case involving a question of very serious consequences to the parties engaged, one of whom lived in Alberta, recently took evidence by affidavit and heard it before Lord Merrivale, president of the court, rather than take the witnesses across the Atlantic ocean to testify. And this house in sending a divorce bill to a committee does not ask that committee to deal with it in any particular way; it leaves it open for the committee to take its own course. For instance, if the member for Wetaskiwin so desires, he may say: We will put these people to all the expense and trouble of calling witnesses before our committee. Or committee may proceed as the British courts of justice have proceeded for many years in admiralty cases, in divorce cases, and in cases in the chancery and king's bench divisions, read, if it is thought desirable, evidence already taken before a committee of another house under oath—upon which perjury might be charged—for the purpose of satisfying itself—the committee——that the case alleged against the defendant has been made out. Now, is it possible that this House of Commons desires so to hold up to the world—shall I say?—our inability to grapple with a simple problem by making it appear, as my friend from Winnipeg North

Centre has done this afternoon, that there is a great principle involved, when the house has already decided to establish no divorce courts in the other provinces? I wonder if my friends realize, first, that this is the only court to which they can go; secondly, that that court consists of two branches of our parliament; thirdly, that one branch of that parliament, through a committee, determines for or against the relief that is asked; and lastly that this house is now merely sending a bill to a committee, which committee may itself determine whether it will utilize the evidence that was given before the senate committee or hear the evidence on its own behalf. And then the bill comes back to the committee of the whole house, which treats it as any other legislation is treated, whether it be legislation relating to patents, to the incorporation of a railway company, or any other question. And that is the reason that the senate committee reduces the evidence to writing, because otherwise there would be no record of it; they might be satisfied with the evidence but there would be nothing in writing upon which to proceed. For that reason they reduce the evidence to writing, submitting it to this house in printed form in order that our committee, following a long established practice extending over twenty-five, thirty, forty and fifty years, may have the evidence before it. It was the same in England. I wonder if my hon. friends realize that before the act of 1857 all divorces considered in Great Britain from any part of the British Isles—from Ireland, from Scotland, from England itself—were by way of private bill which was first heard by a committee of the House of Lords. It was from that practice that we adopted our procedure in this country, of having the evidence heard in a committee of the senate in the first place. That committee of the House of Lords heard the evidence and the appropriate committee in the commons could do what they pleased with it; they could consider the evidence as presented to them, if it were printed, or could themselves hear the witnesses, have the evidence taken down, and arrive at their own conclusion.

I do submit that the observations of the Minister of Railways with respect to the dignity—and shall I say the usefulness—of this parliament were very relevant and most pertinent. Many hon. gentlemen in this house, on conscientious grounds, not believing in divorce and desiring, as they always have desired in days gone by, to maintain their opposition, allow the passage of these bills with the qualification, "carried on division," thereby indicating that they do not become a party to the action of this house in granting any divorce; and I am satisfied that these hon. gentlemen have no wish to see the institutions of this country waste time, involving thousands of dollars, in dealing with a question which after all, if it is carefully analyzed, will be seen to be a problem in respect to which we are following not only practice and custom but a rule which, I think it will be admitted, common sense dictates—namely, that where evidence is given under oath before a committee of the senate it is desirable that we dispense, so far as this house is concerned, with the calling of witnesses and the duplicating of evidence received under cross-examination in another branch of parliament.

There is another phase of the question which I desire to put to the house in all seriousness. This is the only court through which relief can be obtained; and as suggested to me this afternoon by my legal friend from Toronto, an English court has no option but to decide. When the witnesses have been heard, the judge upon the bench must decide the case submitted to him; and a committee of this parliament having been convened in due form, and having before it these cases to deal with, must consider and dispose of them. The paltry excuses which have been put forward against dealing with the matter might be worthy of a debating class in a small academy, but they are unworthy of the parliament of Canada, and to that extent I agree with what has been said by the Minister of Railways. Indeed, I have been waiting all afternoon and evening for some hon. member representing the government to discuss the subject; for the government must assume responsibility for the conduct of public business in this parliament. I therefore congratulate the minister upon what he has said and upon the stand he has taken, and I trust that hon. gentlemen who have used these methods, from a conscientious desire to hold up to the country the lack of facilities which they say are afforded people to obtain divorces to which they are entitled, will now realize that, this house having deprived such people of these facilities by its deliberate action in declining to create a court, and there being no other method by which redress may be obtained, it is therefore important that a reasonable course be pursued such as will enable that redress to be given without further delay on the part of parliament.

Mr. A. M. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I think there is a good deal in what the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) has said as well as

in the remarks of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett); but I do not know that they have said it all. I had a rather unique honour thrust upon me a few days ago when I was selected, as one of the members of the private bills committee, to be a representative of that committee, with the pleasure of attending the committee in the senate to hear these divorce cases. There used to be but one committee in the senate, and apparently it could handle all cases that came before it. Now business has grown so great over there that the senate has felt it necessary to have three committees on divorce. And we used to have two representatives from the private bills committee whose duty it was to hear such cases; now we have six. I assume the object was to have on each of the three committees in the senate two representatives from the commons committee.

I confess that up to the present time I have not had the time to go to the senate to hear these investigations in respect to this very important matter. In the province of Saskatchewan, from which I have the honour to come, we have a divorce court, and on many occasions my constituents have consulted me with regard to this question, asking me why it was necessary for us to spend our time—or, as they put it, waste our time—hearing divorce cases from one or two provinces in Canada. My constituents feel that I am wasting time when I listen to this sort of thing. I agree with the leader of the opposition when he says that there is waste of time; but in my judgment we are wasting time when we proceed in this particular way. This is a matter of great importance and I should like to see every case dealt with fairly and squarely on its merits and a proper decision arrived at. When we dissolve a marriage we dispose of but one phase of the whole question. I have some interest in the women—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon):—whose marriage ties are dissolved. I am sorry that hon. gentlemen opposite laugh. Apparently they have no interest in women; I am different. Let me go one step further and invite them to laugh at this: I have an interest in the children of every marriage which is dissolved. Now I understand that the senate committee has no power, no right, either to deal with alimony for the unfortunate woman or to make a disposition with regard to the children. With all the good intentions in the world, I am bound to say I have not the time seriously to attend the divorce committee in the senate, nor even to report to the private bills committee of the House of Commons. There is not an hon. member who does not know that this is not possible. Every hon. member in this house spends, I believe, from twelve to fifteen hours every day around these buildings during the time this house is in session; and if I attended to the duty which has been thrust upon me and were present at all these meetings of the senate committee on divorce I should be unable to attend to the business for which I was really sent to this house.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why not resign in favour of the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke)?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Perhaps the hon. member would like to take the position I now have on the divorce committee. I would resign in favour of the hon. member, and I am sure he would do as badly as I do by force of circumstance. At least I will do this much: whenever I have a little spare time and the senate committee meets for the consideration of divorce cases I will spend that time over there and do what I can. At the same time I am opposed to the method we are adopting; I do not think it is a good practice. But I know of no other way of bringing to the attention of the country the fact that this House of Commons is not doing full justice to the question in failing to place within the grasp of certain provinces—and I agree with the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that we have not done as we should in this respect—the opportunity of establishing for themselves divorce courts if they so desire. If Ontario and Quebec say that they do not desire divorce courts, at least this house, if this were done, would have gone to the extent of placing them in a position to take advantage of this course as they might see fit. I have given this matter some attention and I think I can stand in this house and say conscientiously and honestly that in the courts of the province of Saskatchewan much more attention is given to these questions than possibly can be given by any committee of this house or of the senate. We are charged by some people with obstructing these bills; some of them get rather warm under the collar because of our actions, but no man can charge any one of us with being less sincere in this matter than he is himself. We are not taking this stand with the idea of obstruction; we are simply drawing to the attention of this country the fact that the present practice is not the proper manner in which marriages should be dissolved, which in my judgment is a very serious business.

While it is not proper for me as a member of this house to review the action taken in connection with another bill or another motion

which came before the house, perhaps I may be permitted to say that members on all sides should seriously consider this whole question if ever it comes before the house again. If it seems better to grant divorce courts to those provinces which do not now have them we should seriously consider that situation, and then we would not be confronted with the situation with which we have been faced this afternoon and this evening. Personally I regret on this or on any other occasion to appear to be delaying the business of this chamber; I have not spent much time talking in this house and I do not propose on any occasion to waste time. However, I do not think we have been wasting time this afternoon or this evening; we are simply using this method of directing the attention of the house to a very undesirable state of affairs in certain provinces of Canada, and I want to place myself on record with regard to the action I have taken.

Mr. A. J. ANDERSON (Toronto-High Park): Mr. Speaker, last year a situation similar to that with which we have been faced to-day arose in connection with a petition for divorce of which I was the sponsor. That was an attempt on the part of those interested to use obstruction in order to force the hands of the government.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. gentleman that the use of the word "obstruction" is not permitted.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): I was merely referring to what happened last year and is happening again this year. Obstruction was resorted to last year in an attempt to force the government to establish such a court as has been suggested, and that is what is being done now. Personally I voted for the establishment of such a court in Ontario, and I would like to see that action taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is charging obstruction, and the use of that word is not permitted.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): I will withdraw the word; this may be a constructive action on their part, since they want to improve the conditions of affairs, and I think it would be an improvement if this court were established.

The hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine) has made himself quite clear; he does not object to these divorce bills being advanced but he would like to see a divorce court established in Ontario. It has been clearly shown to-night and at other times when this subject has been discussed that the province of Ontario has no court to come to other than the parliament of Canada, and that is a discrimination against the province of Ontario. Some time ago there was a vote on the establishment of divorce courts in Ontario; ninety-nine hon. members voted against such action and sixty-nine voted in favour of it. There was a division among the members who come from Ontario, but another vote took place to-day in which seventy-seven hon. members voted for the advancement of a divorce bill, and there was no division among the Ontario members. So I think the members representing Ontario have shown that this province is desirous of having such a court; that is a reasonable conclusion. But, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the ninety-nine votes cast against the establishment of a divorce court in Ontario I am rather sorry to find that forty-two of those votes were cast by members from the province of Quebec, while not one hon. member from Quebec voted in favour of that measure. I am sure the Quebec members do not wish to be unfair. Ontario has no divorce court and therefore is not on a par with the other provinces of Canada, so it is only fair that Quebec should lend its support to the establishment of these courts. In doing so members from Quebec would not be taking any action which might shake their convictions as to the principle of divorce, because the question of divorce in Quebec is also a local matter. Under our constitution divorce is permissible, and it will remain so until our constitution is amended; such an amendment, which would be a very serious matter, cannot be made except by a bill of this house approved by the various provinces of Canada, since the constitution is founded upon the agreement which was arrived at between the original provinces.

All this would seem to lead to the conclusion that we will continue to have divorce in this country. We have divorce courts in six provinces, and divorce is permissible in the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and Prince Edward Island upon application to this parliament. Some hon. members have stated that they are entirely opposed to the granting of divorces, and the only way to get over that objection is to amend the constitution. It is quite unfair to bring in that argument on these individual applications; the constitution cannot be amended in that way. The constitution is here; it clearly defines our jurisdiction; it is clearly shown and well understood that divorce is here and will be granted no matter what we may do in this house. If divorces cannot be secured properly they will

be granted in some roundabout way. Why should we force the people of the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and Prince Edward Island to go to the United States or some other place in order to obtain a divorce? I submit that it is very improper for us to force them to take this action by refusing to give Ontario divorce courts and by refusing to grant divorces here at Ottawa.

Mr. MARCIL: May I ask a question? Has the legislature of Ontario, the legislature of Quebec or the legislature of Prince Edward Island ever petitioned to obtain these divorce courts?

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): I am very glad my hon. friend has brought up that point. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), with whose views I am not always in accord but with whom I agree on this point, stated in his address that the bill providing for the establishing of divorce courts in Ontario should have been amended in order to make it optional with the province of Ontario as to whether or not they should accept those courts. If the province of Ontario has not asked specifically for the establishment of that court, this parliament can create it anyway; we can appoint the judge and it is up to the province to provide the court house and the other officials. The greatest expense is the salary of the judge, which is paid by the Dominion government, and if this jurisdiction is given the supreme court judges there will be no extra expense. Other legislation has been imposed upon the province of Ontario and other provinces without their consent; as examples we have old age pensions and rural credits.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): Ontario is contributing to the cost of the rural credit scheme and it has not accepted the principle. If a divorce court is good for the whole Dominion why would it not be good for one, two or three provinces? I am satisfied that Ontario will not refuse the court if we create it. The cost to the province will be so small that they can readily fall into line. If the Dominion government is prepared to pay the salary of the justice who will administer the divorce law, I am quite sure the province will provide the court houses and pay the salaries of the minor officers.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member is discussing a matter which has been determined already by the house.

Mr. STEVENS: We have been out of order all day.

[Mr. A. J. Anderson.]

Mr. SPEAKER: We are discussing one particular bill of a long list of private bills. The members who discuss this bill are supposed to be familiar with the particulars of it, and they should confine their remarks to the bill. However, as I remarked this afternoon, it is a moot question as to how to distinguish between the general principle of divorce and the particular bill for the granting of a divorce which is now before the house. I would ask hon. gentlemen to confine their remarks as nearly as possible to the present bill.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): I accept Your Honour's ruling although I think there is great justification for my dwelling upon the features of this question. There is no doubt that the action which has been taken with regard to this bill is brought about by the action taken by the house on a former occasion. There is no doubt that the senate committee have arrived at a proper conclusion with regard to this bill. The argument put forth that there is not time to peruse the evidence in connection with these cases is an absolute fallacy, because in most of these cases the evidence is very short. The average case could be read over in about fifteen minutes; for I do not think it takes over twenty-five minutes for the senate committee to hear every word uttered by the members of that committee, the counsel and the witnesses connected with the average case. Copies of evidence are sent to every member of the house, and they can read them if they so desire. I had not seen this particular application until this evening, but I got it from my file and read it in a few minutes while sitting here in the house. There is no doubt that this divorce should be granted. These people are put to very great expense, many of them coming from outside of the country; they are taking the law as they find it and as it is administered, and why should we take the position of preventing them from obtaining their divorces?

I am in sympathy with those who are opposing this bill, because I believe their motive is the establishment of a divorce court in Ontario. At the same time, I think the same result could be obtained by proceeding along a different line, and I believe if the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) were accepted it would overcome all our difficulties. I do not desire to say that the hon. member has been using obstructive methods, because that is unparliamentary language, and I believe he desires to bring about a result which would be beneficial to the people. I might refer to an-

other matter which was obstructed last year, and the principle was accepted this year and went through the house without any objection.

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) has convinced me that I should uphold this corner of the house in opposing the passing of these divorce bills. He said that there was no other court to which these people could apply, but that court is only half a court.

Mr. BENNETT: The court I mentioned was the high court of parliament consisting of both houses.

Mr. ADSHEAD: It is only half a court because it cannot grant what a proper divorce court could grant. This court of parliament can only grant divorces; it cannot grant alimony or give justice and equity.

Mr. BENNETT: I would point out to the hon. member that such relief has been asked for, only in one instance, and parliament dealt with that case.

Mr. ADSHEAD: It is not asked for because it is not within the power of this parliament to grant it, owing to the fact it interferes with provincial matters. That question has never come up.

Mr. BENNETT: It has come up.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Only in one instance, and that was occasioned by an oversight. The hon. member said that there was no other court to which they could apply, and because this court is only half a court and cannot give equity and justice, there is one of two things which we should do. We should grant the divorce court of parliament power to enable them to allow alimony and deal with these people on a basis of justice and equity. If we cannot do that, we should send these people to a court where they can get full justice. As things exist at the present time, when they go through this court they are forced to apply to the civil courts in Ontario to obtain alimony. As the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Young) said, this is the only method we can employ to draw the attention of the public and of this parliament to the necessity of doing one of the two things I mentioned.

As the hon. member who has just taken his seat has said, it is quite true that it would take only about fifteen minutes for a member to read this evidence. There are about 300 cases, and 300 times fifteen minutes equals seventy-five hours. I for one am not going to spend seventy-five hours in reading this evidence. I went up to my room to-night with the idea of obtaining some information with regard to these bills, and I spent five or ten minutes trying to find the particular bill. As the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine) has said, my constituents do not send me to parliament to spend seventy-five hours of my time in reading divorce evidence. I do not like obstructive tactics, but I see no other way by which the attention of the house and of the country can be drawn to the fact that we should either reform our present methods or provide a separate court to pass upon these applications for divorce.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I sometimes find great difficulty in understanding how men reach certain conclusions, and the speech which has been delivered by the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Adshead) is an excellent illustration of that difficulty. When the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) spoke, following as he did the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning), I felt that he had made such a conclusive and absolutely clear statement that the opposition from the corner of the house would have seen the light. But it would seem that while the speeches made by the two hon. members I have mentioned made one impression upon my mind, they made an entirely different impression upon the mind of the hon. member for East Calgary. The house is to be congratulated that the leader of the opposition and the Minister of Railways stated the matter as clearly as they did. I felt very keenly this afternoon that the actions of the house were not in harmony with the best traditions of parliament, or consonant with the dignity of the house.

Mr. SPENCER: Was the hon. member in the house when the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Young) was speaking?

Mr. BROWN: I was. Since the hon. member for Battle River has asked how I regard the speech of the hon. member for Saskatoon, I may say that I agree with him up to a certain point, just as I said, when I spoke first this afternoon, that I agreed with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) up to a certain point. We may candidly admit that they did a service in bringing to the attention of the house the absolutely absurd situation that exists in parliament with regard to the question of divorce, but I cannot follow them to the extreme to which they have gone. They having made their protest, I think, we should proceed to deal with the business of the house in somewhat the same manner as we have

been accustomed to dealing with it in the past and not change the rules of the game after the game has started.

There was one point I wanted to mention this afternoon but to which I omitted any reference, that is, the obligation of this house toward the people who have brought these bills before parliament. That is something we should consider very seriously. These are private bills. Any private individual in Canada has a right to come to parliament and ask for any legislation he sees fit. It rests with parliament to decide the merits of the case and to determine whether or not the legislation sought shall be granted. A large number of people, how many I do not yet know, have come to parliament in all good faith, and they have a right to assume that parliament will deal with these matters in somewhat the same way as we have dealt with them in the past. The question of establishing a divorce court in Ontario has been injected into this debate. Unfortunately hon. members in that corner of the house, the hon. member for Saskatoon and one or two more, assume that that question is an issue before the house. It is not, and it cannot be made an issue before the house at this session if I understand parliamentary procedure aright, because the house has already decided it. It may be made an issue next session, and from the discussion that has taken place this afternoon I am quite sure that the question will be before the house next session when I fully anticipate that a different decision will be reached. But I should like to remind those hon. members that it is not and cannot be made an issue before us at the present time. We can take whatever position we please on these particular bills, but if I am correct in my interpretation, we cannot establish that court this session. Perhaps better parliamentary authorities than I am will confirm or question my statement as they see fit. That, however, is my understanding of the situation. We have to deal with the facts as we find them and the fact is that a large number of people in all good faith have come before parliament and sought relief, as it is called, from the particular disabilities under which they labour. Hon. members assume that they have a right to vote against these bills because they have not the evidence before them. I take the other ground. As I stated this afternoon, evidence has been given before a committee of another house, and I take the position that unless it can be clearly shown, or unless there is some reason to believe, that a proper decision has not been rendered, we have a right to accept the judgment of that committee.

[Mr. Brown.]

On two or three occasions since I have been in the house and also a member of the private bills committee, there have come before that committee cases where there was some disagreement with the judgment rendered by the senate committee. Those questions were dealt with on their merits. It might be that the judgment of the senate committee was upheld, or the reverse. That is the course open to us now. Let us remember that this is a private bill. The principle was laid down two years ago, when we discussed the Georgian bay canal bill, that the second reading of a private bill was always granted unless there was opposition to the principle of the bill. That is a statement which is in harmony with the best parliamentary authorities. Hon. members opposing these particular bills are not opposed to the principle of the bill, that is, the principle of divorce. It is true that some members are. My controversy at the moment is not with them, but rather with those who are following the leadership of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. The principle of the bill is not questioned by them. Therefore, in the very nature of the case these bills should receive their second reading and should go to the private bills committee where, if there is any particular bill to which any hon. member objects or if he thinks in regard to any particular bill the senate committee has not rendered the best judgment according to the evidence, he can bring the matter up and have it dealt with. Otherwise I think we are warranted in accepting the position that the senate committee in making its recommendation has dealt fairly, justly, and according to the evidence.

I want to fall back again upon my other statement. A number of people have come before parliament in good faith, feeling they have a right to expect we will deal with them in much the same way as we have dealt with others in the past. It is quite evident that the course that is proposed by certain hon. members is to institute a blockade by which these people will be deprived of their rights or of the relief which they have a right to expect.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Lisgar has suggested certain motives on our part, namely, that we are trying to create a blockade in order to prevent the passage of these bills. I object decidedly to that. That is not my purpose, and I do not think it is right that an hon. member should impute motives of that kind to another hon. member. I ask that the expression be withdrawn.

Mr. BROWN: I am not charging the hon. member with instituting a blockade, but I am stating what the inevitable result of this particular course of conduct will be, if they insist on calling a vote and discussing every one of these bills as he has indicated he intends doing.

Mr. SPEAKER: The expressions "blockade" and "obstruction" are not parliamentary, and whatever may be the result of opposition, as long as the opposition is legitimate it cannot be qualified as a blockade or obstruction.

Mr. BROWN: I certainly do not wish to use any terms that are unparliamentary, but I am pointing out that that is the inevitable result of the course outlined by these hon. members.

Mr. IRVINE: Withdraw.

Mr. BROWN: I have withdrawn to the best of my ability. I say that I do not wish to use an unparliamentary term, and if the term "deliberate blockade" is unparliamentary, I withdraw it.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): They are very sensitive when we tell them the truth.

Mr. BROWN: Yes, they do not like the truth.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like the hon. member not to charge other hon. members as not liking the truth. If they do not like the truth, what do they like?

Mr. BROWN: I withdraw that. They do not always like to have the clear consequences of their conduct pointed out to them.

Mr. STEVENS: They prefer darkness to light.

Mr. BROWN: The inevitable result of the course outlined by themselves will be that many of these bills cannot be passed through this house, because it is physically impossible for us to deal with so many in such a manner. We cannot take a vote on every one of them on the second reading, then have them go to the private bills committee and be discussed there and come back to the house for their third reading. As I say, the inevitable result will be that they cannot be passed through the house, and consequently the people who have come here in good faith, incurred the expense involved in the house and in connection with lawyers' fees, which in most cases are by no means small, will be treated in a manner that is grossly unfair. Unless there is reason to believe that the evidence taken before the senate committee is faulty, I think we are quite justified in accepting it and granting these people relief.

These are the reasons why I shall give my support to the passage of these divorce bills through the house. While I would strongly support, and did when the other bill was before the house, the establishment of a divorce court to deal with these cases—undoubtedly a court could deal with them better, could go into the question of alimony, for instance —we cannot get these courts at this time, and therefore I say let us, in a manner becoming to the dignity of this honourable house, deal with the situation that confronts us.

Mr. IRVINE: Is the argument of the hon. member that if we consider these bills properly they will not get through this session, and therefore we should put them through without proper consideration?

Mr. BROWN: That is not my argument. From the very beginning I have said that these cases are dealt with properly before the senate committee, where the evidence is taken, and if any hon. member feels that in any particular case the judgment of the senate committee is not in harmony with the evidence, he can bring that case before the private bills committee, and it will be dealt with there.

Mr. IRVINE: Have I to spend seventy-five hours going into the details of all these cases?

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) does me rather an unmerited honour when he suggests—

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member not already spoken on this bill?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, your honour. I think I have a right to speak on this bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): And on all the others.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: And on all the others.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): And he probably will.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: As I was saying, the hon. member for Lisgar has done me a somewhat unmerited honour in suggesting that the members of the house who have spoken against this method of granting divorces are following the leadership of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I am only an individual member, but I venture

to suggest that others who have spoken along the same lines, have done so simply because the merits of the case appeal to them—for that and for no other reason.

The hon. member for Lisgar suggests that bills should be dealt with this year in the same way that they have been dealt with in previous years. I am at a loss to know why he should make a statement of that kind. I can think of the Sun Life bill and the Bell Telephone bill which during the past two or three years were dealt with in a very, very different way from that in which bills of that kind were dealt with for a great many years in this house. I can think of railway bills which during the last two or three years have been dealt with in a very different way from the way in which they were dealt with for many years in this house when we were so lavish in granting railway charters. So there have been changes, and I think we are quite within our rights in insisting that these divorce bills should receive fair attention.

Mr. BROWN: These bills were not before the house last year.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Other bills of this character were. The hon. member for Lisgar says that people have come here in good faith. That may be so. But so have members of parliament. They have come here, and they have certain responsibilities. The hon. member for Lisgar corrected his first statement by saying that if we asked for a vote on all these bills the inevitable result would be that the bills could not pass this house.

Mr. BROWN: I did not say that.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I made a note of his remark at the time, and I think I am correct. I understood him to say that the inevitable result would be that if we discussed each of these bills, then the bulk of the bills could not be passed. Is not that correct?

Mr. BROWN: Yes.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No statement could better bear out my contention than that, that if we go into a discussion of these bills and hear the evidence, if we actually try to consider each bill on its merits, it will be simply impossible for these three hundred bills to pass this house.

Mr. STEVENS: Will not the hon. member admit that precisely the same thing applies to legislation of a different character, leaving these bills out of consideration—that if we treated other legislation in the way he wishes these bills to be treated, we could not pass one-tenth of the legislation that comes before parliament?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not admit that at all. I think with every other class of legislation we insist that the mover or promoter tell the house in at least a few words the purpose of the legislation and indicate the main points at issue, and the Speaker in connection with every other piece of legislation reads the bill from the chair. But as the Speaker knows perfectly well in the last few years it has become the practice in many cases, with the consent of the house, that the Speaker simply calls the divorce bills by number, without even calling the title of the bill; and he has gone further even than that, because bills have been called in batches and passed in bulk, from one to forty at a time. The forty-five divorce bills now before the house were given their first reading in that way. I would submit to the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) that no other class of legislation is dealt with in that way.

Mr. STEVENS: We dealt with all the national railway bills, involving an expenditure of over fifty million dollars, in exactly the same way.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The national railway bills, if I remember correctly, first came before the house by way of resolution, and later the bills go before a special committee, where they are very carefully considered.

Mr. DUNNING: No, my hon. friend is wrong. They go before one of the standing committees of this house, exactly as these divorce bills do.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, not exactly.

Mr. DUNNING: Exactly. The railway bills go before the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, and the divorce bills go before the select standing committee on private bills. That is the only difference.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, I venture to suggest that there is a still more fundamental difference. The railway bills are government bills, and the government stakes its very existence upon them.

Mr. DUNNING: Of course.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: And these railway bills are very carefully considered first by the experts of the railway, and they are supposed to be very carefully considered also by the railway department before they come before the house.

Mr. DUNNING: And they are.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am glad to hear it; but that is the difference between the railway bills mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre and these divorce bills.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is surely begging the question. He knows that the same difference exists between any government measure, on the one hand, and any private bill, on the other. That is not meeting the point raised by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre at all.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The instance given by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre was the railway bills, and in answer to that I am pointing out that there is a great difference between the way the two classes of legislation are considered.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend was citing the fact that we passed certain bills by number, en bloc, and I intimated that we followed precisely the same procedure with regard to the railway bills involving an expenditure of $54,000,000.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Those bills had all been considered before. I think the hon. member for Vancouver Centre will admit that.

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: They had been considered by the government.

Mr. DUNNING: Oh yes.

Mr. STEVENS: And these divorce bills have been considered by the senate.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I would ask the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), who in order to determine how he should vote on the second reading of this bill has no doubt studied the evidence in the case very carefully, to be good enough to state in what particulars he considers the evidence weak. He is not speaking about the bill at all.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. member for Frontenac was present this afternoon, but I do not think it is necessary to review all I said on that occasion. However, I then stated that one of my reasons for opposing the second reading was that I knew nothing whatever regarding the evidence, and that therefore I did not think I was called upon to give my vote in favour of the bill.

Mr. DUNNING: Why did not the hon. member read the evidence?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Why did I not read the evidence? It has already been pointed out that if a member conscientiously read the evidence in these divorce cases, even putting it at the figure stated by my friend from Toronto-High Park (Mr. Anderson), and if only fifteen minutes were devoted to each case—I submit that that is altogether too short a time for me to decide whether a man should be separated from his wife, or a wife from her husband, this being a rather momentous question—if fifteen minutes were devoted to reading the evidence in each case—and I do not know that I could do so in that time—with three hundred cases to deal with it would take something like seventy-five days;—

Mr. DUNNING: Hours.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Seventy-five hours; and at three hours a day it would mean twenty-five days. Now, I do not think any member should be called upon to spend three hours a day for twenty-five days in considering these Ontario divorce bills.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): He could have read quite a number of them in the time he has spent to-day saying nothing.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That may be the opinion of the hon. member for Frontenac, but I do not consider I am talking about nothing; I am talking about matters of very great interest to many people in this country.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The hon. gentleman himself said he was talking about nothing when he acknowledged that he did not know anything about the case, that he had not studied the evidence at all. I am simply using his own words. He admits it himself. I suggest that he go out and read the evidence,—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): —and then come back and talk of what he knows something about.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The hon. member for Frontenac is somewhat facetious. It is very easy for him to give gratuitous advice. I have the evidence—

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The hon. member does not want to make use of it does he?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Oh, yes.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): If the hon. gentleman wants it all to himself, the rest of us will keep quiet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I hesitate to read the evidence in this case, Mr. Speaker, with the galleries crowded as they are. In fact I think the house would not tolerate the reading of it.

Mr. CLARK: May I ask the hon. member why he could not have read that evidence during the last vote? I read it and had plenty of time to do so.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The hon. member may be a faster reader than I am. As a matter of fact I have been trying to follow the speeches, and if my friends will give me a chance I propose to deal with some of the remarks that have been made.

Mr. CLARK: No speeches were made during the vote.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We have been accused of holding up the house. I do not think that is a fair accusation.

Mr. BROWN: It was withdrawn.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am glad to hear it. Nevertheless it was made. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that before taking action on these bills we should be given a brief explanation of each individual case, and that we be accorded the right of voting on each case yes or no. I do not think that is too much to ask. More time has been spent in discussing a few dollars for a post office estimate than we have yet spent in discussing this great principle of divorce; and the hon. member for Frontenac has been one of the sinners in that regard. I have never yet discussed a post office estimate, so perhaps I may be pardoned if I take my innings in discussing a matter of this kind.

The hon. leader of the opposition referred to the work done in the private bills committee, and he drew a very fine picture of its proceedings. He said that actually it did the work that is done in courts of justice. Well, as I have sat on that committee for some years, I hope that courts of justice carry on their work more effectively than I have seen the private bills committee function. Any man who has been a member of that committee knows perfectly well that we deal with divorce bills there as we deal with them here—in a most perfunctory way, simply taking them by numbers and adopting them en bloc. As a matter of fact there is absolutely no safeguard or check in the way in which the ordinary divorce bill is there dealt with. So that a great deal of what the hon. leader of the opposition said, however fine it sounded, really did not amount to a great deal. He was very impressive, as was the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning), with regard to maintaining the dignity of the house. But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive of anything less dignified than the manner of passing these bills—forty-five of them given first reading Friday after being called by number and dealt with en bloc. Do you call that maintaining the dignity of the house? When a resolution was introduced this evening, supported I think by the member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown), that would prevent discussion of a divorce bill—I refer to the "previous question"—I wonder if that was maintaining the dignity of the house. All we are asking is that the promoters of these bills give an outline of their measures.

The Minister of Railways said it was merely a matter of procedure. On the other hand, the leader of the opposition spoke in very high-sounding terms of the parliament of Canada being a high court. In one sense it may be a court, but primarily it is a legislative body, and I do not see that we have any right to transform ourselves into an ordinary court of this character. But there is a very great discrepancy between this being a mere matter of procedure, the bills to be passed over as rapidly as their numbers can be read, and the picture drawn by the leader of the opposition that we sit here, the highest court of the land, giving judicial consideration to these bills as one by one they are presented to the house.

The leader of the opposition also referred to the practice of Great Britain before 1857. Well, that is characteristic. Does he really mean that we should continue what was the practice in Great Britain in 1857? Great Britain, conservative old country that it is, has nevertheless moved forward a great deal since 1857. Some of us would like at least to keep in sight of Great Britain. Some of us are afraid that if we even suggested doing the things they are doing in Great Britain we would be called radicals and bolsheviks. But the leader of the opposition tells us we ought to continue to follow the British practice of 1857.

Mr. STEVENS: He did not say that.

Mr. DUNNING: In fairness to the leader of the opposition, I would point out that he did not say that at all, nor did he seek to convey that impression. He is not in the house now or I would not interrupt my hon. friend.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not want to be unfair to the leader of the opposition, but at least he did tell us of the practice in Great Britain in 1857, and he proceeded to say that in our practice we were simply following that practice as it obtained in 1857. My inference was that he expected us to be satisfied with that procedure. If he did not mean that I do not know why he took the trouble to go back to 1857. There would be no point to his remarks.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): That is the hon. member's great trouble, he gets his wires crossed.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am glad to see the leader of the opposition has come in. If I have made any statement that is not correct I shall be glad to have his correction.

Mr. BENNETT: Since the hon. gentleman is good enough to offer me the opportunity, I desire to point out that I made no such observation except to say that this was a high court in this matter, as the parliament of England had been, and that divorce applications, before 1857, did originate in and were heard by a committee of the House of Lords, as they have been here. I pointed out that this parliament had been asked and had refused to take the forward step of creating a court such as the hon. gentleman would support, and therefore we were thrown back upon the practice which existed prior to 1857. I am sure that the hon. gentleman, in his love of dialectics, will try to be more fair as to what was said than to make such observations as he has made.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am glad the leader of the opposition came in to make that statement again. But may I emphasize this: We ought not to go back to 1857 for our procedure. It is high time we were passing on to the reforms that came in that period in Great Britain, but we in this country have remained stationary.

Mr. BROWN: Has the hon. gentleman a clear plan to outline whereby we may get these reforms this session?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) is attributing to me a far larger program than I had in mind. All I am asking is simply that as these bills come up one by one we give them sufficient consideration to know what we are voting on, and that we have a roll call in order to let the country know where we stand. A great many members have been quite satisfied to have the statement made, "carried on division." As I said this afternoon, all I want to do is to give meaning and reality to these words and to have a division; that is all. What will happen if that procedure is carried out it is not for me to say; it is for the government to say. It is for the government, whom the hon. member for Lisgar supports, to decide a way out of the dilemma, and not for me. All I can do is to ask that each bill shall receive a fair hearing. May I say in conclusion that what my hon. friend from Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine) asks of the promoter of the bill in this case is that he do in this instance as he did in regard to the previous bill which he sponsored, that is, that he give us some idea of the merits of the case. So far he has declined to give us any information respecting it.

Mr. BROWN: Has the hon. gentleman put his mathematics to work to find out how long it would take to have a recorded vote on every one of these bills? We have heard about the length of time it would take to read the evidence. There are 300 bills. It would take, in my opinion, 150 hours to dispose of them in the way the hon. member suggests, and that would be 25 parliamentary days.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The hon. member for Lisgar is better at mathematics than I am. I have not figured it out, but I was taught long ago that sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof; and if we deal with this bill and the next and the next we shall undoubtedly find some way out of the dilemma before many days have passed. All I do now is to ask once more that with regard to this bill the hon. member who sponsors it should give us an outline such as he gave in regard to the merits of the previous case.

Mr. T. E. KAISER (Ontario): I wonder if it has occurred to some of the hon. gentleman to our left, Mr. Speaker, that this particular case has now cost the country, so far as I have figured it out, $2,000. It costs $1,000 an hour to run this institution, and if we deal with three or four hundred cases in this same way the country will have to put up some $2,000,000 to see the show through.

This case has given rise to the question of a divorce court for the province of Ontario. When that question was before the house I was paired with another hon. gentleman who was going to vote against the bill, inasmuch as I intended to vote for it, and I want to put myself on record as being in favour of the principle of establishing a divorce court for Ontario. I was not able on that occasion to follow the matter to a conclusion, because the discussion was closed off by you, Mr. Speaker, a little too quickly from my point of view. I should like to see embodied in legislation

creating a divorce court for the province of Ontario, two conditions, whether appearing in the original bill as passed by this house, or incorporated in the provisions enacted by the province. In the first place, I do not believe that any divorce case should be tried in the county in which the applicant resides; it should be tried in an adjoining county. In the second place, if a court be established in Ontario, I do not wish to see the gruesome details of the whole story published in the newspapers. In my opinion, any information which is to be published should first be submitted to the judge who tries the case, and he should determine the desirability or otherwise of its publication. These are the only two points I wish to mention and I stand firmly by them: Cases should not be tried in the county in which the applicant resides, and the literature which is spread throughout the country in regard to such cases should be censored by the judge who tries the case.

Hon. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac-Addington): The question has come up as to whether or not we should have a divorce court in Ontario or Quebec or Prince Edward Island. As stated by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) that is outside the discussion. We could not introduce legislation this session in that regard if we were unanimously in favour of it. On this point, however, I would simply say this: It should be within the genius of this parliament, it seems to me, to devise some kind of law which would give the three provinces that have not now divorce courts an opportunity of establishing such courts if they so desired. But that is apart altogether from the question before us. We are asked to vote on the second reading of Bill No. 93, and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) calls upon the member whose name appears after the motion as sponsor to give him the reasons why the bill should be proceeded with. When the hon. member puts that question he knows perfectly well that the reason for this, as for every other bill of a similar nature, is defined by law; and there is only one reason. What is our duty in determining whether the bill shall receive the second reading? We have to determine whether or not the evidence on which the senate committee formed its conclusions is right and proper. I cannot shift my responsibility in that regard on to the shoulders of the member whose name happens to be associated with the bill. It is incumbent upon me as it is upon the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and every other hon. member, if we are not satisfied that the senate committee, taking evidence under oath, has come to a correct conclusion, or if we are satisfied that there is some weakness in the evidence, to get up and say so, to say what that weakness is, and to oppose the bill on that ground; not merely to get up and talk in generalities about the advisability or inadvisability of conducting matters in these divorce cases as we are now doing. That does not determine how we are to vote.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre spent the better part of an hour on what? Presumably he was speaking on the second reading of this bill, but he did not offer or even hint at a single reason or suggestion, why this bill should not receive its second reading. His only comment in that regard, after giving expression is a lot of generalities more or less irrelevant—rather more irrelevant than relevant—was that, the member sponsoring the bill should tell us why he was asking that the bill be read a second time. The hon. member knows very well that under our law there is only one reason back of all these bills; if he or any other member is not satisfied with the evidence adduced under oath before the senate committee, it is up to that member to take exception on that ground. I think the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Pettit) put the matter very well; the court—because it is a court—hears the evidence in a proper way, cross-examines the witnesses and comes to a certain conclusion. That conclusion is passed on to this house and we are asked to concur or otherwise in the decision of that court. If I am not prepared to concur in that decision I should give my reason for that attitude and I should be able to say that I cannot concur in the judgment because I think there is a weakness in the evidence, pointing out that weakness to the house. Otherwise I should vote for the second reading of the bill and pass it on to the committee, which has all the privileges outlined by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) and the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Dunning) in regard to going further into the matter if that is thought desirable. I cannot use the word "blockade"; that is unparliamentary, but I can have my own opinion.

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

Miss AGNES MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that to me it does not seem fair that we should ask members from the other provinces to spend at

least some time in listening to the reading of divorce bills based on applications coming from the province of Ontario. It is not fair to the members to expect them to vote upon bills of which they know nothing, bills which are called by number and which are not discussed, nor is it fair to ask them to spend hours of their time finding out what these bills actually are about. I think we are all coming to realize that very soon we must establish a divorce court in Ontario; this is no place to deal with the divorce applications coming from this province. The establishment of a divorce court in this province will neither increase nor decrease the number of divorces; surely anyone who can understand fundamentals must know that. The causes of divorce lie very much deeper, and I am quite free to say that in my opinion one of the causes is the greater freedom of women. Formerly women had no choice; they had to bear all sorts of indignities because they had no economic existence apart from their husbands. That is not true to-day; women are demanding freedom to live their own lives and I would be the last to deny them that right if they wish it.

Many times during the last seven years I have thought it a complete farce that we should sit here and listen to bills being read over about which we knew absolutely nothing. There is no use in the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) or the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) getting up to lecture the house; I know they are both learned gentlemen, but they do not need to tell us that we could know all about the cases which come before us. We cannot do so, and what is more we do not particularly want to know about them; I do not think that is the work which should be done by this house. I do not know what is in the mind of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) but to me it is quite clear that this house must be made so sick of this thing that they will have a sensible point of view when a divorce court for Ontario is next proposed.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): The strict rules of order have been transgressed so frequently during the course of the day, Mr. Speaker, that I beg your indulgence if I appear to transgress them for one moment now. During the course of the remarks of the hon. member for Toronto-High Park (Mr. Anderson) I gathered that he wished in some way to blame members from Quebec for not having assisted in the passage of a certain bill which came before this house on a previous occasion. Since that time I have looked up the votes and proceedings in order to inquire into the vote cast on February 26 with regard to an act to provide in the province of Ontario for the dissolution and annulment of marriage. I find that amongst the yeas, or those who supported this measure, there were fifteen members from Ontario while amongst the nays there were thirty-three members from Ontario.

Mr. CLARK: Thirty-one.

Mr. POWER: So far as I can ascertain, of that thirty-three only seven were of the Roman Catholic faith. I simply wish to place these facts before the house in order that the house and the country may understand that if this divorce court legislation was blocked, certainly it was not entirely due to the members from Quebec; in a large measure it was due to the attitude of members from the province of Ontario, who spoke and voted in this house against the establishment of such a court.

Mr. ARTHURS: And is it not a fact that the figures with regard to the members from Quebec were forty-two against the bill and none for it?

Mr. POWER: I am not discussing the members from Quebec; I am pointing out to hon. gentlemen, who in some way have been blaming the province of Quebec, that before casting stones over here they should look after themselves.

Mr. CLARK: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: This will close the debate.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): If this means that the hon. member will block the debate—

Mr. CLARK: I do not intend to block the debate.

Mr. BOURASSA: According to the usages of the house when the hon. member speaks he will close the debate, and there is one point upon which I would like to express myself; I refer to the lectures which were given the house by my excellent friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett). I suppose they meant well, but as far as I am concerned I am not prepared to admit that we are lowering the dignity of this house because we propose to see clearly through one of the most important problems with which this parliament can deal. I quite admit that the manner in which the discussion arose, the occasion for this debate, is rather extraor-

dinary; but since the leader of the opposition has referred to the traditions of the English parliament he should know that many of the greatest questions of government, of legislation and of public liberty dealt with by that parliament arose from the most trivial questions. Just by way of example I might remind hon. gentlemen that one of the basic principles of ministerial responsibility was decided by the English House of Commons, under the leadership of Mr. Gladstone, on the mere appointment of chambermaids to the Queen in Buckingham Palace. Another great principle of public administration and the responsibility of various heads of departments was decided under the same leader, one of the greatest statesmen not only of the British Empire but of the world at large, on a paltry question of the purchase of pencils, pen handles and a few sheets of paper in each department. Gladstone was derided by some of the microscopic members of the House of Commons, but he successfully demonstrated to the British people that when a great principle was at issue, whatever the legislative or administrative occasion, it is the right and the duty of each member of the house to discuss that principle, whatever the other consequences may be.

The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Kaiser), one of the most sympathetic and genial members of this house—everyone loves him, of course,—has raised the argument that this discussion is costing the country so much per minute. The hon. member is somewhat older than I am, but I well remember in the days of the old parliament when we used to say to the opposition members, during the discussion of some trivial estimate, that they were costing the country so much. The answer would always come back, and it was the proper answer, that, whatever the amount of money at issue, there was some principle of administration or legislation at stake. That is the position which we take to-night.

The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) has spoken of those who are opposing this bill as being under the leadership of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth). As far as I am concerned, I would have no more objection to following the lead of that hon. gentleman, when that lead is well inspired, than to following that of any other member of this house. The hon. member for Lisgar has followed various leads in this house—of course that is his business—and he should not attribute small motives to any hon. member when he happens to agree with some other hon. gentleman.

[Mr. Bourassa.]

Mr. BROWN: I did not desire to cast any reflection upon the hon. member.

Mr. BOURASSA: What I want to make clear to the house is this: Some of us are opposed on principle to all these bills, while others are opposed on principle also, but a different principle. It is our right and duty to discuss every one of these bills in order to make our position clear to the country as well as to parliament. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I think I have given fair warning to this house as well as to the country—if the country cares for what I do or say here—as early as last year as to the action I would take. I admit that it was towards the end of the session, after we had passed a certain number of similar bills, when I expressed some of the ideas I have expressed here as to the growing hesitancy I had in allowing such bills to pass, and as to the growing conviction there was in my mind; firstly, that there was something wrong with the law, and, secondly, that there was something wrong with the practice.

Without going over the work which is being performed by the senate committee, or repeating the declarations made by representatives of that committee when they asked for the concurrence of this branch of parliament in relieving them from their burden, I find further evidence that the practice—leaving the principle aside for the moment—of granting divorces has become an impediment to the free exercise of parliamentary judgment in both branches of the house, as well as a threat to the social fabric which is affected by the increase in the number of these bills.

Mr. DUNNING: This session the house determined in the negative with regard to the stand it desired to take in the granting of a divorce court to Ontario. What course does the hon. member suggest the house should follow in dealing with these particular bills?

Mr. BOURASSA: If the hon. minister will permit me to finish the point I was discussing, I will give him an answer. However, I thank him for the interruption.

I was pointing out that the practice which has grown upon us is becoming a nuisance to parliament and a danger to the country. As has been mentioned by many hon. members, it is practically impossible to read all this evidence. I received these records in two bundles; and in the interval between six and eight o'clock I endeavoured to classify them. There is no classification other than by name. What did I do? I am a quick worker at that kind of thing, and I classified them in alphabetical order. I then referred

to the order paper to discover the number of each particular bill, and I marked that number on two or three records of evidence. I spent an hour and a half in doing work that should have been done by the servants of this parliament. When the house met at eight o'clock two or three of these bills were allowed to stand, but during the debate which followed I had an opportunity of going through this bunch of papers and managed to find the evidence connected with the particular bill under consideration. Without insisting further that this manner of offering the evidence to the members is very clumsy and almost unworkable, I can only repeat that it is a parliamentary system which has grown upon us during the last few years. The people who established that practice probably had no idea of the manner in which it would grow.

What do I find in this particular case? The divorce is asked for by a woman who married a certain man a few years ago. Although she does not say in her testimony that there was anything wrong, they seem to have disagreed. She left him and went back to England. According to her uncontradicted evidence, upon her return a reconciliation took place, but she found that during her absence the husband had developed certain habits of which she complained, and she had a special investigator make up a case. Here is the testimony, all contained in three or four pages. That investigator took a friend of his; they went on a certain night to a certain house, and they found the husband walking in a certain room while a woman was in the bed. The whole evidence rests upon these two things. The policeman hired to make up the case says: "The woman in the bed is not the woman here"—meaning not the wife. The other, the second witness necessary to make up a case before a tribunal, says: "I did not see the woman. I only found that she had fair hair." It is upon those two testimonies that a judgment has been granted breaking a marriage tie, without the husband being heard and without its being known whether the man had any previous complaint. Yet we are told that we are a court of appeal and that, in the exercise of that majestic dignity, we have nothing to do but to confirm this judgment rendered by a committee of the other house. I dare say that if the same work was performed in connection with all these three hundred cases, a good many would be corresponding with this. Therefore I quite understand why an hon. member belonging to the province of New Brunswick, who allowed me to make use of his name, a Roman Catholic, voted for the motion moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), some days ago, because, he said: "Comparing the manner in which divorces are granted or refused in my province with the manner in which they are granted in parliament, I, as a Catholic and the father of a family, cannot vote any longer for this system."

Is all this lowering the dignity of parliament? I can assure the Minister of Railways and the leader of the opposition that the people who have sent me here, humble settlers who can hardly read nor write, but who for many years have carried on a Christian life in the midst of the hills and continued the devoted work of the pioneers in enlarging the moral as well as the material wealth of the country, have placed their confidence in me, not only to vote money for the railway department or any other department of the state, but to do my level best to preserve some of the moral foundations upon which this little country of ours has grown up. Whether it pleases or not members of the government or members of the opposition; whether it is on the occasion of a private bill, or of two bills, or of ten bills, or of fifty bills, I will lose no opportunity to assert before parliament and before the country that we have a duty to perform, not only in the building of railways and the digging of canals, but in the preservation of the morality of Canada.

There is one point which my good friend the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre brought up during the discussion of this bill and which I want to answer right away. He stated, quite properly, that he resented, not the imputation but the deduction that could be drawn from the attitude taken by the representatives of Quebec on a question like this, because it might be said by some narrow-minded or ill-willed people that, in opposing the principle of divorce, we pose as representing a more virtuous population than those of the English-speaking provinces. That is not our way. We have our defects and our drawbacks in Quebec as elsewhere; but if we can claim some credit, it is this: that we have never acted in a pharisaical manner in teaching lessons of morality to other parts of the country. All that we have done and that we are doing is this: the Catholic and French province of Quebec has made to the Dominion of Canada, its population and its institutions, a contribution of its own which I do not claim to be superior to that of the other provinces, but which I claim to be valuable in the manner and to the degree in which we preserve within ourselves those

elements of social organization which are our own. Let us admit that there are differences in temperament, habit and tradition. Perhaps among the English-speaking people, especially among those of Scottish and English descent, you can play a little more fast and loose with the laws relating to the organization of families or of society. But when you come to the Latin races, with their more radical temperament and their more logical turn of mind, beware of any attempt made to loosen the ties which preserve the family and the social organization. This is one of the reasons why, while not teaching any lesson to any other element of the population, while not posing as Pharisees, we say: Understand our point of view as we endeavour to understand yours. That is why, since the matter has been referred to, I may be permitted to employ two or three minutes of my time in regard to it.

When the question of a divorce court for Ontario came up, I made it quite clear that I was opposed on principle to divorce; that I was opposed to the establishment of divorce courts everywhere. But since divorce courts have been established in seven out of the nine provinces of Canada in esse or in posse,—because in Prince Edward Island they voted long before confederation for the establishment of a divorce court and they have it in posse if not in esse—I stated and I repeat to-night, and the sense of the house and the sense of the country will have to come to it: the only real remedy for this situation, which has grown upon us and which will be far worse next year, and the year after, than it is this year, is to come back to the true moral and social basis of confederation: wipe off from clause 91 the subsection enabling or, rather, forcing—because in that respect I agree with the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan)—forcing this parliament to deal with divorce. Let us go back to the principle, the spirit of confederation, and let us wipe off those three words: "Marriage and divorce" from clause 91.

It has been said by the hon. member for Toronto High Park (Mr. Anderson): "But you cannot do it unless the provinces agree to it." Why? We can not take away any of the rights of the provinces without their consent, but we can always renounce some of our own rights; and after that, the provinces can, under another disposition of the British North America Act, amend their own constitution according to their needs. Once this parliament, by a joint address of both houses, decides that it will have no more to do with divorce, either in a legislative capacity or in its capacity of creating courts of justice to adjudicate upon divorce, then the provinces are free, each of them according to its views, according to what it considers to be in the best interest of the local community for which its government is responsible, to decide whether or not they will maintain the divorce courts they have or, if they do not have them, create them. This is a practical remedy. I mentioned it during the first debate. I mention it again to-night, not with the hope, of course, that it will be voted upon right away. Perhaps some hon. members who would be disposed to agree to it would not like to receive it from such unholy hands as those of the man who is speaking now. But the time will surely come, and let it come as soon as possible, when individuals and groups and parties being forgotten, some sensible individual, no eccentric or crank of my nature, but some sensible individual accepted as a wise man by everybody, will stand up and propose this remedy; and then it will be jumped at by all the wiseacres of the land; because, I repeat, this is the only manner in which you can at once simplify the operations of this house and return the two branches of this parliament to their proper functions, and at the same time strike off from the constitution that anomaly which leaves a portion of our matrimonial law in the hands of the provinces while keeping another portion here. It was a nonsensical disposition adopted in the last hours of the discussion on the confederation bill. As a matter of fact, it was not in the resolutions of Quebec; it was not in the decisisons taken by the parliament of United Canada. It was grafted upon the constitution, like that absurd clause 93 with regard to schools, in London, in order to conciliate the views of this church and that church, of this group and that; and like all that kind of patchwork it could not work. So long as the population was limited the number of people seeking divorce was not numerous, therefore we did not feel the absurdity or the pinch of the system; but now it is upon us.

I cannot agree with my good friend from Lisgar, who proposes that we let the present system go on for this year. No, sir. If we do not bring it home to every member of this house and to the people whom we represent, the same thing will go on year after year. It will never be remedied until parliament realizes that we are in an impossible situation and that we must treat it in a radical manner from a double point of view—one of principle and one of practice equally.

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Vancouver-Burrard): The hon. member for Quebec South (Mr.

Power) I think presented the best reasons why this house should give due and proper consideration to divorce bills. He stated that there was a large number of members in the house who had voted against the granting of a divorce court to Ontario, and he gave the vote. I have looked at that vote, and I find that there were seventy per cent of members from provinces other than Ontario who voted against the establishment of a divorce court in that province—seventy per cent of the vote. In other words, this house has elected to stand by the constitution. The constitution has been the same since confederation. This is the court which adjudicates upon divorce petitions. This house once more elected this year that it would not delegate that duty to any other court, and every member of this house is faced with the duty of adjudicating from a judicial point of view on the facts of this case. No member of this house can shirk the vote on the merits of this case, any more than you, Mr. Speaker, can refuse to put the question on this petition. That is the issue before the house.

So far as the facts of the case are concerned, I submit that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) did not correctly represent them. Any member of this house could have read the evidence in this case in five minutes. I read it while the vote on the last bill was being taken. The facts are simple. I do not intend to repeat them because it is the duty of every member of this court to read them and to express his judgment upon them.

There is just one other point. I submit that it is not the duty of the sponsor of the bill to place the facts of the case before the house at all. Someone has to sponsor these bills. It is a mere formality. I have consented in this case to do so. It is not my duty necessarily to put the facts of the case before the house on the second reading. All that is necessary here is to establish the principle: Is this a bill which comes within the law relating to divorce? If it is, then it is the duty of the house to send it to the committee, which will look into the facts of the case, and if necessary call witnesses and check evidence that has been taken before the senate.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: To what law does the hon. member refer when he says "the law relating to divorce?"

Mr. CLARK: The common law of England which is in force in this country; the common law of England which has been adopted by certain of the provinces and upon which divorce courts are based.

Mr. SPENCER: I asked the hon. member earlier in the evening if he would give us some reasons why we should support this bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The debate is closed. Is it a question the hon. member wishes to ask?

Mr. SPENCER: The only information in reference to the case that is before us has been given by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). If the hon. gentleman would give some reasons why we should support this bill, we should be glad to do so. Otherwise I shall have to vote against it.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Clark) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Adshead
Anderson (Toronto-High Park),
Arthurs,
Bancroft,
Barber,
Bell (St. John-Albert),
Bennett,
Bothwell,
Bowen,
Brown,
Cahan,
Campbell,
Charters,
Clark,
Coote,
Cowan,
Dickie,
Dunning,
Esling,
Fansher (Lambton East),
Forke,
Fraser,
Garland (Carleton),
Gershaw,
Glen,
Gray,
Hall,
Heaps,
Jenkins,
Johnston (Long Lake),
Jones,
Kennedy,
King (Kootenay East),
Lawson,
Lovie,
Lucas,
MacLean (Prince),
McLean (Melfort),
McKenzie,
McPhee,
McPherson,
McRae,
Malcolm,
Matthews,
Maybee,
Milne,
Neill,
Pettit,
Plunkett,
Rennie,
Robb,
Ryerson,
Sanderson,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Queens),
Sinclair (Wellington North),
Speakman,
Spence,
Steedsman,
Stevens,
Stewart (Edmonton West),
Stewart (Leeds),
Stirling,
Telford,
Thompson,
Totzke,
Vallance,
Young (Weyburn).—68.

NAYS

Messrs:

Beaubien,
Benoit,
Bissett,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Boulanger,
Bourassa,
Bourgeois,
Carmichael,
Casgrain,
Delisle,
Denis,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Dionne,
Dubuc,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fansher (Last Mountain),
Fiset (Sir Eugene),
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Gervais,
Girouard,
Guérin,

Irvine,	Rinfret,
Lacombe,	Roberge,
Laflamme,	Ross (Moose Jaw),
Lapierre,	Séguin,
Luchkovich,	Spencer,
Macphail (Miss),	Tobin,
McIntosh,	Veniot,
Marcil,	Ward,
Mercier (St. Henri),	Woodsworth,
Motherwell,	Young
Power,	(Saskatoon).—47.
Prévost,	

Mr. GEARY: If it is not too late, Mr. Speaker, may I withdraw my vote? I was paired with the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier). I thought he was in his seat, but he is not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Clark, seconded—

Mr. MARCIL: Mr. Speaker, it is eleven o'clock.

Mr. MORIN (St. Hyacinthe): I was paired with the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ryckman). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. CARDIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Cantley). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. CANNON: I was paired with the hon. member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. Edwards). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, April 16, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Fourth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.—Mr. Parent.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE—OFFICERS' PENSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. H. KING (Minister of Health): In regard to a return moved for by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Hubbs) as reported in votes and proceedings, No. 1, page (i):

For a return showing the names and present addresses of all officers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force who have had their pensions reduced under section 14, subsection 1 of the Pensions Act, which reads:

Pensions shall be paid to, and in respect of a member of the forces in accordance with the rank or acting rank, for which he was being

paid pay and allowances at the time of the appearance of the injury or disease for which he is pensioned.

The chairman of the pension board has supplied the following answer which I desire to read:

Between 200 and 300 cases were adjusted to the correct rate under section 14, subsection (1) of the Pension Act. To publish the names and addresses of those comprising any class of pensioner is considered by the Board of Pension Commissioners to be detrimental to the interests of returned men generally, such information being regarded as confidential between pensioners and the commission. This is also the policy of the British Ministry of Pensions. It is therefore considered contrary to public policy to publish the names and addresses asked for.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 132 for the relief of Myrtle Virginia Maulson.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 133 for the relief of Claude Le Cheminaut.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 134 for the relief of Dora Taylor.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 135 for the relief of Alice Gladys Barkey.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 136 for the relief of Helen Awrey.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 137 for the relief of James Lynham.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 138, for the relief of Harry Freeman Switzer.—Mr. Young (Toronto).

Bill No. 139 for the relief of Bessie Stephen Lee.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 140 for the relief of Nanette Coffey.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 141 for the relief of James Graham McCreadie.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 142 for the relief of Stephen Dymon.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 143 for the relief of Irene Sagar.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 144 for the relief of Clifford Wilson.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 145 for the relief of James Clayton Powell.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 146 for the relief of Mina Thompson.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill No. 147 for the relief of Clare Doutre Walters Bertram.—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 148 for the relief of Margaret Duffield.—Mr. McPhee.

Motions for first readings agreed to on division.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MONTREAL RAILWAY TERMINAL FACILITIES

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the

house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to provide that the Canadian National Railway Company may construct and complete terminal stations and facilities and other railway works and improvements at or in the vicinity of the city of Montreal, and the governor in council may guarantee the principal and interest of securities to be issued for these purposes by the company to an amount not exceeding $50,000,000, and the proceeds of any sale, pledge or disposition of the securities shall be deposited to the credit of the Minister of Finance in trust for the company, and released from time to time to the comapny by the said minister to be applied to expenditures made or indebtedness incurred in connection with the said works.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE

SALARIES OF PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL OFFICIALS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Might I ask the Minister of Finance whether the government are yet ready to announce the names of certain distinguished gentlemen who, they indicated a few days ago, would be asked to counsel with them regarding the duties, rates of salaries and so forth in connection with technical employees in the service?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): I anticipated that this question might be asked, because my hon. friend had asked it before. As hon. members know, it has been represented that the remuneration provided in the government service is no longer attractive to persons of superior technical and professional training. The report made last year by the Civil Service Commission recommends a graduated flat increase of from $240 to $420 per annum. This would apply to 1,936 persons, and involves $690,000 to one class and $60,000 to another, or a total of $750,000.

While there may be those who feel that, generally speaking, the civil servants of Canada are as well provided for in the way of salaries as are their fellow citizens who furnish the revenues to pay for the services, it is felt that in the public interest a fair comparison of salaries within and without the service should be available. The government, therefore, invited Mr. E. W. Beatty, president and chairman of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Sir George Garneau, of Garneau Limitee, Quebec city, and Doctor Murray, president of the university of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, to inquire into and report on these phases, thereby providing the government with information permitting a readjustment fair to all interested.

May I add that the government feel that this house will agree the country is fortunate in being able to secure the services of men of such wide experience.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY

CLAIMS OF HOLDERS OF FIRST AND SECOND PREFERENCE SHARES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to ask the Minister of Justice whether or not the reports appearing in the public press as to the granting of a fiat to the first and second preference shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company empowering them to enter an action with respect to their claims, has been granted by the minister.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I saw that report in the press. It is wholly erroneous. The matter is still engaging the consideration of the Department of Justice.

CANADIAN REPARATIONS ASSOCIATION OF TORONTO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. E. MacLEAN (Prince): Can the Secretary of State give the house any information regarding an organization known as the Canadian Reparations Association of Toronto, which is writing to different claimants telling them that if they turn over their claims to this association, it will see that they are adjusted, and that five per cent commission will be charged for the work.

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): Although I have no specific knowledge of that association, its existence has been brought to my attention, as well as similar proposals made to the claimants for a certain consideration to further their claims. I would not like to appear to be denying to any claimants any means of making their claims good, nor would I like to impute any motive to any association, but I do desire to say very clearly that I fail to see the least usefulness on the part of any of these claimants in going on with their claims after their claims have been investigated by Commissioner Friel and a report has been made by

the commissioner in regard to every one of them. It is now a question not of dealing with individual claims, but rather as to what policy shall be adopted as regards the claimants as a whole. That question is now before the house, and the government has a resolution covering the matter. Further, it wishes to take parliament into its confidence in order that a definite solution might be found for this rather involved problem. I do think, however, that claimants should guard well against entering into any such agreement with any outside association, and rely rather on the sense of justice of the government and of parliament in this matter.

MARINE AND FISHERIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. G. ERNST (Queens-Lunenburg): I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin) to the fact that early in the session two bills, Nos. 25 and 26, relating to the fisheries of the Dominion, received a second reading in this house and were referred to the committee on marine and fisheries. They have been considered indirectly at one meeting of that committee which was held a considerable time before the Easter recess, but nothing has been done with respect to them since, nor has the committee since been convened. I should like to ask what is the intention of the department and of the government with respect to them.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): My hon. friend certainly understands that I am not the master of the committee of marine and fisheries. These two bills were referred to that committee with a view to giving all parties interested the opportunity to make their representations before the committee. I am sure that the committee will devote the proper amount of time to a consideration of the proposals contained in these bills, and I have no doubt that it will be in a position to report to the house before very long so that we shall have an opportunity of proceeding to adopt these bills.

PROPOSED CHIGNECTO CANAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. K. SMITH (Cumberland): I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Dunning) when his department will commence their investigation and surveys in connection with the proposed canal across the isthmus of Chignecto.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): My hon. friend was kind enough to give me notice of his question. I have to make the very frank confession that I have not had time to go further into the matter since it was the subject of discussion in this house. My hon. friend will remember that I have rather a large volume of work before the house which occupies a great deal of my time, but I can assure him that this matter is not being lost sight of.

SUPPLY—RURAL MAIL CONTRACTS

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Mr. Speaker, as I understand that it is the intention of the government when the house goes into supply to enter upon a discussion of the estimates of the post office department, I thought that this might be an appropriate time to enter upon a brief discussion of the question of rural mail contracts as they now exist in the Dominion of Canada. When I heard at noon to-day that this matter was coming up, I notified the secretary of the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) that I proposed to discuss this matter, and I intend before I resume my seat to move an amendment.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is rather late, without notice.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I gave notice. The amendment which I propose to move is one which I believe will bring on a general discussion of the matter and in the end lead to action by the government. It is not a subject which is in any way new to the House of Commons or to the present Postmaster General or to the government, because on three or four occasions in the past five or six years this matter has been fairly well discussed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We have not a copy of the amendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I will give my right hon. friend a copy. So the matter which I intend to lay before the house on this occasion cannot in any way be considered as a new one. The truth is that a condition exists in regard to rural mail couriers in Canada to-day which is nothing less than a public scandal. It was about twenty years ago when we in Canada decided to establish a system of rural mail delivery throughout all the better settled portions of rural Canada. A system had been established prior to that time in the United States, and the experience in that country in regard to the delivery of rural mails throughout a very extended territory had been

pretty satisfactory. We launched the experiment in Canada with some trepidation, I remember, but gradually we have extended the system through the better settled portions of rural Canada until to-day we have in operation, as I understand, some 4,007 rural mail routes which are of great benefit and convenience to our rural population.

The system which was adopted in the first instance in regard to these rural mail routes was one based on tender and contract. Certain routes were publicly advertised, tenders were called, and as a rule a fairly large number of tenderers responded to the advertisement in the hope of securing occupation as mail carriers in the rural parts of Canada. I suppose that lack of experience had something to do with the unsatisfactory conditions which attended the first tenders and the first contracts, but as time has gone on, conditions instead of improving have gradually become worse until to-day we find a system established throughout practically the whole length and breadth of this country under which certain men who are practically employees of this government and of this country, for the purpose of carrying His Majesty's mails, are not receiving an adequate return for the services they perform. Indeed, so inadequate is the return to our rural mail couriers that the matter has become nothing less than a public scandal. Year after year this matter has been brought to the attention of this government and of the present Postmaster General during the discussion of the Post Office estimates. Year after year the rural letter carriers have requested that their claims be considered and that they be treated on some fairer basis and on some higher standard than anything they have enjoyed hitherto.

Now, the situation I will briefly describe as follows. The figures which I give, it must be understood, will be only average figures; I cannot go into particular cases; but I find that in the report of the Postmaster General for the year ending March 31, 1928, the total cost to the Dominion for the "conveyance of mails by ordinary land" is $6,291,180.52. I have been informed by officials in the Post Office department that this item includes the cost of all the rural mail routes, of all the stage routes, and all the routes known as station-to-post office routes; these are all referred to under one item as "conveyance of mails by ordinary land." Just what part of that single item is devoted to the delivery of rural mail I am unable to say with precision; I can only form an estimate, but information has been given to me that the number of established routes to-day is 4,007, and it has been represented that the average route in Canada at the present time is one of twenty miles. Some routes are a little more than this, some a little less, but as an average twenty miles is supposed to be about right. The average pay for a courier who travels that route of twenty miles is, according to my informant in the department, about $800, although according to a statement which I have received from the Letter Carriers' Association the average amount which each carrier receives is only $720. I am taking the higher figure of $800 for a twenty-mile route, which would be payment to the courier at the rate of $40 per mile over a period of a year.

Now, what is he supposed to do for that money? In the first place, he has to maintain the service and in most, if not all, cases the service has to be daily; he has to perform his trip in all kinds and conditions of weather, winter and summer, with few, if any, holidays—I believe there are one or two holidays specified now; he has to maintain a sufficient horse and conveyance to cover his route, and he has to maintain himself and his family, all out of that average sum of $800 which he receives as a total annual remuneration.

One has only to state these facts to demonstrate that a service based upon such unfair conditions can only result in one thing—a public scandal. No man can perform the service satisfactorily under such conditions. The maintenance of the horse and equipment takes more than half of the remuneration which he receives. Officials in the Post Office department tell me that in order to ensure proper service on a twenty-mile route, two horses are necessary. I know of routes upon which only one horse is maintained. But take it, if you will, at only one horse, the first question is: what does it cost to keep a horse in Canada to-day? I have made inquiries from men who ought to know—some men in this house, some outside—and I find that for the maintenance of one horse there is annually required:

140 bushels of oats at 70 cents	$ 98
3 tons of hay at $13	39
Bran	25
Horshoeing	20
Depreciation and repairs—horse and conveyance	40
A total of	$222

Or $440 on any route that requires two horses—and the majority of them do. I submit these figures to the house as the minimum figures which I have been able to obtain. The figures supplied by the Letter Carriers' Association are far in advance of these figures. They tell me that three tons of hay is far too

little to maintain a horse for a year, and that $13 a ton is too low a price; that $20 is too little for horseshoeing, and that $40 is too little for depreciation and repairs of the equipment. But I am taking these as minimum figures which show that a mail carrier will have an actual outlay, if he employs two horses, of $440 for maintenance. This will leave him only $360 for the support of himself, and of his family.

There is no man in this country who can support himself and his family on $360; it cannot be done. Is not that a very strong reason why there is such vigorous and persistent complaint in regard to this matter? These men are underpaid while performing a very important service. Their net remuneration is but $360. Why, the figures supplied to this house by the Department of Labour show that the minimum requirement for a family of five in January of the present year was $1,122.60, for the mere necessaries of life. And yet under present conditions as operating throughout this Dominion the Post Office department we are asking these couriers of His Majesty's mail in the rural districts to do their work for $360 a year. Mr. Speaker, I repeat it cannot be done. The men are losing money. They are suffering grave hardship. Surely it is beneath the dignity of such a country as Canada, it is beneath the dignity of any government, to allow a system of that kind to continue.

Now, what will the result be? Loss to the contractors? Certainly. Inefficiency in the service? Certainly. Dishonesty will probably follow. Indeed there are some parts of Ontario where the matter has become a real scandal. There have been prosecutions before magistrates by humane societies at various points because these contractors for the conveyance of His Majesty's mails have not had money enough to feed their horses. The magistrates have taken a lenient view of these cases and have dismissed them, but the matter has become an outstanding scandal.

What is the real difficulty? The tender system, I submit, is a wrong system in regard to this matter. When it was first introduced some twenty years ago it was experimental. We had had no experience at that time. But why continue it when we know year in and year out that the system is not satisfactory and is causing grave hardship? Why allow the matter to remain as it is year after year when it has been pointed out in this house, on every occasion on which post office estimates are discussed, that the system is unfair, that it is a gross hardship, and that it must be altered and improved? Why does the government delay action in this matter?

[Mr. Guthrie.]

What is the system which has been adopted in the United States, for instance? There they began with a system of tender and contract for specified routes. They found it unworkable, just as we have found it unworkable and unsatisfactory in Canada. But in the United States they promptly changed it; they put it on the mileage basis. There they have established certain definite routes, the mileage is calculated, and a man is appointed as letter carrier on a route with the definite understanding that he shall receive so much per mile. I believe there is some variation allowed in prices by reason of physical difficulties which may arise in the country over which the courier has to travel. In the United States at the present time the courier receives in the majority of cases $75 per mile travelled. This is not an unreasonable amount; it is, I submit, fair and reasonable. It may be that the United States rate at the present time would be too high in a country such as Canada where distances may be greater and population sparser. But $40 a mile which is the average they are receiving now, is absurd. Something must be done to increase the amount, and steps must be taken to make these men permanent. Forty dollars a mile is the average in Canada and $75 in the United States. Moreover, our system lacks the permanence which attaches to the system in the United States. When a mail contract is let, and when the local community start tendering one against another, they cut the figure down and down to rock bottom, and the contract is given for four years to the lowest man provided the contractor can furnish the necessary security for the carrying out of the contract. But at the end of the four years he finds that he cannot make money. Indeed, a good many of them are willing to give it up, but unfortunately they have their horses and their equipment and do not know what to do in the matter. If they do not renew the contract at practically the same amount there is another advertisement for tenders, with another group of tenderers. Other people know what the former contractor got and they try to cut a little bit under him. And they do so. The result is that the figures have been going down and down and down, while the cost of living has been going up or has been maintained at a very high standard; and so the system has been positively disastrous to many men.

Now what we ask by this motion and what we have asked for the last three or four sessions in this house, is that a new system be adopted forthwith. The mileage system should be adopted in place of the tender system and the positions should be made permanent, just as permanent as are letter

carriers in the city districts. An amount should be fixed as remuneration having regard to the cost of living in this country and the duties and responsibilities of the courier. I do not suggest the rate which they now pay in the United States, but I do suggest $70 or at any rate $60 a mile as a reasonable sum in this country. Now, assuming that the present contractors do average $800 a year each, and assuming that there are 4,000 rural mail routes, this involves an annual expenditure to-day of $3,200,000 or thereabouts of the $6,000,000 item which is in the Postmaster General's report. That is on the basis of $40 a mile. What would be the effect of increasing the rate to $60 a mile—a 50 per cent increase? You would raise the total amount by $1,600,000. Would not that be fair? Instead of $3,200,000, which I assume it is now approximately—I cannot give the figures definitely—it would increase to $4,800,000 a year; and if you deemed proper to make it $70 a mile, which I submit would be reasonable, you would need to add another 25 per cent to the last figure I have given.

I submit that under present conditions in Canada it is not beyond this Dominion to grant $70 a mile, and I also submit that the tender system should be abolished at once. In my opinion the position of rural mail courier should be made permanent immediately, and a definite satisfactory amount should be fixed as remuneration upon the mileage basis. This is not a new proposal in this house, nor is it in the country. The public conscience has been aroused throughout the Dominion in regard to this matter. The press of the country, without distinction politically, has discussed the matter editorially, and as briefly as possible I am going to put on Hansard with my remarks some press comments to show that there is no political bias in the matter to it, to show also that the men now engaged as rural mail carriers in Canada have a real and substantial grievance. And I ask again why this government has not remedied this grievance before now. Listen to what the Toronto Globe says. I read from a Globe editorial of September 10, 1928:

> The annual meeting of the Canadian Mail Contractors' Association, held in Toronto the other day, brought once more to the attention of the public the unfortunate conditions under which the rural mail contractor carries on his work. Chief among the resolutions passed by the carriers was that requesting the government to abolish the present contract plan under which mail is delivered in the country, and to bring about the introduction of the salary system on the basis of $70 per mile per year for rural contractors. The request made by these men is reasonable. What they are asking from the government is simply a living wage and to be placed on a similar footing to the postal carriers in the cities of the Dominion.
>
> The contract system has outlived its usefulness, and should be discarded without delay. It was given up long ago by the United States government, and the rural mail men placed on the same basis as other employees of the postal department. The contract system in vogue in Canada has little to commend it, except that it is cheap. The man who submits the lowest tender may get the job. Too often it may happen that he will also perform the worst service. The rural mail carriers have protested for long against the present plan, and have petitioned the government repeatedly to have it changed. Surely the time has come when their plea should be heeded.

That from the Toronto Globe. The Ottawa Citizen has also spoken editorially, and its views are as follows:

> A convincing case has been made out for better treatment at the hands of the Department at Ottawa by the Rural Mail Contractors' Association in the memorandum they recently sent to members of both houses of parliament. As most persons are aware, rural mail deliveries are carried out under a contract system whereby the contractor undertakes to deliver mail along a given route for four years. The average length of a mail contract route is 20 miles and the average yearly contract price paid by the government is $732. Besides furnishing wholly inadequate remuneration for the character of the work and duties entailed, this system possesses inherent defects which only its abolition can remove. The rural mail men point out that the average upkeep of a contractor's horses and rigs during the last five years has been $1,058.

That is more than twice the figure I gave.

> This means an average loss of $326 yearly, in addition to which the mail contractor has given his time and assumed responsibilities free of charge.

The London Advertiser has a long article very much to the same effect which I need not quote. The Toronto Star contains a very strong article against the present system, calling on the government to change it at once. The Montreal Herald too carries a strong article, and comments appear in the Telegraph-Journal of St. John, the Hamilton Herald, the Canadian Countryman, the St. Thomas Times and Journal, the Farmers' Sun, the Hamilton Spectator, the Stratford Beacon-Herald—in fact one may say all the leading newspapers of Canada have brought this matter to the attention of the Postmaster General and the government, yet year after year nothing has been done. There is a way, however, by which I hope to bring the question pointedly to the notice of the Postmaster General and by which I propose to ask the house to deal with it. I am moving a motion on going into supply this afternoon which, as the house knows, is always in the

nature of a motion of want of confidence. I have taken that course in order to test out this matter in this House of Commons. In years past many hon. members in various quarters of the house have discussed this matter very forcibly; they have laid before us the case of the rural mail couriers with great effect, and I sincerely hope that upon this occasion they will implement the speeches they made in this house in previous years. I hope that as a result of this vote these rural mail couriers who have been complaining for years and who have been suffering gross injustice for years, will have their injuries remedied as they should have been remedied by this government long ago.

This afternoon I have briefly stated the case to the house as I believe it to exist, and I have drawn up a resolution expressing as well as I can what is in my mind. I may say in connection with this resolution, however—and I say this in the presence of my leader—that it embodies the policy of the Conservative party on this question, and if the Conservative party is returned to power this policy as outlined in this amendment will be carried out without further delay.

With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens):

That all the words after the word "that" in the motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"in the opinion of this house the present system of awarding contracts for the delivery of rural mail by tender has proved unfair, burdensome and unsatisfactory, and that such rural mail carriers should be appointed by the Civil Service Commission upon a permanent basis with a definite rate of pay, based upon mileage and the physical conditions of the territory involved, having regard to the amount paid to the other servants of the government for similar employment."

Mr. T. E. KAISER (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the question of the better treatment of the rural mail carriers of Canada has been brought to the attention of the house in this way, because I feel very strongly upon this question. In one respect, however, I regret that the matter has been brought before the house by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), because when he introduces a question and speaks upon it very little remains for anyone else to say. He has covered the ground thoroughly, and I can add but very little to his remarks.

One reason why I feel very strongly on this question is because right opposite my home is located the post office serving the entire district which I represent, and every morning throughout the year I see some nineteen or twenty rural mail carriers start from that point. I am personally acquainted with each of these men and I know the difficulties they must meet; I know what they do and how they work; I understand the obstacles which they must overcome and I sympathize with them very deeply in the effort they are putting forth for their country. They are unfairly treated; their job is very precarious, since they may be removed from it at any time, and their remuneration is absolutely inadequate for the work they are doing. As my hon. friend has said, our method of handling this work has been to call upon each individual to apply for the job, and naturally the government have endeavoured to get this work done as cheaply as possible. Unfortunately, in order to secure the contracts, men have put in very low tenders and as a result have undertaken the work with very unreasonable remuneration. The lack of system is not creditable to this country, and the lack of method is a common topic of conversation. This work should be systematized and placed under the Civil Service Commission, or handled in some way other than the very disagreeable and disjointed procedure that now prevails.

Reference has been made to what has been done in the United States. I have in my hand a statement issued by the government of the United States showing the different salaries paid to rural mail carriers. They have daily, tri-weekly and weekly mail routes, but I think the figures given with reference to the daily routes would be the most interesting to this house. I will not read the whole list, but in part it is as follows:

Length miles—	Miles	Annual salary
6 and less than..	8	$ 792
8 and less than..	10	864
10 and less than..	12	936
12 and less than..	14	1,008
14 and less than..	16	1,080
16 and less than..	18	1,260
18 and less than..	20	1,440
20 and less than..	22	1,620
22 and less than..	24	1,728
24 and not over..	24.5	1,800
Over 24.5 and not over..	25.5	1,830

The table continues down to final figure of:

Over 54.5 and not over..	55.5	$2,730

It would be very simple for any member to take the routes in his own constituency and work out the cost on a basis of the rates paid in the United States. Other countries have advanced to the point where a fair price is fixed, and in addition superannuation is provided for. Two and one half per cent of the salaries paid in the United States is deducted and merged into a superannuation fund.

I have worked out this comparison as it applies to my own constituency. I will not read the complete list, but a few of the examples are as follows:

Route mileage	Canadian salary	American salary
19⅜	$ 849 82	$1,440
23⅜	1,033 66	1,728
18⅝	1,050 00	1,440
19½	800 00	1,440
13½	400 40	1,008
26½	1,300 00	1,860
25½	1,300 00	1,830

The total cost of rural mail delivery in my constituency amounts to $17,008.83, which, figured on the American basis, would amount to $28,818, or an increase of 59 per cent.

I would not advise adopting the American rates immediately, but I think the whole thing should be reduced to a system. It could be started with a raise of 30 per cent, and then a further increase as time and conditions justified. It is not correct to say that the systemizing of this work and the placing of these men upon an equitable basis would multiply our cost. The American mail carrier is contented and satisfied with his conditions, and I think a fair increase would satisfy our own men. The people of the province of Ontario sympathize with these letter-carriers. As a rule, they are kindly disposed and as they pass through the country, they do hundreds of kindly acts which are entirely outside of the actual delivery of mail. It is certainly not creditable to this country when we consider the way these rural mail carriers are treated.

If the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) would be big enough to lay aside for a few weeks the question of further employment and the dismissing of postmasters, and devote his attention to the rural mail carriers and see that they are given a reasonable allowance for doing their work, he would be much better employed.

Mr. POWER: Does the hon. member suggest that the present rural mail carriers should be brought into the civil service without further examination?

Mr. BENNETT: He did not say that.

Mr. POWER: That is the question I am asking the hon. member.

Mr. KAISER: I suggest that you ask the Postmaster General.

Mr. POWER: I am asking the hon. member for his suggestion.

Mr. BENNETT: The motion speaks for itself.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He is obstructive, not constructive.

Mr. H. A. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has drawn the attention of the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) and of this house to a long standing grievance on the part of a large body of faithful and efficient public servants against whom there has been what might well be termed an unfair discrimination, in that, although discharging duties which are as important to the public as those performed by other servants who are on the permanent list and receive regular salaries, they are not similarly treated. Representations have been made from year to year on behalf of these mail carriers and facts have been cited which should long ago have brought about a remedy of this grievance. In fact, one wonders why there has been this continued neglect, this refusal on the part of the Postmaster General to consider the requests of this large body of public servants and to find a remedy. He has shown in some instances activity and keen interest on behalf of other employees of the department. In fact, he has taken pains to point out to the house that in some cases the Civil Service Commission have not met his views with respect to increases of salaries.

We all know the character of the duties of a rural mail carrier. They are exacting; they demand punctuality. He must be faithful; he must be on the job every day of the year, Sundays excepted, rain or shine, no matter whether the travelling is good or bad. He must furnish ample security for the discharge of his duties. He is under supervision, and in every respect his position is a difficult and an exacting one. I am sure the Postmaster General must recall the fact that from time to time members of parliament have to interview his deputy and those in charge of this service on behalf of unfortunates who have tendered for it only to find out that they have signed a contract binding them for a period of years, and that the proposition has been a losing one for them. In some cases they have had to ask to be relieved and have been replaced by others. Sometimes persons are found without knowledge of the situation who are willing to take over the contracts, but these unfortunate individuals soon find themselves in trouble. I know personally of contracts that have had to be transferred three or four times, in each case to the disadvantage and loss of the party who took it over.

We do not ask for tenders for similar services on the part of mail clerks or those

in the postal service, and I think the time is long past when we should continue this method. These ought to be considered permanent employees and there ought to be a reasonable, fixed compensation for them. Not knowing that the matter was going to come up in the house, I took the liberty some time ago to write to the postal department in Washington to find out how they dealt with the matter there, and under date of March 29, 1929, I received from the fourth assistant postmaster general a letter which I desire to put on Hansard. The letter reads:

My Dear Mr. Stewart:

Reference is made to your letter of March 23, requesting information as to the rate of pay of rural mail carriers in the United States, and as to particulars of the equipment and vehicles which they or the department provide for the service.

The salaries which rural carriers shall receive are fixed by law, being based on the length of the route served and the frequency of the deliveries, routes being served either daily except Sunday or three times a week. For serving a rural route of twenty-four miles six days in the week, the salary is $1,800 per annum; on routes twenty-two miles and less than twenty-four miles, $1,728; on routes twenty miles and less than twenty-two miles, $1,620; on routes eighteen miles, and less than twenty miles, $1,440; on routes sixteen miles and less than eighteen miles, $1,260; on routes fourteen miles and less than sixteen miles, $1,080; on routes twelve miles and less than fourteen miles, $1,008; on routes ten miles and less than twelve miles, $936; on routes eight miles and less than ten miles, $864; on routes six miles and less than eight miles, $792; on routes four miles and less than six miles, $720. Each rural carrier assigned to a route on which daily service is performed receives $30 per mile per annum for each mile of his route in excess of twenty-four miles or major fraction thereof, based on actual mileage, and each rural carrier assigned to a route on which tri-weekly service is performed receives $15 per mile for each mile of said route in excess of forty-eight miles or major fraction thereof, based on actual mileage.

A rural carrier who serves one tri-weekly route is paid a salary and equipment maintenance allowance on the basis of a route one-half of the length of the route served by him. A rural carrier serving two tri-weekly routes is paid a salary and equipment maintenance allowance on the basis of a route one-half of the combined length of the two routes.

In addition to the salary each carrier is paid an equipment maintenance in the sum of 4 cents per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled.

Rural carriers are required to provide and to maintain suitable vehicles with which to perform the service.

It will be seen that this is a very much more generous compensation than we allow for this service. I do not suggest that the situation requires that we should pay as much as they are paying in the United States, and it has occurred to me that I might make these suggestions which might be helpful to the Postmaster General: That there should be a survey of all these routes, and they should be divided into perhaps three or four classes: A, B, C and D, the classification being made on the length of the route, the time required for the service, the hours of the day at which the service has to be carried out, the physical conditions and any other consideration that might properly be taken into account in the classification of these routes. Then a mileage rate should be fixed for each of these different classes. A similar classification is made of post offices, and I can see no reason why the principle should not be applied to rural mail routes.

The mover of the resolution has so fully dealt with it that I cannot add much to what he has said, but I want to impress upon the Postmaster General that this class of public servant is suffering; that they need relief; that they have from time to time made representations that are sound and sane, and that are based on fact. Their representations are not imaginary, unreasonable or unjust. The Dominion of Canada cannot afford to have in its service any considerable body of faithful servants such as these who are underpaid, who are carrying on under a sense of discrimination and a feeling they are being unjustly dealt with.

I wish also to call to the minister's attention the compensation that is in some cases paid to the collector of mail from city or town boxes. This also is done by tender. I have in mind the case of an unfortunate man who is travelling around ten or twelve miles a day seven days in the week, and receiving the handsome sum of about $520 per annum.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Who set the price?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): He set it himself, but surely that is no answer. If you were to apply that all round you might easily get some person to act as Postmaster General—

Mr. ROBB: Or member of parliament.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Or prime minister.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Would the hon. member have all the members appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): No.

Mr. POWER: Most of them would not get the job in that case.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I am discussing the question of compensation.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Do you object as a general rule to the principle of tendering, or only in the case of this particular service?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I object to any public servant being asked to tender for services of this kind. I think it is a vicious principle—

Mr. STEVENS: "A thoroughly vicious principle."

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I think it is unsound, and I can see no reason why it should be applied to this particular class of public servants. I hope that the Postmaster General will give consideration to the representations of the rural mail couriers. I think he feels himself that an injustice is being done to them, and I hope he will find some way of giving them redress.

Mr. R. K. ANDERSON (Halton): I wish to make a few remarks in support of the resolution introduced by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). This question has been before the house on many occasions; it has come up almost every session for a great many years. In anything I have to say I am in no way criticising the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) because the system that prevails has been in existence for a number of years. We know that the rural mail delivery service is very efficient, and that the farmers of this country would not wish to do without it. It is a great improvement over the system prevailing before, when the people in the country had to drive many miles into the nearest village or town to get their mail. The rural mail couriers to-day not only carry the ordinary mail and registered mail, but also deliver small supplies to the farmers, and collect their mail for delivery to the post office.

I wish to direct the attention of the Postmaster General to a comparison between the remuneration paid to the rural mail couriers and that of the mail carriers in the cities. In my county there is a rural mail route of fifteen miles, for which the courier is paid $750 a year. That amounts to about $2.40 per trip. This man is compelled to keep two horses and a vehicle. He has to provide equipment throughout the year, meet the cost of all repairs and maintenance, and keep his family, all on $750 a year. His work on the route occupies the whole of his time, because the roads are bad and it takes him almost a whole day to make the trip. It costs him more than half of that $750 to maintain his horses and rig. He is on the road every day, six days in the week, and has only six holidays throughout the year. In the performance of his duties he is out in all kinds of weather, rain or shine, cold or hot, and over all kinds of roads. I think the minister was not listening when I said that all this man received for his services on this route of fifteen miles was $750 a year, or about $2.40 a trip, and he has to supply the whole equipment. The government supplies nothing. His brother delivering mail in the city receives a minimum of about $1,080 a year, with the chance of advancing each year until he reaches a maximum of $1,500. In addition, he is provided with at least one suit of clothes, if not two, per year, and I think also his boots, and he has no equipment expenses of any kind. Of course he has his family to keep, but the man in the country has his family as well. There is no comparison between the amounts paid by way of remuneration for these two services, and I do not see how the Postmaster General can refuse to take into consideration the conditions under which the rural mail couriers work. Of course we know that they tender for the route and that generally the price is set by the man himself—but not always, because the system of tender is such that the tenderer is compelled to put in the lowest figure at which he thinks he can get the work. I know of cases where the inspector who opens the tenders has peddled them around amongst the different tenderers to see if he could not get a lower bid. That has been done more than once in the section from which I come.

Mr. VENIOT: That has been changed. All the tenders are now sent to my department.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): I am glad that change has been made, because I know that the practice prevailed some years ago. I hope the minister will take into consideration the comparison I have made between the remuneration of the mail carrier in the city and that of rural mail courier, and that the latter will receive better remuneration for the work they perform.

There is another point. At the end of four years, if these rural mail couriers wish to retain the route, they have to put in a new tender. If they do not carry on with the work they have their team and rig on their hands, and frequently they have no further use for them; consequently in many cases they put in a lower bid than they otherwise would have done. The average equipment, if it is anything like decent equipment, costs between two and four hundred dollars; in fact it is only very poor equipment that you can

get for $200. If they lose the contract at the end of the term they are left with that equipment on their hands; consequently they will sometimes tender at a lower rate for the second contract if they think there is any possibility of another man getting the route. These things should be taken into consideration by the minister, and I hope he will lend a sympathetic ear to the representations that are being made on behalf of these rural mail couriers. I hope the discussion to-day will assist the minister in doing justice to these men.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): I think, Mr. Speaker, in the ten minutes that are left before six o'clock I can conclude the few remarks I have to make. I must congratulate the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) on bringing this matter before the house. I have a keen appreciation of any political manœuvre, and I think the motion of the hon. member for South Wellington is good political manœuvring. He and his party wish to be able to say to the rural mail carriers throughout the country: We have been endeavouring to give you greater remuneration, but the government, which spends thousands of dollars elsewhere, won't give it to you. I would have been more pleased with my hon. friend had he told us how he proposes to go about this thing, whether he intends to include other classes with the rural mail carriers. I have no rural mail carriers in my constituency, but I have a man who drives the mails from the railway station to the post office, and another man who furnishes the horses and equipment for collecting the mail from the city mail boxes. Now, if it is an utterly vicious system, as has been remarked by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Stewart)—

An hon. MEMBER: Principle.

Mr. POWER: If it is an utterly vicious principle to call for tenders for the delivery of the rural mails, it is an equally vicious principle to call for tenders for the collection of mail from the city mail boxes. So we would be handing somebody in the city $30,000 or $40,000 annually, absolutely without tender. The principle involved is exactly the same. I know of some cases where men have actually lost money on the contract for collecting mail from the city mail boxes. The same principle would apply no doubt to the men who collect the mail at the railway stations and deliver it to the post offices—a matter of probably five, six or ten thousand dollars in some of the large cities. That is one fault which I wish to point out in the suggestion of the hon. member for South Wellington, and which I think if he is sincere he will find means of correcting.

There is this other fault. When the hon. member goes before these rural mail carriers and tells them that he wished to increase the pay that they are getting, I wonder if he will tell them that under his proposal perhaps 75 to 80 per cent, possibly 90 per cent of them would be under the jurisdiction of the commission, unless they are blanketed in at so much a month, something which I think we are not permitted to do under the present regulations, and something which I am sure would meet with serious opposition from hon. gentlemen opposite. I am quite sure that if the Postmaster General were to propose that all the rural mail carriers be blanketed in at so much a month there would be a howl from the other side of the house. Then if those men are to comply with the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission, I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that applications will be called for, notices will be put up in the post offices that on a certain date candidates for the position of rural mail carrier from such a point to such a point must appear before the commissioner's examiner. If in our district they would have to present themselves at McGill university, because on the last occasion when the commission wanted cleaners for the public buildings in Montreal they called for an examination at that university. In any case the rural mail carriers would have to be between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five, and many an old, respectable and honest mail carrier has been carrying on his work for forty or fifty years, loyally to the department and to the country; such a man would not be allowed to sit for examination. Then they would be questioned on all subjects under the sun, such as, What is the capital of Patagonia? Who was the last king before Herod built the pyramids? What is the depth of water at Anticosti island? And so on and so forth, in short, whatever ingenious questions any intelligent gentleman in the Civil Service Commission may conceive of. That is what would be involved by this proposition if it goes through.

Then it has been suggested to me that there is something else. Altogether apart from the qualifications of the man who drives the mail conveyance, will we not have to set up—taking him probably from the department of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell)—an examiner of horses? A civil service commission which examines into the qualifications of charwomen and labourers surely can give some decision on horses.

Mr. BENNETT: That would mean another trip to Europe to inspect.

Mr. POWER: I have no doubt the hon. member might have to go to Europe if this thing passed. We will have all these factors, which must be considered before giving a vote on the proposition before the house. I submit, sir, that in view of the fact that my hon. friend from South Wellington has not explained just how he expects to enforce the scheme which he asks the Postmaster General to accept, and as it is purely a political manœuvre in that it is a vote of want of confidence in the government, he himself can hardly expect it to be accepted by this side of the house. I submit, further, when those whom he pretends to benefit by this suggestion realize what it does mean, that in 75 to 80 per cent of the cases the present incumbents will not be benefited, he will lose a great deal of the sympathy with which this proposition must have been received in the country.

There is one other point I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that if these men work hard all the year, if they are obliged to carry on their duties in all weathers, they do it by choice. They tender to do the work at a certain price. They know just what the distance of the route is, generally they live in the locality, and in a large number of cases the same men carry on the work year after year. Having entered into a contract with the department it is their duty to abide by it. I have every sympathy for them; I think possibly they should ask for higher rates, but if in their own interests they do not feel justified in doing so, I see no reason why we should increase the expense of this service.

Mr. W. E. ROWE (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Chairman, had it not been for the speech of my hon. friend who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Power) I should not attempt to discuss the motion of my hon. friend from South Wellington.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

PROCEDURE RESPECTING APPLICATIONS FOR DIVORCE

Mr. J. E. LAWSON (West York) moved the second reading of Bill No. 89, for the relief of Naomi Pauline Wilson.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, after the discussion which took place yesterday there is perhaps not much to be added to the comments upon this or any other bill for divorce, but I feel it is only fair that we should dignify the bill with a vote of the house to see how hon. members regard it.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): There is precisely here a point which exemplifies the system. As I told the house last night, in the recess between six and eight o'clock I had to go through some sixty records of evidence, classifying them in alphabetical order, then taking the list of bills before the house and trying to ascertain which of the records of evidence corresponded with each bill. There is no indication whatever. These records are sent to us in groups without any indication of their relation each to the particular bill called when such legislation is before the house. This evening I happened to have an advantage over most other members in that I took a little time between six and eight to look into the records and I succeeded in marking about one half of them with letters corresponding to the bills to which they relate. Then, in the expectation that these bills would be called in their order, I began reading the evidence respecting the first bills likely to be taken up.

We were told last evening, and I think quite properly, by such hon. gentlemen—to mention only two—as the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) and the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan)—two hon. gentlemen who, I think I may say without exaggeration, are shining lights in parliament and in Canada with regard to judicial and legal matters—that in respect of the question now before us we in this house are acting as the highest court of justice in the land. These hon. gentlemen have told us that, parliament having seen fit to establish no jurisdiction respecting divorce in either the province of Ontario or the province of Quebec, parliament itself acts as the highest court of justice in Canada, and that therefore it is the duty of every hon. member of this house to take with respect to these bills the attitude of a judge or of a juror. The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, whose personal views I well know and to whose sense of duty as well as his dignity I can testify, regarding him both as a public man and as a friend, compared our position to that of judges in his own native province of Nova Scotia, where courts of divorce have been established and have exercised jurisdiction for many years. As he said, there are in these courts Roman Catholic or perhaps Anglican judges whose religious beliefs are entirely antagonistic to the principle and practice of divorce, but who nevertheless consider that, having to exercise their jurisdiction, they

must take cognizance of every case which is brought before them in order to apply the law according to the facts, and irrespective of their personal views; they must invoke the principle of law applicable to such cases. If such is our position it seems to me impossible for us to pass any judgment, or rather to adjudicate upon any of these cases, conscientiously and intelligently without knowing all the circumstances of each case as it comes before us.

It has been said that in this matter we act as a court of appeal; that by common consent and usage a committee of parliament performs—rather, I should say, now, committees perform—the duty of a court of inquiry; they find the facts and, it is said, all that we have to do is to ratify, so to speak, their judgment. But I do not think it has been suggested by anyone, either by the leader of the opposition or by any of the other legal members of this house, that we can pass final judgment in the matter, conscientiously and with intelligence, without at least knowing the evidence. One hon. member on the other side of the house has made the statement that it takes a very short time to read the evidence, that in about fifteen minutes any one of these records can be read. He went further and said that in the committee of the senate it took about twenty-five minutes for that court of inquiry to hear the witnesses, to hear the pleas of lawyers and to render their judgment. In other words, in twenty-five minutes a committee of one of the branches of this highest court of justice in the land declares that a marriage is null. That is the position and we as a court of review, a court of appeal or, if you prefer it, as a ratifying body passing final judgment upon the findings of a committee of the senate, come here to decide upon these cases. A bill is called and it stands; another bill is called and it stands, a third bill is called and stands and so we come to the fifth or the sixth on the list. Who has the time to read the records and the evidence in the six bills which may be called within two minutes? We are told that it is our duty to place our stamp of ratification on the findings of the court of inquiry, the divorce committee of the other branch of parliament. I appeal seriously to the other members of this house; whatever title we give ourselves, whether we call ourselves a parliament, whether we call ourselves one-half of that so-called high tribunal, or whether we style ourselves a court of review which revises and passes final judgment upon the findings of the other branch, can we do so without knowing upon what we must adjudicate? Here is a bill called; I have not read the evidence, although I read the records of the three previous bills. By the way what bill has been called, may I ask?

An hon. MEMBER: Bill No. 89.

Mr. BOURASSA: I have not read the evidence in that case and I am not prepared to adjudicate upon this bill, leaving aside entirely the question of principle which was discussed at length, and not without benefit, last night. I cannot say whether or not this bill is proper; I know from what little time I was able to give to these records yesterday and to-day that in many instances cases have been made by the evidence of the party asking for the divorce, the evidence of one policeman especially hired to make the case, and by the lawyer acting for the appellant, who sometimes turns himself into a witness to complete the evidence. I found two such cases this evening in the eight or ten records through which I glanced; the lawyer requested permission to take off his gown in order to turn himself into a witness. I ask the shining legal lights of this house whether there is any court of justice in this country which would admit such evidence upon which to render judgment even in the most trivial case, civil or criminal. In these cases we have the testimony of one party, who of course is interested in getting judgment; we have the evidence of a policeman or detective hired to make the case for that party, and we have the evidence of the lawyer hired to win the case. In all fairness and coolness I ask, and I appeal to the sense of justice and social order of every member of the house: Is this the way in which justice is to be dispensed by the highest court of the land? I think that aspect is worthy of consideration before we proceed.

I did not want to refer to this particular bill at any greater length, but once more I enter my protest against this system and I am prepared to vote against the second reading of this and all similar bills.

Mr. J. E. LAWSON (West York): Although I do not desire to close the debate perhaps I might be permitted a word of explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman speaks now he will preclude any other member from speaking. Is it the pleasure of the house that the hon. gentleman have leave to speak?

Mr. BOURASSA: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is it not possible for us to have an explanation from the promoter of the bill without necessarily closing the debate?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has already spoken, but by leave of the house he may proceed.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think it might help a great deal if the sponsor of the bill could give us an explanation, however short.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not catch what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think it would help if we could have some explanation from the hon. member, even though it be short.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is the pleasure of the house that the hon. gentleman should make an explanation, notwithstanding the rule? By unanimous consent the hon. member may speak on the bill without closing the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. LAWSON: In view of the remarks of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) I deem it advisable to offer a word of explanation with respect to this bill. The committee duly constituted under the rules of parliament has passed upon the evidence brought before it; in this case it has recommended a bill of divorce upon the only ground on which such a bill will be recommended by that committee.

Without going into details of the evidence, may I say for the information of hon. gentlemen that from fifteen years' experience in practising before the courts I look upon this as a case in which it has been most conclusively proven, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the respondent to this petition has been guilty of the act of adultery. That has been proven by calling the female party to the act; it has been proven by the evidence of a witness who happened into the place where the act was committed. Any reasonable man reading the evidence in this case must perforce come to the conclusion that an act of adultery was committed.

Mr. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton): If it is in order I would like to suggest that a committee of this House of Commons meet with the senate committee on these divorce bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: The private bills committee of the House of Commons considers these divorce cases; it is a custom of the house to refer divorce bills to that committee. In addition, some of the members of that committee are appointed to attend the meetings of the senate divorce committee, and I understand that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) is one of the members appointed for that purpose.

Mr. TUMMON: If my memory serves me aright, six members of the private bills committee were appointed for that service this year, in view of the fact that two senate committees were sitting.

Mr. G. R. GEARY (South Toronto): Once more I have been fortunate enough to listen to a speech delivered by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and while listening to it I was struck with the lack of point in it; I could not make out to what the hon. member addressed his remarks. I suppose he intends the house to gather from his words that we must stop considering all divorce petitions; otherwise his remarks lead us nowhere. To some extent he finds fault with the deliberations of the senate committee, and he says one case took up only about twenty-five minutes. I can quite understand a case in which there is no contradictory evidence being conclusively proved in twenty-five minutes or even less. As mentioned by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Lawson), I can well imagine a case being called where there was no argument or presentation by counsel, only two witnesses being heard, and the whole case being closed up in fifteen minutes. But hon. members must not think that the hearing of every petition takes only twenty-five minutes. I have heard of contested cases which have lasted the better part of a week.

I do not agree that this is a court of appeal, or a court which is to judge whether or not a petition is well founded. This function has been delegated to a committee, which committee is chosen from the senate because of some supposed judicial capacity. The Hon. Senator Willoughby, who was the chairman of that committee last year, is a lawyer of very wide experience and is well qualified to sift out the evidence. The proceedings are carried on in a very formal manner, much more formally than in many courts of higher jurisdiction. The lawyers must gown and the rules of evidence are strictly enforced That committee has the advantage of seeing and hearing the witnesses. When you to go to a court to appeal from the findings of a trial judge without a jury, you find that that court will almost invariably accept the findings of fact which have been made by the trial judge. Why? Because he has had the opportunity of seeing the witnesses and judging from their demeanor and the manner in which they presented their evidence whether or not this or that side is to be believed. His function is to sift the evidence where there is contradiction, and to frame his judgment accordingly.

If the hon. member finds himself in difficulty, I would suggest that he read the evidence as it comes to him. A good deal of the evidence is quite formal and can be skimmed over quickly in order to obtain a knowledge of the facts. If he finds a case in respect to which he considers insufficient proof has been offered, let him make a note of that case and bring it up here for discussion. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find very many cases in which he feels that he, as a member of parliament, should intervene and cast doubt upon the finding of the trial court —the senate committee—which has been set up. If the hon. gentleman would adopt some such plan I believe he would find that the few cases in which he desired to intervene would not ocupy much of his time in the house. He can attend the committee to which this bill will be sent if it is passed on, and have witnesses called and the whole case reviewed.

Mr. IRVINE: Does the hon. member wish to convey to the house his belief that the present method of dealing with divorce bills is adequate, or does he suggest that it is practical for every member to give that attention to these bills which might be expected of one who was going to sit in judgment upon the case?

Mr. GEARY: I certainly do. That is part of the business of the houses of parliament; that is part of the duties which we have sworn to perform. If it takes a long time, so much the worse. Who is to say that a divorce petition, any more than a petition for the incorporation of a company, is beneath the attention of this house? It is the duty of the members to acquaint themselves with the facts, and if it takes a long time, that cannot be helped. We have been vested with this jurisdiction, and we should not shirk our responsibility.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: With reference to the case mentioned by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), does the hon. member consider it proper that the barrister who appeared as counsel for the petitioner, and who afterwards disclosed himself to be a brother-in-law of one of the parties involved, should appear as a witness in the case?

Mr. GEARY: I see no reason for saying that he is not competent; whether or not his evidence would carry any weight is a question for the court.

Mr. BOURASSA: We are the court.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In this instance there were apparently only two witnesses, the brother-in-law who was acting as counsel, and the lady in the case who was accused of having improper relations.

Mr. GEARY: She admitted that.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, but that is only one case.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (West Calgary): Mr. Speaker, I venture to intrude in this debate merely to remind the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) that the evidence in the case is not before the House of Commons on the second reading of this bill. We have been discussing this case as though the evidence were involved in the discussion. In fact it has nothing to do with the second reading of this bill. That evidence is available when the bill goes to the committee, and if the committee does not desire to utilize that evidence it may call witnesses and have the case proven there. We have been treating this matter as though the evidence had something to do with it. This senate record really should not be in our hands until after the bill goes to the committee, and the real difficulty has arisen because we have taken the evidence and attempted to deal with it before that time. On the second reading of this bill all we do is refer the bill to the committee which is to decide whether or not the petitioner is entitled to a divorce. As the law now stands that is a constitutional principle. There being no delegation of the powers of parliament to a court, therefore this parliament considers the matter. I urge my hon. friend to reconsider his position in the light of what I am sure anyone will tell him is correct; that the second reading of this bill merely affirms that constitutional principle, and that only, and it is wholly out of order to discuss the evidence which was given before the senate committee. That evidence can be discussed when the bill has been given its second reading and sent to the committee. Some member of our committee will move that the senate committee shall be taken as the evidence in the case, because it is given under oath. If a sufficient number of the members of the committee desire that the case should be proved again, witnesses may be called.

With all due deference, it does seem to me that this discussion as to what the evidence discloses is wholly out of order until such time as the bill has gone to the committee. The evidence taken before the senate committee is not properly before the commons until the bill has been referred to a committee of the commons, and that committee may take its own action to determine what shall be done with respect to the bill, either by approving the evidence taken before the senate committee or by asking that evidence be taken de novo.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, as I understand the position taken by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett), he is arguing that we should not discuss the merits of this particular bill at this stage; that that should be done when the report comes from the private bills committee. What we are discussing now is the principle of divorce. I attempted to convey to the house yesterday the terrible extent to which the evil of divorce had been scattered throughout the Dominion, not only by the action of the provincial legislatures which created divorce courts, but by the actions of this parliament as well. But that is only a part of the harm which is being done. There are a number of people who do not dare to face public opinion in Canada by coming to parliament or to the provincial courts in order to obtain divorce, but who go beyond our borders and secure divorce elsewhere. I have under my hand the official statistics furnished by the Department of Trade and Commerce, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and I wish to read the following paragraph showing the extent to which divorce has spread in Canada. Last year 785 divorces were granted in Canada by the courts and the Dominion parliament. This is what the Dominion Bureau of Statistics says:

Divorces granted in the United States to persons married in Canada.

A fact which throws considerable new light on the divorce situation in Canada is found in the Marriage and Divorce Bulletin of the United States Bureau of the Census. The statistics of this publication indicate the surprisingly large extent to which divorces are granted in that country to persons married in Canada. Thus, in 1922, no fewer than 1,368 divorce decrees were granted to couples married in Canada, a number more than two and one-half times as large as the total number granted in Canada in the same year. This number also formed 36.2 per cent of the number of divorces granted in United States during the year to couples married in foreign countries, while, at the same time the percentage of the Canadian-born population to the total foreign-born amounted to only 8.1 per cent. The Bulletin goes on to say; "It is possible that many Canadians acquire a residence in the United States for the sole purpose of obtaining divorce because, in general, divorce laws are more liberal in the United States than in Canada." Of the 1,368 divorces granted in 1922 to couples who had been married in Canada, no fewer than 462 were granted by the courts of the state of Michigan, while 135 were granted by the courts of the state of Washington and 128 in California. No later figures than the above have been published in connection with the dissolution of marriages contracted outside the United States.

Those who read the Montreal papers may have noticed last week or the week before that a judge held that Canadians married in Canada cannot obtain a divorce in the United States and then come back to this country and imagine that their divorce is valid here. According to the findings of that judge people who are married in Canada can have their marriage annulled only in Canada if they intend to remain citizens of this country. We find ourselves in the position of having hundreds and, perhaps before long, thousands of Canadians who, not wishing to go through the very unpleasant ordeal of bringing up their cases before the senate or the provincial courts, go into a foreign country, secure a divorce there and return to Canada. The number of marriages being dissolved is such a serious matter that, to use a French expression, malgré nous, in spite of ourselves, we are obliged to deal with the problem of divorce. I hope the time will come when the public in Canada will realize the deplorable state of affairs and take some action in the matter. I have conscientious objections to divorce, but I hope the day is fast coming when members elected by the public will realize that the present state of affairs is beyond common sense and that means must be found to end it.

It has been said that the fathers of confederation did not impose divorce either on Ontario or on Quebec. There were originally four provinces in the confederation. Divorce existed in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick prior to confederation and, that being the case, they had to provide in the constitution for that condition. They put it under federal jurisdiction on the ground that the federal parliament would be more difficult of access and the procedure more costly, the result being that divorce would be discouraged. They were right at the time, because in the first ten years after confederation only seven divorces were granted, whereas we have reached 293 during the present session. Of course public opinion in Canada has somewhat changed in regard to this question. The official bulletin ascribes that to the war and the consequences of the war. That may be true, or it may not; but what is happening in Canada is happening unfortunately in all countries, and, while not wanting to make any criticism, I can only repeat and urge that the position we now occupy is a false one, because the hearing of these witnesses occurs in the senate, whereas the House of Commons as represented by its private bills committee does not see the witnesses or hear the evidence. There are now on the order paper forty-one divorce bills which stand for second reading and seventeen that have been read the first time at this sitting. Is this the way the parliament of Canada is going to act—

to dissolve seventy or seventy-five marriages in perhaps a few minutes, throw the children out on the street and give to the guilty party the same privilege that we give to the innocent party? Our sympathies naturally go with the innocent party, but by the second clause which we insert in the divorce bill we give the guilty party the right to marry again; the result of our judgment is inevitable.

Nobody objects to a judicial separation provided that it is properly carried out. That is the law we have in the province of Quebec under clause 185 of the code, and separations take place daily. Alimony is provided for the wife and proper care is taken of the children. But in this case nothing of the kind happens; we simply break the marriage tie and put the guilty party on the same footing as the innocent party. If we were to remove the second clause from these bills, that is the clause authorizing the people to re-marry, I do not think you would have ten per cent of the applications you have at the present time.

Therefore I can only repeat what I said yesterday, namely, that I am conscientiously opposed to divorce; I am opposed to it for the stronger reason now that it has become the greatest problem we have to deal with in this country. What will it be in five or ten years from now unless some means are devised to stop it? The only way we can stop it is to make it as difficult as possible to obtain divorce and, when it is granted, it should be granted in an equitable manner so that the innocent party will be treated differently from the guilty.

Mr. H. E. SPENCER (Battle River): I will take up only a moment of the time of the house in order to correct a statement made yesterday during a similar debate. The hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Bennett) was referring to the time of the house being taken up on these matters and stated that two members in this corner of the house, the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine), and myself, were members of the private bills committee. I denied the statement at the time, as I am not a member of that committee; but the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), seeing my name on the votes and proceedings, said that I was. The Hansard reporter did not catch my second denial, and so I take this opportunity of saying that, although my name appears in the votes and proceedings through a clerical error, it was intended to be that of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Spence). I am not a member of the private bills committee and therefore I have a perfect right to raise my voice in protest against or in support of any of these bills that come up in the house. I draw the attention of the house to that fact because, according to Hansard, page 1592, it looks very much as if I were a member of that committee.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Lawson) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Toronto-High Park),	Lang,
Anderson (Halton),	Lawson,
Arthurs,	Lovie,
Baldwin,	Lucas,
Bancroft,	Macdonald (Glengarry),
Barber,	MacLaren,
Bell (St. John-Albert),	MacLean (Prince),
Bennett,	McLean (Melfort),
Bird,	McGregor,
Blatchford,	McKenzie,
Bock,	McPhee,
Bothwell,	McPherson,
Bowen,	McQuarrie,
Bowman,	McRae,
Brown,	Matthews,
Cahan,	Maybee,
Cantley,	Millar,
Casselman,	Milne,
Cayley,	Neill,
Chaplin,	Peck,
Charters,	Pettit,
Dickie,	Plunkett,
Dunning,	Price,
Embury,	Ralston,
Euler,	Robb,
Fansher (Lambton East),	Ross (Kingston City),
Forke,	Ross (Moose Jaw),
Foster,	Rowe,
Fraser,	Ryerson,
Garland (Carleton),	Sanderson,
Geary,	Senn,
Gershaw,	Simpson,
Glen,	Sinclair (Wellington North),
Gray,	Speakman,
Guthrie,	Spence,
Hall,	Spotton,
Hanson,	Steedsman,
Harris,	Stevens,
Hay,	Stewart (Edmonton West),
Hepburn,	Stewart (Leeds),
Jelliff,	Stinson,
Jenkins,	Stirling,
Johnston (Long Lake),	Taylor,
Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria),	Telford,
Jones,	Thompson,
Kaiser,	Totzke,
Kennedy,	Tummon,
King (Kootenay East),	Vallance,
King, Mackenzie (Prince Albert),	White (London),
	Young (Weyburn).—99.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead,	Blanchard,
Beaubien,	Bouchard,
Benoit,	Boucher,
Bettez,	Bourassa,
Bissett,	Bourgeois,

Bradette,
Cahill,
Cardin,
Carmichael,
Casgrain,
Delisle,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Dionne,
Dubuc,
Fafard,
Fansher (Last Mountain),
Ferland,
Fiset (Sir Eugene),
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Gervais,
Girouard,
Guérin,
Howard,
Irvine,
Lacombe,
Laflamme,
Langlois,
Lapierre,
Letellier,
Luchkovich,
Marcil,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Mercier (St. Henri),
Morin (Bagot),
Motherwell,
Perras,
Prévost,
Rinfret,
Roberge,
Robitaille,
St-Père,
Séguin,
Spencer,
Tobin,
Veniot,
Woodsworth,
Young (Saskatoon).—56.

Mr. BALDWIN: I voted for the bill in error, Mr. Speaker. I desire to withdraw my vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: A vote once given cannot be withdrawn.

Mr. J. E. LAWSON (West York) moved that the bill be referred to the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—RURAL MAIL CONTRACTS

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Finance) that the house go into committee of supply and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Guthrie.

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is any more exacting responsibility in the public service of this Dominion than is involved in the carrying of His Majesty's mail, and I also doubt whether that responsibility is discharged under any greater handicap than obtains in the rural districts. As the mover of the amendment (Mr. Guthrie) has stated, the change proposed has to do not with a theory but with a recognized condition. The hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) has suggested that the amendment is prompted merely by political expediency. I submit, sir, it is quite apparent that the government of the day, while opposing the change now, will as a matter of political opportunism incorporate it in their preelection budget next session.

It does seem to me that throughout the various provinces it is recognized that this change should be made. It has been sponsored by those who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, and it should be adopted by those who sit to your right. Everyone familiar with rural conditions realizes the handicap under which the rural mail carriers serve the department. Those of us who travel the highways and byways of the Dominion recognize that the average rural mail carrier is not a very good advertisement for the Postmaster General's department. The rattle of his dilapidated buggy and the stagger of his poor lame and blind horse are familiar intimations that approaching you is the rural mail carrier, one of the servants of the Postmaster General.

I have had some experience in feeding cheap horses and also in feeding horses cheaply, and I am in a position to state that even for the figures quoted by the hon. member for South Wellington a horse cannot be maintained in reasonably fit condition for the mail carrying service. To show that the figures I am about to give the house are reasonable, I ask the indulgence of hon. members while I go into details. It has been admitted that a mail carrier needs two horses. I submit that $100 is a reasonable price per horse. That represents $200, the interest on which would be $12, at 6 per cent. The cost of feed, hay and oats at present prices, at the country point, would be $150 each, or $300 per annum. And then there is the depreciation in regard to each horse, because I submit that no horse can stand a rural mail service on rough country roads for a longer period than five years, so that depreciation can safely and sanely be estimated at $20 per horse, or $40 per annum for the two. As regards horse shoeing—and many times the horse would have to go unshod—I would estimate $25 each, or $50 per annum for the pair. Then interest, depreciation and repairs in connection with the vehicle, together with blankets and general equipment, would represent another $30. This brings the total to $432, as the minimum expenditure which the rural mail carrier in Canada must incur. Now if the first estimate which has been given of the amount the mail carrier receives—$720—is correct, it would leave him $290 or less than a dollar a day; while if the second estimate is correct—$800—he is left with $370 per annum or $1.25 per day. Perhaps those with large families receive the second rate, $800. I wish to point out that this is a ridiculous state of affairs in the public service of this Dominion. We have been told that the messengers in this house, who merely stand at attention and wait for someone to tell them what to do, receive $4 a day. Yet here are men who are obliged to drive up and down this country in all sorts of weather, on stormy days, every day of the week but Sunday,

travelling frequently through blizzards, over snowdrifts and through muddy roads. And this is the remuneration they get for loyal service to an important branch of the public service.

Not only are the rural mail carriers expecting relief in this matter, but they are entitled to it, and it seems to me that the people of Canada would approve of this increased expenditure especially in view of the fact that this government, though it preaches economy, is spending money to beautify this city and at the same time is increasing the salaries of deputy ministers, securing new automobiles—some members of the government take their cars with them wherever they go—and expending money in other directions. These are the apostles of economy, the friends of the poor man; yet they cannot pay a reasonable remuneration to men who are engaged in this important work and who are rendering just as loyal service as any other employees in the government. Surely it is high time that these rural mail carriers were given some consideration. It is not a joke or a gesture, as the hon. member for Quebec South has suggested. We are faced here with a very real problem. These men find themselves in a situation where it is impossible for them to keep their wives and families on the wages paid by the Postmaster General's department. For these reasons I submit that the motion proposed by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) is fully warranted, and I appeal to the government to consider the matter favourably and to give to the rural carriers their just recompense for the splendid service they are rendering the whole Dominion.

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): In rising to speak to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) I wish to refer to the first remark he made. He said that I had been notified of his intention to move this amendment. I received word of his intention at a quarter to three this afternoon, and in conversation with my assistant secretary, who got the word, I was told—I think that this perhaps was a misunderstanding—that the hon. member would deal with the question of railway mail clerks. Receiving that word at a quarter to three I immediately undertook to obtain all the information possible touching the situation and the salaries of railway mail clerks. I do not wish to offer as an excuse the short notice given with respect to this amendment; but I think that when an amendment of this importance is to come up, an amendment which involves if adopted an additional expenditure from the treasury of this Dominion of some $7,000,000 a year, a little more time by way of notice should be given to the person who has charge of the department which has to make the expenditure.

However, I have had an opportunity of listening to the speeches which have been made here this afternoon and evening, and while I am not going to say that our rural mail carriers are paid sufficient and might not be paid more, at the same time I wish to point out that the hon. member in proposing the amendment chose to deal only with rural mail deliverers, so to speak, because he directed his argument entirely to the 4,007 rural mail routes in Canada. He forgot altogether to deal with the six or seven thousand other mail carriers who do not deliver mail at rural boxes. If my hon. friend wanted to be fair—or whoever coached him and gave him the information on which he based his argument—he would not have overlooked that other class of hard working mail deliverers in Canada amounting to some 6,000.

Mr. ROWE: Who are they?

Mr. VENIOT: Exactly; I thought the question would be asked, and it shows that my hon. friend opposite does not know what he is talking about. There are 4,007 persons employed delivering mail on rural mail routes where there are boxes in which they can place the mail addressed to residents of those districts; and there are about 6,000 other mail contractors who use what we call the stage coach for delivery from post office to post office.

An hon. MEMBER: Who told you that?

Mr. VENIOT: My hon. friends opposite have not posted themselves on the subject, and undoubtedly they have ignored these people. Let me point out that these people draw from the treasury of the Dominion the nice little sum of $1,550,000 for that service. They are pretty well paid, and if the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment had added that sum to the amount that we paid to those who deliver mail in the boxes on the rural routes he would not have arrived at the average he gave in making his comparison with the amount paid by the United States government. He would have obtained a much higher average; he would have found that with this addition we are not so far behind the United States in this regard.

Let me give some figures in this connection. Rural mail delivery is the delivery of mail to boxes along the mail routes established throughout the Dominion of Canada. Of

these there are now 4,007, which number is increasing every year; I think 182 routes were added during the past year, and this service costs $2,825,317. If we were to pay a rate of $70 per mile, which hon. gentlemen say is the average paid under the monthly or yearly salaries in the United States, that would cost us $4,977,905. Stage services cost $1,550,000; under this new system which has been advocated they would cost $3,153,430. City services are on the same basis and include the delivery of mails from stations to post offices.

Mr. ARTHURS: That is done by your own department.

Mr. VENIOT: That is not done by the department; it is done under contract. That shows that the hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. We ask for tenders and contracts are given under those tenders. That service costs us $720,000; if it were carried on under the monthly salary advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite the cost would jump to $2,160,000. Then we have our side services from the railway stations to the post offices throughout the entire Dominion of Canada, and those services cost $1,050,000. If they were placed on the basis of a monthly or yearly salary that cost would increase to $3,150,000. In other words, under the basis advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite the cost for the services rendered in Canada would be $13,441,335 as against the present cost of $6,145,317, or a total increase of $7,296,018. These figures cannot be contradicted; they have been worked out to a nicety. Last year I made a similar statement with regard to the difference in cost, but at that time I did not give these details.

Then there is another feature in connection with this agitation; I think that word correctly describes it, although I do not wish to apply it to hon. gentlemen opposite. This agitation was started by a certain person in Canada who is making a living by going around and advocating the adoption in this country of the United States system. Now he is advocating that if this system be adopted it be made retroactive to 1917, and to show the folly of that argument let me point out that such action would mean an expenditure of $87,522,216. That is all that gentleman wants. This man is not even a mail carrier; he calls himself secretary of the mail contractors' or mail carriers' association of Canada. Everyone has heard him plead his case and everyone knows he is urging the mail carriers throughout Canada to carry on this agitation.

Let me point out that I have been considering this question since it was first brought to my attention, which I think was in the winter of 1928. Looking over the whole system as it exists in Canada to-day, Mr. Speaker, I believe hon. gentlemen will believe me when I say that this system cannot be reviewed in one or even two years. It will take time to attempt to work out something which will better these conditions, if they can be bettered, but let me say that Canada never can adopt the system in force in the United States, because of our sparsely settled districts. The United States, with the population much more concentrated, can do that which we could not undertake in Canada on the same basis. Let me go further: In attempting to make that review, at one time I did think it might be a good thing to try to arrange what might be called a minimum tender, after looking over the whole situation and getting all the information required. That would not do away with the tender system but it would provide that no tender below the minimum would be considered by the department. It may be said that now we can refuse a tender if we consider it to be too low, but that is not the case under the postal act, which provides that we must accept the lowest tender offered. Therefore, after reviewing the whole situation in order to see if a better system might be evolved, it may become necessary to ask for an amendment to the postal act, but I fear that if I should ask for that amendment immediately hon. gentlemen opposite would say that I wanted to play politics and handle the contracts for mail service as I saw fit. However, let me say to hon. gentlemen that if I am convinced that that is the proper method, no criticism from the opposition will deter me from doing what I think is right.

An hon. MEMBER: Whether right or wrong.

Mr. VENIOT: Certainly I would have very poor judgment if I could not distinguish right from wrong as well as my hon. friend. We are told that these men are not receiving an adequate return for their services, and we have been asked to compare what it costs these men to provide these services. A twenty-mile route has been taken as an example, with an average rate of $700. There are some routes in Canada twenty miles in length for which we pay as much as $1,000 a year.

An hon. MEMBER: Surely not.

Mr. VENIOT: There are several of those routes.

Mr. SPENCER: For how many deliveries each week?

Mr. VENIOT: Six times a week.

An hon. MEMBER: Where are those routes?

Mr. VENIOT: I could not give them from memory, but if the hon. gentleman would like the information I will secure it. There are other routes forty-five miles one way and forty-five miles the other, for which we pay as much as $5,000 a year.

An hon. MEMBER: Too much money.

Mr. VENIOT: Now we are coming down to what we might call brass tacks. These contracts are let under tender; and in addition there are rural routes which are only travelled three times a week. There are mail routes which handle the mail between railway stations and post offices two, three or four miles distant. Those are daily routes, and the carrier receives as high as $400 to $450 for the service. There are other routes of ten or fifteen miles, for which the carrier receives from $350 to $500. It takes only from three to four hours to cover that route, and the remainder of the time can be used as the carrier sees fit. The hon. gentleman should not forget that the mail contractors have the right to carry passengers and be paid for that transportation. This is the one fault I find with the system; many tenderers will tender low because they feel that they will be able to obtain a certain number of passengers during the year, and in that way they sometimes shut out what may be a more legitimate tender. The mail carriers are also permitted to carry parcels the same as an express company, and they are paid for that service. Provided they carry packages weighing more than fifteen pounds they do not infringe upon the regulations of the post office department, and they make considerable money from that service.

An hon. MEMBER: It is not a lot.

Mr. GRIMMER: Does that apply to the province of New Brunswick too?

Mr. VENIOT: It does.

Mr. GRIMMER: Can you give me an instance?

Mr. VENIOT: It is general all over Canada. The bus lines tender for the carriage of mail from post office to post office along their routes, and some of them carry from sixteen to eighteen passengers on the same trip with the mail.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: This motion does not involve that class of people; it is only the 4,007 rural mail carriers.

Mr. VENIOT: Why did you not include them? According to you, those poor fellows are receiving only starvation wages.

Mr. STEVENS: We will deal with them later.

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. gentleman had thought of it he certainly would have included that class.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Oh, no.

Mr. VENIOT: I have enlightened the hon. member and he is going to go one step farther. I welcome that other step. At least I have opened the eyes of our friends of the opposition.

An hon. MEMBER: No, no.

Mr. VENIOT: When the hon. gentleman compared the remuneration here with what is paid in the United States he forgot to deduct from the American figures the cost of the rigs and uniforms which those men must have according to the regulations. He forgot to deduct the amount of money which has to be paid each year into the insurance fund, and he forgot to say that the maintenance of the vehicles is much higher in the districts where the population is concentrated than it is in the country districts of the Dominion of Canada. We have heard a lot about the cost and upkeep of the horses and rigs, and the fact that the outfit is of no use when the contract is not renewed, but I would tell the hon. gentleman that ninety per cent of the rural mail contractors are farmers. The rigs that they use are farm rigs, and if they lose their contract at the end of four years those rigs go back to the farm and do the work they are ordinarily called upon to do in that connection.

The hon. gentleman says that there is general dissatisfaction among the mail contractors of the Dominion. Last year out of 494 mail contracts renewed without calling for tenders, only 4 per cent advised that they did not wish to continue with the contract because they considered the price was too low.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They are living in hope.

Mr. VENIOT: It seems very significant to me that our friends opposite have awakened all at once to the duty they owe the mail contractors of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: We have been pleading with you for three years.

Mr. VENIOT: They were in power from 1912 to 1921 but they did not discover that

the contractors for the mail routes in the Dominion of Canada were being so poorly paid. Now that they are in opposition, now that they feel it necessary to cater to this element, they are prepared to lay down a policy. That policy was not laid down at Winnipeg; I do not find it in the Winnipeg platform, and I am not as yet satisfied that the hon. leader of the opposition has consented to the statement made by his deskmate the hon. member for South Wellington.

Mr. BENNETT: You need have no doubt about that.

Mr. VENIOT: The policy of a party is generally laid down by the leader of the party and not by one of his lieutenants.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman need not have any doubt about that.

Mr. VENIOT: I see the hon. leader of the opposition is awakening now to the necessity of a new plank in the platform, and is supporting the policy put forth this afternoon by his first lieutenant.

I do not intend to devote any more time to this question, beyong stating—

An hon. MEMBER: It is not worth it.

Mr. VENIOT: It may not be worth it from the standpoint of the hon. member, but apparently it is worth it from the standpoint of the hon. leader of the opposition, in order that there may be a new plank in the platform.

An hon. MEMBER: There is going to be an election.

Mr. VENIOT: That is why you are putting in this plank, so you may be able to use it at the next election.

Mr. GARDINER: Is the hon. minister stating that there are 4,007 rural mail contractors receiving $2,825,317?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: Can the minister give the mileage covered by those contractors in the course of a year?

Mr. VENIOT: Surely the hon. member would not expect me to have that now.

Mr. GARDINER: I presume that is in the contract.

Mr. VENIOT: I could get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The average is 20 miles.

Mr. VENIOT: There is nothing in the department pertaining to post office matters which cannot be obtained.

Mr. ERNST: By a friend.

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. member desires me to do so, I will have the contracts gone over and I will produce the information this week.

I do not intend to deal with this matter at any greater length, beyond repeating what I said at the beginning. My attention was called to it in a casual way in 1928, and later on my attention was more closely drawn to it, I think towards the end of 1928. But from the spring of 1928 to the present time, some attention has been paid to the existing system, and we are reviewing the situation to see whether or not a more equitable system can be put into practice.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the hon. member means 1927, because he will remember that in 1928 we discussed the matter.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes; it was in 1927 that my attention was first drawn to it. I thank the hon. member for the correction. I feel that I have enough information now to warrant my saying that the application of the United States system in Canada is an impossibility. But I do not say that a better system than the one we have cannot be put into practice and it is with that end in view we are at present reviewing the situation.

Mr. M. J. MALONEY (South Renfrew): In addition to the matter covered by the amendment of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), which points out that the policy of the Post Office department under the present government is to grind down the contractors who are the mail carriers on the rural mail delivery routes, there is the question of the present uncertainty of the length of their service. I have good reasons for repeating a statement I made a year ago in connection with this matter. We had in the county of Renfrew a mail contractor who, prior to the election of 1926, had a contract with three and a half years to run. That contractor happened to be wise enough to support me in the election, and what was the result? Immediately afterwards a few of the Liberal supporters in that county brought the matter to the attention of the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) and the result was that a questionnaire was sent out to every house on the route asking if they had any complaints to make with regard to the contractor. The answers came back without one objection; they were entirely satisfied with the contractor; they said that he was giving excellent service, and they hoped that he might be permitted to continue in his contract. But within two weeks of the

report going in, the contract was cancelled and the service was again put up for tender. This is the case of a solemn contract entered into between a responsible minister of this government and a citizen of the land being openly violated, for what reason? Because the man happened to vote for a Conservative candidate in the election. Has it come to this in Canada, that in addition to these mail contractors being ground down as regards the rate of pay they receive, they are obliged to vote Liberal if they are to be allowed to continue in the service of the country? That is hardly fair to the mail carrier. I do not blame the Postmaster General for all this; there are others who are responsible in addition to him. He is not a bad man in many ways; but when he starts to explain to the house the tremendous expense involved in increasing the salaries of the rural mail carriers to the extent proposed by the hon. member for South Wellington, let me point this out to him: In the first place he advertises the Post Office department from one end of the country to the other as "service, not cost." This is a department looking for service, not for profit. When he tells us that at the present time the rural mail carriers are drawing from the government $2,800,000 odd and that an increase in accordance with the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Wellington would mean $4,977,000 odd; if he is anxious to make up the difference, let him not be afraid. All he has to do is to intercede with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to abandon his foolish project of pulling down the best part of the city of Ottawa and, instead, to hand the money over to the rural mail contractors.

Mr. VENIOT: Will the hon. member give me the name of the contractor?

Mr. MALONEY: Does the minister want it now?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, or at any other time.

Mr. MALONEY: The man's name is Bernard Hartney and the rural route is No. 4, Eganville.

Mr. VENIOT: There are always two sides to a story and I will endeavour to tell the other one.

Mr. A. E. MacLEAN (Prince): No doubt the question before the house is quite an important one, and no doubt also it is quite ingenious on the part of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) to make this motion at the present time. We cannot, however, help noticing that the amendment he has moved is rather contradictory, because in one breath he moves to cut out all further proposals in the estimates and to do away with all appropriations, and in the next he calls for an additional expenditure by the government of some one or two million dollars. No one knows better than the hon. member himself that this cannot be done. No one knows better than the hon. member that by moving his resolution, he cannot bring any relief to the rural mail carriers of Canada. I will deal with his resolution later.

There is a great deal of merit in what he has stated regarding the pay that the rural mail carriers are receiving, and I do not think he has overstated the case. In many cases the rural mail carriers are underpaid, and I am glad to hear from the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) that he has been giving the matter consideration and that he intends to endeavour to arrive at some rate or some minimum salary that will meet the situation in some way. But at the present time he is prevented under the act from doing so, and as we all know, the contracts can be renewed to the present carriers only at the existing rate of pay. It is also quite true that when tenders are invited, a large number of tenders are sent in and in many cases the present carriers ask that their contracts be renewed at the same rate and that the route be not put up for tender. I cannot quite agree with the argument that is sometimes advanced that this shows that the men are satisfied. On the contrary, I think it is quite true they are afraid that if they do not accept the contract at existing rates, they will lose the contract and that it will go to someone else. Therefore, rather than lose it, they are willing to enter into a new one at the same rate of pay. In the notice that is sent out there is a provision which reads:

> In this connection, I might remind you that while the Post Office Act empowers the Postmaster General to renew existing contracts for further terms, such renewals can be executed only on existing terms and conditions.

Until the act is amended it is impossible for the Postmaster General to enter into any sort of arrangement other than is provided for in the act.

The hon. member for South Wellington said this afternoon that the amounts of the tenders are gradually going down, that the rate of pay to the mail couriers is constantly decreasing. I do not know whether or not the facts bear out that statement. My own information is that in a great many cases, and I think this is generally true, the drivers on these routes are receiving a higher rate of pay at the present time than formerly, and that so far from the average rate of pay getting lower, it is yearly becoming a little better.

The hon. member for South Wellington also said that the whole tender system is wrong, and he advocated that we adopt a new system and put the whole rural mail service under the Civil Service Commission. As has been pointed out by some other speakers, this would not do away altogether with competition. Under the Civil Service Commission at the present time there is competition, not in respect of price but in respect of qualifications. I think the point brought out by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) this afternoon in that connection is very important. He pointed out that if this proposed change was adopted it would not mean that all the present couriers throughout the Dominion would be blanketed into the service under the Civil Service Commission and retain their positions. I know that our friends opposite would be only too glad to demand that every mail courier throughout this Dominion immediately throw up his job, and that all these positions be advertised by the Civil Service Commission. We know what the result would be. We know that competitive examinations would be held and a great many of the present couriers would lose their jobs, which would go to people now outside the service, and so the relief which my hon. friend seeks to bring to the mail couriers could not be given under the change he proposes.

I would point out that the mail couriers are not the only ones in the government employ who, to my mind, are not receiving adequate pay. We have lighthouse keepers throughout this Dominion. Their positions are under the Civil Service Commission. Now if there is any class of people in the government service throughout this Dominion who serve long hours in very lonely out-of-the-way parts of the country, it is the lighthouse keepers, but in a great many cases they receive very small remuneration. I have a letter here which I would like to put on Hansard with reference to the salary of a lighthouse keeper, and I am quoting this to make a comparison with the remuneration of the mail couriers. The letter is as follows::

> I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th ultimo with respect to the salary paid for the keepership of the North Point light, Tignish.

Mr. SHORT: I object to the hon. gentleman bringing the lighthouse service into this discussion on the rural mail delivery service. He can bring up the lighthouse service when the estimates of the Marine and Fisheries department are under consideration. What has the lighthouse service to do with the rural mail service?

Mr. McLEAN (Prince): My hon. friend is not living up to his name. His name is Short, but on interruptions he is long. I am speaking to the amendment which has been moved to the motion to go into supply, and it is quite relevant to the question before the house to make a comparison of the salaries paid in different branches of the public service. But if my hon. friend wants to make another speech, I will give him the floor.

Mr. SHORT: I have not spoken on this matter as yet. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it is in order for the hon. member to bring in the lighthouse service when the question before us is the rural mail delivery service.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman's remarks should be relevant to the subject matter of the motion before the house.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I think a comparison of salaries is quite relevant to the motion before the house.

Mr. BENNETT: But not the letter.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): I can state the case without reading the letter, if the hon. leader of the opposition objects to that. The salary this lighthouse keeper receives is $480, for a yearly service. There are a great many cases where these positions are advertised, and when a vacancy is advertised there is always a large number of applications. I have in mind a case where a position was advertised at Summerside in my province. The man was acting as temporary lightkeeper and was giving splendid service; he was quite able to carry out his duties. But the position was advertised by the Civil Service Commission, and he had to step out and someone else came in. A returned soldier got the preference. We have no objection to that, of course. I am simply pointing out what would happen if all the positions in the rural mail delivery service were advertised by the Civil Service Commission.

I know our friends opposite wish to make some political capital out of this question. I do not blame them for that because that is their privilege. But the hon. member who moved the amendment knows perfectly well that he can bring no relief to the mail couriers under his motion. He knows that the motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) for the house to go into committee of supply was made in order that we might discuss and vote on the appropriations of moneys that are required for carrying on the public service of the country, and he knows perfectly well that his amendment to that motion is simply holding up the house from going into supply and voting the money that is required

to carry on the country's business. It is a want of confidence motion, and I do not propose to be put in the position of not explaining my position clearly on this matter.

In our province we have in our rural service as fine a class of drivers as can be found anywhere in this Dominion, and they give us splendid service. It may be a surprise to my hon. friends to know that right in my home district where I have lived the best part of my life one of the first rural mail routes in the whole Dominion was established, and now the system has spread throughout the whole province so that to-day there is not one part of the province that is not served by rural mail delivery. We have a splendid service and as fine a class of men as can be found anywhere, and we would be only too glad to see them get an increase in salary if that is possible. But I shall be compelled to vote against the amendment—for what reason? Because it is a want of confidence motion, and it cannot bring the relief which my hon. friend from South Wellington would like to lead the country to believe he desires to bring to the mail couriers under his motion. I therefore propose to vote against his amendment and to support the motion of the Minister of Finance that the house go into committee of supply and vote the money to carry on the public services of this country.

Mr. GEORGE SPOTTON (North Huron): I was not in the house when the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) made his address this afternoon, but after listening to the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) I have sent over for the amendment, and I think the Postmaster General has not stuck to the text. The amendment reads:

> In the opinion of this house the present system of awarding contracts for the delivery of rural mail by tender has proved unfair, burdensome and unsatisfactory, and that such rural mail carriers should be appointed by the Civil Service Commission upon a permanent basis with a definite rate of pay, based upon mileage and the physical conditions of the territory involved, having regard to the amount paid to the other servants of the government for similar employment.

Now, I can scarcely be accused of being a recent convert to this proposed change, because the first time that I addressed this house I did what I could to bring to the attention of hon. members the unfair condition under which the rural mail carriers were working and the inadequate remuneration they were receiving. I think the Postmaster General is evading the question in asking why did not the previous government take care of this matter between 1911 and 1921. The Postmaster General was no doubt in this country during that time, and he must not forget that the war was followed by a very trying period of reorganization and rehabilitation. I do not think any unfair advantage was taken of him, because he had been having interviews from time to time with the Rural Mail Carriers Association. And, Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why the rural mail carriers of this country should not be free to band together in an association as well as any other class of people in this Dominion. I know not why the Postmaster General spoke so unkindly of this association last session. It is a real association; it is not like the Consumers League in which the word "consumer's" should be spelled with possessive singular. Simply because the preceding government did not remedy this unsatisfactory condition of affairs is no reason why we on this side of the house should not advocate remedial action on the part of the government. The preceding government was tried by the electorate and in their opinion, found wanting, and discarded. In the very near future this government is going to be tried by the electorate, and already we can hear a "sound of going" in the tops of the mulberry trees. I suppose the Postmaster General might have his chauffeur drive him out into the country in his $8,000 Stutz car to meet the mail carriers and tell them they are prosperous.

I was very much impressed by the remarks of the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe). I am a little hard of hearing, but as I drive about the country I can always distinguish the rattle of the mail carrier's buggy. I see no reason why the rural mail carriers should be the only men in the service of the Post Office department to be stood up every four years and shot at. I believe the Deputy Postmaster General has had his salary raised by two thousand dollars during the past year. and yet when we ask for a modest increase and a permanency of employment with a few holidays for these men who go over the country roads in all weathers the Postmaster General turns a deaf ear to our request. But I am glad to see he is in a little more conciliatory mood this year than last. Perhaps he has been advised that the time is coming when the Prime Minister will be again reforming the senate and lowering the cost of living and the price of farm implements, and on that occasion no doubt the Postmaster General will be holding out to these mail carriers the bait of fair remuneration.

I should like the Postmaster General to make this clear. I understood him to say that at the expiration of their contract letters

are sent to all rural mail carriers asking if they are prepared to carry on for another four years at the same rate. If that is not correct will he kindly state with what particular ones does he communicate?

An hon. MEMBER: The favoured few.

Mr. SPOTTON: Are letters written to all of them or only to certain ones?

Mr. VENIOT: We generally like to renew the contracts of those against whom there are no complaints and whose official records show they are giving good service.

Mr. BENNETT: Political considerations govern.

Mr. VENIOT: No. If political considerations governed I would have had to deal with Conservatives, because until the last four or five years nearly every mail contractor was a Conservative.

Mr. BENNETT: That was before 1921.

Mr. SPOTTON: I am not yet clear as to the number and type of rural mail carriers to whom the Postmaster General writes asking if they are prepared to carry on.

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot help you then.

Mr. SPOTTON: I accept the Postmaster General's word for the moment that only those against whom there has been no complaint as to their service—not their politics—are asked if they wish to carry on. I can name him a mail carrier in my riding with fifteen years' public service, against whom there was not a breath of complaint, but who was put up, his route advertised, and when the old and faithful servant and a new man tendered at the same figure, the Postmaster General's department wrote the defeated Liberal candidate asking who should get this contract, the old faithful servant or the new man. I think the Postmaster General has in mind the route in question.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, I know the circumstances and will deal with the case when the time comes.

Mr. SPOTTON: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to labour this question, having dealt with it rather fully last session. I feel that the rural mail carrier is entitled to a fair wage, to some guarantee of permanency of position, to holidays like any other civil servant, and to be treated as a human being. It seems to me that this is the only branch of his department where the Postmaster General can take a good fling at political patronage and declare "to the victor belongs the spoils." It has become an obsession with him, a plaything, and it would be unkind to deny him the little pleasure that this activity affords him.

As a basis of comparison let me take the letter carriers of the city of Toronto—and they are not overpaid. They get $1,440, or thereabouts, a year delivering mail from house to house; their position is permanent; they are cared for if they lose their health in the service, and presumably they are entitled to a retiring allowance. At any rate, these men, with no more intelligence, no more capability and no better type of citizens than the rural mail carriers, get $1,440 a year to walk for a few hours twice a day over their routes, and then they are free to go back home; whereas the poor rural mail carrier has to cover up to 32 miles over the snow banks in the winter and through the mud roads in the spring and fall, keep up two horses—all for $590 a year on an average. Taking the Postmaster General's own figures, the average is even lower—only $500 a year.

I fail to understand why he should attempt to draw a red herring across the track by talking about bus and stage coach service. This amendment has to do definitely and clearly with the rural mail carrier. It may be, as the Postmaster General would say if he were speaking in another province, that this is another of "those fanatics from Ontario" who object to "G.R." being taken off the mail wagons. It is most unfair to say that the rural mail carrier makes any money carrying passengers. In my constituency I do not think there is a single rural mail carrier who makes $5 a year in this way. The average rural mail carrier goes down the concession and back, and he will give any man a free ride, even though this government has him working at a starvation wage. Let me give the Postmaster General an instance. And remember I have a great deal of appreciation for the Postmaster General in many respects. He has shown a broad sympathy and human kindness in many little matters in my constituency which I have brought to his notice. But I think he can hardly be cognizant of this. In the village of Auburn the post office was moved down the street 39 rods, which shortened the mail carrier's route by twice 39 rods, and the Postmaster General sent down a high paid inspector, getting perhaps $10 a day with travelling expenses, to measure that distance of 39 rods, and he docked that rural mail carrier $10.48 per annum for the rest of his term. That surely is proving that he is a friend of the working man in this country.

To give consideration to this question at this late date is not offering much consolation to those men who are doing the hardest work in the Postmaster General's department and getting the least pay. The Postmaster General will say, "Why, it is let by contract". Well, you know, a man gets settled down in one walk of life and he is afraid to get out of that groove lest he may not make a success of anything else; and if the Postmaster General's position were advertised to-night he would take a few thousands less in order to retain it.

Mr. VENIOT: I think it is worth a great deal more when I have to listen to such criticism as that.

Mr. SPOTTON: Perhaps the truth hurts But let me tell the Postmaster General that he will continue to hear about it until this wrong is righted. So long as the poorest paid men do the hardest work in his department, receiving the least consideration, he is going to hear about the matter, and we are going to try to have him place the situation fairly before the house and not sidestep it by quoting bus line and stage coaches when he should be sticking to the plain rural mail carriers. The Postmaster General has not said that he would not accept his position at a few thousands less. Now a man has a rural mail contract and he is growing old He gave up his farm—and there are very few farmers in my constituency, not one out of ten, who carry mail. These rural mail carriers work steadily day by day. There is little else they can turn their hands to. And when their four years are up they may not be the ones to whom a letter is written—they may be of the wrong political stripe—asking them if they will carry on. The complaint has been registered that they voted U.F.O. in the last election and therefore they are put up at auction. The mail carrier is afraid he will lose his job. He has his horses and his rig and therefore he says, "I will tender a little less". If he is still able to exist, when the next four years expire he will tender again a little less. So that, as the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Ross) said last year, the Postmaster General will soon be getting this work done for practically nothing.

I would ask the Postmaster General to give one sane reason why these men in his service should be the only men who are made political toys of. Is there any reason? I have heard the Postmaster General say that Canada has not lost one dollar through rural mail carriers, that they are honest, that they are efficient. And it is the only branch of his department of which he can so speak. Yet this is the way he proposes to reward honesty and efficiency. I know he has a particular grudge against a gentleman who went about striving to organize the rural mail carriers, a gentleman named McKinnon. The Postmaster General did not like it. He apparently thinks that the rural mail carriers did not know they were working too cheaply until Mr. McKinnon got a soap box and started a riot.

I wish once more to appeal to the Postmaster General to consider sane legislation in this matter, and to have the thoughts which he has in mind crystallized into legislation at least by next session so that these gentlemen can receive a fair wage according to the work that they are doing, instead of having ignominy cast upon them. Do not let the Postmaster General say to them, "You are the only gentlemen in my service who are not to receive the same treatment as others." I invite the Postmaster General now to come up to my constituency in his private car and send ahead his eight thousand dollar Stutz car, with chauffeur, and tell the people of that constituency that rural mail carriers or anybody else there are prosperous.

In closing I wish to say this. I feel that it is a blot on the fair name of Canada that we should meet many of the men carrying His Majesty's mail with the outfit they have. Last year I read in this house an account of a case in the city of Stratford where a rural mail carrier was taken before the court by the humane society for driving a horse which should not be driven. When Magistrate Makins learned that the Postmaster General was giving this man $1.75 a day to support that horse and rig and to maintain a family of five he dismissed the action. The same thing has occurred also in the vicinity of London.

Mr. VENIOT: Was not the party brought before the court, Fred Sitwell?

Mr. SPOTTON: I do not know the name of the mail contractor. I read about the case in the Daily Beacon and I wrote to the magistrate to find out whether the newspaper clipping was correct and he sent me a letter enclosing the clipping and saying, "yes, it was absolutely correct."

Mr. VENIOT: The man brought before the court was not the mail contractor but the brother of the mail contractor who sold the contract to him at $100 less than what he was getting from the government.

Mr. SPOTTON: Does the Postmaster General mean to tell this house that these contracts are sold from one man to another?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, we discovered that this man was doing it.

Mr. SPOTTON: And the Postmaster General is telling the house that he permits a mail contractor—

Mr. VENIOT: No, I did not say that.

Mr. SPOTTON: —to sell a contract—

Mr. VENIOT: Not at all. When we discovered it we cancelled the contract.

Mr. SPOTTON: And I suppose the Postmaster General discovered it when it was brought to his attention in this house; therefore that is one reason he does not like to listen to matters of this kind. Now I am not suggesting that the Postmaster General should put into effect what the mail carriers' association ask; I am not suggesting that he could put into legislation that which obtains on the other side. The rural mail carriers' association may be asking too much. But I want the rural mail carriers in my riding to know that the Postmaster General treats this matter in a very light vein—and it is no joke to those who are not properly provided for.

Mr. VENIOT: I am amused at the statement you made.

Mr. SPOTTON: I am not suggesting that he can put into effect what is now the law in the United States; I am not suggesting that he can give at once what the rural mail carriers' association are asking. It may be too much for the present. But I plead with him to grant some relief, to give some financial assistance to these men, and to make their positions secure. Their positions then will become permanent, and they will be able to give better service to the country. I wish the Postmaster General would take a look at the little covered wagon used by a rural mail carrier and then tell me what use could be made of it on a farm, unless the farmer has a milk route of about fifteen or twenty customers.

Mr. R. H. JENKINS (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I desire to add a few words to this discussion. In the first place let me say that I am entirely in sympathy with the great majority of the rural mail carriers throughout Canada who are asking for an improvement in their conditions, but I do not intend to be led astray by this plan of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), which is designed to embarrass me as well as many other supporters of the government.

If, as the hon. member suggests, these appointments should be under the Civil Service Commission, I must remember that a large number of the men at present employed in this work in my constituency would be out of a job. I understand that the age limit for applicants for civil service positions is thirty-five years, and this would shut out many of my friends.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why could we not change that section of the Civil Service Act? That could be done in five minutes.

Mr. JENKINS: It would be some job. Then, as the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) has so well stated in his inimitable way, perhaps many of them would not be able to answer satisfactorily the exacting questions which might be put by the examiners. A number of men possibly not so well qualified as others in an educational way would be quite capable of giving good service in this particular work. Other qualifications also are taken into account, and some older men who perhaps were not physically fit to serve in the war would be shut out.

No well-defined plan has been outlined by hon. gentlemen opposite for looking after the present incumbents of these positions, and therefore I think this proposed amendment is only an effort to embarrass the government. As I have already stated, these rural mail carriers give excellent service for small remuneration. Not long ago a large number of these men and women, because in our province I think some women carry on this work, met at Charlottetown and placed their case before me. I promised to lay their representations before the government, and my colleague (Mr. Sinclair, Queens), the hon. member for Prince (Mr. MacLean) and myself have stated the case to the Postmaster General. It deserves serious consideration, and I am of the opinion that the government will be well advised to endeavour in some way to alleviate the difficulties under which many of these men labour. But, Mr. Speaker, to vote this government out of office and replace it with another in order to attain this end is, in my opinion, no solution of the difficulty.

I will tell my hon. friends and my supporters in the constituency which I have the honour to represent that I will support any reasonable measure intended to better the conditions of the rural mail carriers in Canada, but I prefer to have that matter attended to by the party to which I belong rather than by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Toronto Northwest): Mr. Speaker, the post office is a public utility, and no public utility in Canada should use its employees in the way the government uses these rural mail carriers. Where is the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan); what has he to say about this? According to a table appearing on page 12 of the report of the Post Office department this service was operated at a loss from 1868 to 1901; from then on, with the exception of a few years, it has shown a surplus. Last year the net revenue amounted to $30,529,-154.76; the expenditure was $32,379,195.65, leaving a deficit of $1,850,040.89. Let us see how the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) uses some of the big fellows in this country; the present government hand the newspaper industry of this country a straight cash subsidy of about $8,000,000 a year. That is computed as the difference between the actual cost to the Post Office department of carrying the newspapers and what they receive for this work.

It is not creditable to the government to use the low-paid employees of this department in this way. Twenty-five years ago the section men on the railway were similarly treated; they were not permitted to join a union, but finally the railways had to give in. The railway men have just as much right to form themselves into a railway union as hon. members of this house have to form themselves into a lawyers' union or a doctors' union. The Bell Telephone Company could not treat its employees in this way; the employees of the Department of Agriculture could not be treated in this way; the Hydro-Electric people could not treat their men like this, so why should the government do so? While all this is going on the Minister of Labour is going up and down the country saying that this government is a friend of labour. I think we should have a committee to inquire into the Post Office department and change the system from top to bottom. I believe if there were a redistribution of the rates on package mail and on goods sent from the large mail order houses, who could well afford to pay a higher rate, the additional revenue would enable the government to pay these rural mail carriers a larger wage.

I take issue with the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Spotton) when he speaks of the city of Toronto. That city pays about $7,000,000, or a quarter of the total cash revenue obtained by the Post Office department, but we cannot get a new post office there. In many places throughout Canada where the revenue is only $100, $200, $400, $1,000 or $2,000, new post offices are built costing $8,000 or $10,000; no doubt this is a good way to provide work for the boys in the rural constituencies. I think the time has come when this great public utility should be placed on a real business basis with an injection of a little of the human element. The low-paid men in the department are not receiving very much more now than they received in 1780 and 1790. Cowper's Task in that part called the Winter Evening, alludes to the low pay of rural mail delivery men in 1780 and 1790 when they received ten cents a day, and conditions have not improved much even in Canada since that time. The contract system has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. There is a lack of efficiency about it, and the maintenance of such a system in the future would not be in the interests of the country. These men should be put on the same basis as the employees of the Canadian National Railway.

The post office is one of the most important government services we have in Canada, and the postal workers deserve better treatment than they are receiving at the present time. I was surprised to hear the Postmaster General who is generally a good friend to many of the branches of the department, referring to the rural mail carriers as "that element". I believe that all services should be on an equal basis and whether a man is sweeping the street, driving a tramcar or delivering rural mail, he is performing a service which is just as important as being the Prime Minister or the Postmaster General of this country. The other night the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) referred to the gentlemen who sit on the back rows of benches as the "back-benchers". It seems to be popular to coin catch phrases, but let me say that the branch of the public service which has been referred to as "that element" is doing as efficient a public service as is the Postmaster General and his deputy.

The large cities of Canada are contributing the most of the revenue to the Post Office department, but they receive very little of the returns. The postal workers in the city of Toronto are very poorly paid. The postmaster of that city, in which the post office has a yearly turnover of almost $7,000,000, only receives $5,000 per year. There should be a committee of the house appointed to go into these matters to see if we could not find a policy, as suggested by the amendment of the hon. member for South Wellington, which would bring about an improvement in the most important public service in Canada.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Guthrie) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Arthurs,
Barber,
Bell (Hamilton West),
Bell (St. Antoine),
Bennett,
Black (Halifax),
Bowen,
Boys,
Brady,
Cantley,
Casselman,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Church,
Clark,
Cowan,
Dickie,
Edwards (Waterloo South),
Embury,
Ernst,
Esling,
Fraser,
Gardiner,
Geary,
Guthrie,
Harris,
Heaps,
Hubbs,
Irvine,
Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria),
Jones,
Kaiser,
Kennedy,
Luchkovich,
MacDonald (Cape Breton South),
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdougall,
MacLaren,
Macphail (Miss),
McGregor,
McQuarrie,
McRae,
Maloney,
Manion,
Matthews,
Maybee,
Peck,
Plunkett,
Price,
Quinn,
Rennie,
Ross (Kingston City),
Ryerson,
Senn,
Short,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Wellington North),
Smith (Cumberland),
Speakman,
Spence,
Spencer,
Spotton,
Stevens,
Stewart (Leeds),
Stinson,
Stirling,
Thompson,
Tummon,
White (London),
Woodsworth.—70.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead,
Allan,
Baldwin,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Benoit,
Bettez,
Bissett,
Blanchard,
Blatchford,
Bock,
Bothwell,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Boulanger,
Bourassa,
Bourgeois,
Bradette,
Brown,
Cahill,
Cardin,
Carmichael,
Casgrain,
Delisle,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Dionne,
Donnelly,
Dubuc,
Duff,
Dunning,
Elliott,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fansher (Last Mountain),
Fansher (Lambton East),
Ferland,
Fiset (Sir Eugene),
Forke,
Foster,
Gershaw,
Gervais,
Girouard,
Glen,
Guérin,
Hall,
Hay,
Hepburn,
Howard,
Jacobs,
Jelliff,
Johnston (Long Lake),
King (Kootenay East),
King, Mackenzie (Prince Albert),
Lacombe,
Laflamme,
Langlois,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Letellier,
Lovie,
Macdonald (Glengarry),
MacLean (Prince),
McLean (Melfort),
McDiarmid,
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McMillan,
McPhee,
Malcolm,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Mercier (St. Henri),
Millar,
Milne,
Morin (Bagot),
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Neill,
Parent,
Perras,
Power,
Prévost,
Ralston,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robitaille,
Ross (Moose Jaw),
St-Père,
Sanderson,
Séguin,
Sinclair (Queens),
Steedsman,
Stewart (Edmonton West),
Sylvestre,
Taylor,
Telford,
Thorson,
Tobin,
Totzke,
Vallance,
Verville,
Ward,
Young (Weyburn).—106.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Rutherford,
Rinfret,
Young (Saskatoon),
Veniot,
Bowman,
Raymond,
Chevrier,
Boivin,
Howden,
Cannon,
Lacroix,
Kay,
Heenan,
Gray,
Marcil,
Lanctôt,
Edwards (Ottawa),
Fontaine,
Morin (St. Hyacinthe),
Pouliot,
Lang,
Odette,
Dussault,
Ilsley,
Cayley,
Smith (Stormont),
McPherson,
Gott,
Cahan,
McGibbon,
Hanson,
Hodgins,
Bell (St. Antoine),
Anderson (Toronto),
Hocken,
Macdonald (Richmond),
Edwards (Frontenac),
Rowe,
Wilson,
Black (Yukon),
Lawson,
Perley,
White (Mount Royal),
Garland (Carleton),
Anderson (Halton),
Ryckman,
Lennox,
Young (Toronto),
Robinson,
Cotnam,
MacNutt,
Smoke,
Pettit,
Ladner.

Mr. GOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kent, Ont., (Mr. Rutherford). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine): I was paired with the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Raymond). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. CANNON: I was paired with the hon. member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. Edwards). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Morin). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. RINFRET: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. ROWE: I was paired with the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Lacroix). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON (Toronto): I was paired with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. VENIOT: I was paired with the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I was paired with the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Howden). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. KAY: I was paired with the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Wilson). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. LAWSON: I was paired with the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Gray). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. HEENAN: I was paired with the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Black). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I was paired with the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. McGibbon). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BOIVIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto West Centre (Mr. Hocken). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Motion (Mr. Robb) agreed to and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

[Mr. L. G. Bell.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Salaries and allowances	$17,295,464 40
Mail service including mail service by air	16,305,000 00
Miscellaneous, including Lucien Pacaud, Secretary of the High Commissioner's office, as the representative of the Canadian government on the Pacific Cable Board, at $1,500; and $5,000 for the payment of compassionate allowances to employees injured while in the performance of their duties, or to dependents of employees killed while on duty, such payments to be made only on the specific authority of the governor in council	1,176,175 00
Yukon Territory	150,000 00
	$34,926,639 40

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Would the Postmaster General give the committee a general statement as to the air mail service?

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): Does the hon. gentleman wish the statement for the whole of Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: Last year we had an air mail service between Rimouski and Montreal, Montreal and Ottawa, and Ottawa and Toronto. That was twice a week to meet the incoming and outgoing British mail steamers. That continued during the season of navigation. During the winter time, after the close of navigation, we had an air mail service between Mal Bay, Seven Islands and Anticosti island. That is a weekly service. After the close of navigation we also had an air mail service between Moncton and the Magdalen islands. That service was begun a little later last winter than the winter before, but we carried it on until the opening of navigation or until such time as landing on the ice at the Magdalens became dangerous. I think we made seven or eight weekly trips. For a time we had an air mail service between Moncton and Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. The ferry boat had been laid up on account of an accident and we could not get the mails in on the regular time, so the service was put on during that period. We also had a temporary mail service lasting about seven weeks between Ottawa and Montreal, Montreal and St. John, and St. John and Halifax. This was tried out with the object of establishing later on a regular route between Montreal and the maritime provinces. We also had an air mail service for ten days before Christmas and up to New Years between the principal points in the three western provinces, with Winnipeg

as the starting point. That was done with the object of ascertaining the feasibility of establishing this year an air mail service route in the three western provinces.

Mr. BENNETT: There was no air mail service from the east to Winnipeg?

Mr. VENIOT: No. Hon. gentlemen will see that there is in the estimates an amount of $880,000. We intend establishing an air mail route from Toronto to Buffalo, connecting up at Windsor with the American lines and following those lines until we get to a point where we can join in again with our system at Winnipeg, and from Winnipeg continue the service over the three prairie provinces. The actual routes in the three prairie provinces have not yet been definitely determined, but one thing we are prepared to say, and that is that we will accommodate the larger cities and towns in those three provinces.

So far as an air mail service to the coast is concerned, I do not contemplate establishing any route this year because the surveys which the National Defence department have in hand for us have not yet been completed. When we intimate that we desire to establish an air mail service, the Department of National Defence undertake to have the route surveyed by their experts and to report to us on its feasibility. Part of that survey has been completed, and the remainder I hope will be done this year, so that we shall then be in a position to say when and how we may reach the Pacific coast.

We had other air mail services during the winter. We had a service from the head of steel out of Edmonton about 432 miles, up the Mackenzie river for some 700 miles. The people along that route used to receive their mail once during the winter, but with the service we gave them they received their mail pretty nearly once a week. We also had a service to the Flin-Flon area, to Cold lake. To-day our mail contractors in the Yukon have permission to use aeroplanes for the purpose of carrying out their contracts.

Mr. BENNETT: Is there an air mail service to the Yukon?

Mr. VENIOT: The contractors in the Yukon have permission to use aeroplanes if they so desire. We have other air mail services, but not directly under the control of the department. For instance, a company developing some part of the country will ask permission to carry mail, and we give them permission to use what is called the sticker system; that is, they would carry the mail, protecting it by the sticker system, and they could charge to those who wished to send their mail in that way a certain fee. We regulated the fee. In some cases it was 10 cents per ounce, and the highest charge was 20 cents per ounce. That, Mr. Chairman, is a rough outline of what we are doing and what we are hoping to do this year in the air mail service.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I notice in the press that in all probability the air mail service between Montreal and Toronto will be discontinued. Is the department considering that?

Mr. VENIOT: Not "in all probability." I made the statement myself that if the business men and commercial houses and those engaged in industry did not sufficiently appreciate what the department was doing as a convenience to them and as an extension of our mail system to patronize the service as it should be patronized, I did not intend to run it for the health of the department. I felt that cities like Toronto and Montreal having that service should appreciate it to the extent that we would at least meet expenses. The matter rests there.

Mr. HEAPS: In this vote, Mr. Chairman, there are four separate items, and I suggest that each item be taken up separately because each is a separate item in itself. The first deals with salaries and allowances, and I suggest that this be taken up so that we may consider the salaries of the postal employees.

Mr. VENIOT: I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN: The first item reads:

Salaries and allowances, $17,295,464.40.

Mr. RYERSON: With reference to the proposed air mail route between Toronto and Windsor, is it the intention to make intermediate stops between those two cities?

Mr. VENIOT: I forgot to mention this point in connection with the air mail service. We are being asked daily if we will stop at this or that point, at this town or that. The main point to be considered in flying is the starting and landing places, and we will not stop at any place that will not provide a landing. The department is not providing landings. We cannot take chances of giving communication by air mail to places that will not provide a safe landing. We do not judge that for ourselves; it is done by the experts of the national defence department, but I may say that there are places between Toronto and Windsor that have good landing places and where we certainly will stop.

Mr. RYERSON: In the event of some of the cities between Windsor and Toronto providing proper landing places, will they be stopping places for the air mail service?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. RYERSON: Would they stop at Bradford?

Mr. VENIOT: We will stop at any place between Toronto and Windsor that will give us a proper landing.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, April 17, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

First and second reports of the select standing committee on railways and shipping.—Sir Eugene Fiset.

Fifth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.—Mr. Parent.

Fifth report of the select standing committee on banking and commerce.—Mr. Hay.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURES

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, when the house was in committee of ways and means last Friday certain correspondence was tabled between the Minister of Finance and certain automobile manufacturers in Canada. My attention was directed to the omission of replies from some of the manufacturers, and particularly the reply from the president of the Automotive Association. That gentleman arrived in Ottawa this morning and he brought to me my own original letter acknowledging his reply, and a copy of his reply. I regret that the correspondence had been mislaid in my department, and I now desire to table it.

RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING COMMITTEE

Sir EUGENE FISET moved:

That the first and second reports of the select standing committee on railways and shipping be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Veniot.]

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SALARIES OF DEPUTY MINISTERS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What are the names and salaries of all deputy ministers, and of all acting deputy ministers for the fiscal year 1927-28?
2. What is their present salary, respectively?

Mr. RINFRET:

Department of Agriculture:

1. (a) Dr. J. H. Grisdale, deputy minister, $7,500 and use of house; (b) Dr. A. T. Charron, assistant deputy minister, $5,145.
2. (a) $9,500 and use of house; (b) $5,220.

Department of External Affairs:

1. O. D. Skelton, deputy head, $8,000.
2. $10,000.

Department of Finance:

1. and 2. J. C. Saunders, deputy minister and secretary of the treasury board, $15,000.

Department of Indian Affairs:

1. (a) Duncan C. Scott, deputy superintendent general, $8,000; (b) John D. McLean, assistant, deputy superintendent general and secretary, $4,920.
2. (a) $9,000; (b) $4,920.

Department of Insurance:

1. G. D. Finlayson, superintendent, $10,000.
2. $10,000.

Department of the Interior:

1. W. W. Cory, deputy minister, $8,000.
2. $10,000.

Department of Justice:

1. (a) W. Stuart Edwards, deputy minister, $10,000; (b) John Chisholm, assistant deputy minister, $6,000; (c) J. A. Renaud, assistant deputy minister, $6,000.
2. (a) $10,000; (b) $6,500; (c) $6,500.

Department of Labour:

1. (a) Howard H. Ward, deputy minister, $8,000; (b) Gerald H. Brown, asst. deputy minister, $4,620.
2. (a) $9,000; (b) $4,620.

Department of Marine and Fisheries:

Marine Branch

1. A. Johnston, deputy minister, $8,000.
2. $10,000.

Fisheries Branch

1. Wm. A. Found, appointed deputy minister July 12th, 1928. $6,000.
2. $8,000.

Department of National Defence:

1. G. J. Desbarats, deputy minister, $8,000.
2. $10,000.

Department of Mines:

1. (a) Dr. Charles Camsell, deputy minister, $8,000; (b) L. L. Bolton, acting deputy minister, $4,620.
2. (a) $9,000; (b) $4,620.

Post Office Department:

1. L. J. Gaboury, deputy postmaster general, $8,000.
2. $10,000.

Public Works Department:

1. J. B. Hunter, deputy minister, $8,000.
2. $10,000.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery:

1. F. A. Acland, deputy head, $8,000.
2. $9,000.

Department of Railways and Canals:

1. (a) Major G. A. Bell, deputy minister, $10,000; (b) Geo. W. Yates, asst. deputy minister, $4,920.
2. (a) R. A. C. Henry, $10,000; (b) $4,920.

Department Secretary of State:

1. Thomas Mulvey, deputy head, $8,000.
2. $9,000.

Department of Trade and Commerce:

1. F. C. T. O'Hara, deputy minister, $8,000.
2. $10,000.

Department of Immigration and Colonization:

1. (a) W. J. Egan, deputy minister, $8,000; (b) F. C. Blair, asst. deputy minister, $5,220.
2. (a) $9,000; (b) $5,220.

Department of Pensions and National Health:

1. Dr. J. A. Amyot, deputy minister, $8,000; N. F. Parkinson, deputy minister, $6,000.
2. $9,000.

N. F. Parkinson (retired Dec. 31st, 1928).

Answers to number 2 in all cases show the amounts as provided for in the main estimates for the fiscal year 1929-30.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What are the names and the present salaries of officials enjoying the rank of deputy minister or assistant deputy minister, who make use of publicly owned automobiles?
2. How many heads of families employed in the departments of the deputy ministers referred to in the above question, receive less salary than $100 per month?

Mr. RINFRET:

Department of Agriculture:

1. Dr. J. H. Grisdale, deputy minister, $9,500 and use of house.
2. Classified civil servants, 15; labourers, 186; total 201.

Public Archives:

1. A. G. Doughty, deputy minister, $9,000; Wm. Smith, assistant deputy minister, $4,620.
2. Nil.

Department of the Interior:

1. W. W. Cory, deputy minister, $10,000.
2. 17.

Department of Marine and Fisheries (Marine Branch):

1. A. Johnston, deputy minister, $10,000.
2. 124.

Department of Mines:

1. Dr. Charles Camsell, deputy minister, $9,000.
2. Civil servants, 10; prevailing rate men, 13; total, 23.

Department of National Defence:

1. G. J. Desbarats, deputy minister, $10,000; H. W. Brown, assistant deputy minister, $5,220.
2. Fifty-two employees in permanent capacity; 131 employees in temporary capacity; total, 183.

Department of Public Works:

1. J. B. Hunter, deputy minister, $10,000; R. C. Desrochers, assistant deputy minister, $5,220.
2. Inside Service, heads of families:

Class	No.
Clerk, Grade 2	1
Clerk, Grade 1	1
Messengers	2
Museum helper	1

Outside Service: Total number of employees who receive less than $100 per month. No information as to how many are heads of families.

Class	No.
Firemen	20
Cleaners and helpers	111
Watchmen	21
Elevatormen	68
Stenographers, grade 2	3
Messenger	1
Gardener	1
Damkeepers	2
Bridge motormen	5
Lockmaster	1
Dock and other labourers at monthly rate	7

Labourers whose wages are based on an hourly prevailing rate are not included.

Note: Salaries of the deputy ministers and assistant deputy ministers, are as provided for in the main estimates for 1929-30.

TRANSLATING STAFFS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. How many departments of the government support translating staffs?
2. What is the number of officials concerned in each case?
3. What is the total cost of same?

Mr. RINFRET:

Department of Agriculture:

1 and 2. 6 permanent, 1 temporary.
3. $1,055 per month.

Public Archives:

1 and 2. 2.
3. $5,280.

Auditor General:

1 and 2. One clerk engaged on translation work.
3. The salary of this clerk in 1928-29 was $2,520.

Department of National Revenue:

1 and 2. 7.
3. $13,560.

Department of External Affairs:

1 and 2. One official doing translation work.
3. The salary for 1929-30 is $2,700.

Department of Finance:

1 and 2. 2.
3. $3,720 (annual salaries).

Department of Indian Affairs:

1 and 2. One.
3. $3,000 per annum.

Department of Labour:

1 and 2. Three.
3. $4,920 per annum.

Department of Marine and Fisheries:

Marine Branch

1 and 2. Two translators; three stenographers.
3. Translators' salaries, $6,420 per annum; stenographers' salaries, $4,260 per annum; total salaries, $10,680 per annum.

Fisheries Branch

1 and 2. 1.
3. $2,400.

Department of National Defence:

1 and 2. Four.
3. $8,760 per annum.

Department of Mines:

1 and 2. A French translating staff is maintained. Two permanent French translators at present employed.
3. Fiscal year 1929-30: salary of one principal translator, $2,790; salary of one senior translator, $1,920; total, $4,710.

[Mr. Rinfret.]

Post Office Department:

1 and 2. Three.
3. $7,500 per year.

Privy Council:

1 and 2. Two.
3. Fiscal year 1928-29, $4,740.

Department of Public Works:

1 and 2. Three.
3. $7,830 (1928-29).

Department of Railways and Canals:

1 and 2. (a) Railways and canals, 1; (b) railway commission, 1; total, 2.
3. 1 senior translator at $2,400, railways and canals; 1 translator at $1,740, railway commission; total, $4,140.

Secretary of State Department:

1 and 2. One.
3. $2,760.

Department of Trade and Commerce:

1 and 2. Headquarters, 2; Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 2.
3. Headquarters, $4,245 per annum; Dominion Bureau of Statistics, $4,560 per annum; total, $8,805 per annum.

Department of Immigration and Colonization:

1 and 2. Two, one of whom is temporary only.
3. One permanent translator at $1,860 per annum and one temporary senior translator at the rate of $1,920 per annum.

Pensions and National Health Department:

1 and 2. A translating staff of three: one translator, two stenographers.
3. Fiscal year 1928-29, $5,693.89.

Department of the Interior:

1 and 2. Thirteen.
3. Fiscal year 1928-29, $28,222.96.

ST. HUBERT, QUE., AIRPORT

Mr. CLARK:

1. Has the government purchased, leased, optioned or secured control of property in or near St. Hubert, east of Montreal, for the purposes of an airfield?
2. What is the acreage of said airfield?
3. What are its dimensions?
4. What was the purchase price or rental value?
5. What buildings were on the property at time of purchase?
6. What buildings are now on the property?
7. What was the cost of said buildings and the purpose thereof?
8. Has a dirigible air mast or tower been erected, and at what cost?

9. What area of land is reserved or to be used for dirigible purposes?

10. Are private airplane companies privileged to use the field, and if so, what portion thereof and on what conditions?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Yes.

2. 716.09 arpents.

3. The property is triangular in shape, the sides being 7,500 ft., 6,700 ft. and 7,770 ft. long respectively.

4. $143,747.56 paid for 13 parcels. One lot containing 1 arpent has been expropriated but the price has not yet been determined.

5. 1 stone house, 4 barns and 3 small outbuildings.

6 and 7. 1 mooring tower, 1 temporary (wooden) hangar, 1 permanent (steel) hangar, 1 wireless and meteorological hut, 1 power house for water supply and 3 temporary offices, for post office, customs house and public works, restaurant and 3 small workshops.

The farm buildings purchased with the property have not as yet been removed. A number of building structures have been undertaken, but not entirely completed, as follows:

	Approx. cost
(a) Hangar No. 1	$ 42,000
(b) Movable wooden hangar No. 2	8,000
(c) Pump—filter house, fire station—reservoir, including pumps and filter plant	28,500
(d) Temporary radio hut	2,000
(e) Office building	2,300
(f) Two small buildings for Customs and Immigration officers and postal service	800

8. (a) Yes; (b) Approximate total cost including special machinery and other equipment now in course of installation, $287,000.

9 and 10. The whole area was purchased and is available for handling the airship. A third of it has been prepared as an aerodrome for the use of aeroplanes. Sites may be leased. A charge is made for landing, storage and service, depending on the type of aircraft and the duration of its stay at St. Hubert.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—HOTEL AT CONSTANT SPRING, JAMAICA

Mr. BLACK (Halifax):

1. Has any branch of the government, including the Canadian National Railways, or Canadian National Steamships, guaranteed any bonds in connection with the company now building a hotel at Constant Spring, Jamaica, or become interested directly or indirectly in such hotel company?

2. If so, to what extent, and what is the nature of the interest?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. No department of the Dominion government or the Canadian National Railways or the Canadian National Steamships has guaranteed the bonds of the Canada-West Indies Hotels Company, Limited, which company is now building an hotel at Constant Spring, Jamaica, but the Canadian National Railways have purchased $50,000 of 7 per cent convertible notes of that company.

2. Answered by No. 1.

DUTY ON BANANAS

Mr. BLACK (Halifax):

When does the change of duty on bananas come into effect?

Mr. ROBB: May 2, 1929.

WEST INDIAN FRUIT COMPANIES

Mr. BLACK (Halifax):

1. Has any department of the government or the Canadian National Railways, or Canadian National Steamships, any interest in any fruit company or organization whatsoever in the West Indies or Jamaica, or elsewhere?

2. If so, to what extent, and what is the nature of the liability?

3. What is the name of the company, and where is the head office located?

4. What agencies has the company in Canada or elsewhere?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. No department of the Dominion government or the Canadian National Railways or the Canadian National Steamships has any interest in any such company.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

PLACE NAMES IN HONOUR OF COLONEL LINDBERGH, SIR JOHN ALCOCK AND SIR ARTHUR BROWN

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has an island or mountain been named by the geographical board or the government, and a Canadian National station been named in honour of Colonel Lindbergh, an American aviator?

2. Will said precedent be extended to include the most heroic work of the pioneers, eight years before, Captain John Alcock, D.S.C., and Lieutenant Arthur Whitton Brown?

3. In view of (1) and (2) aforesaid, will an island or mountain be named after these British aviators, and will a Canadian National station be called after them, also following precedent? If not, why not?

Mr. RINFRET:

Department of the Interior:

1. Geographic board decisions do not include any feature named Lindbergh. In July 1927, the geographic board was informed that the owner of an island 25 acres in extent on the north shore of Lasqueti island, strait of Georgia, B.C., desired to apply the name Lindbergh to it. He was referred to the provincial

authorities. It is not known if any action was taken. On January 28, 1929, Mooswa, P.O., in Tp. 56-5-4, Alberta, was re-named Lindbergh by the Post Office Department. There is also a Lindbergh lake 15 miles long in Kenora district, Ontario. This name was placed on the map by the Department of the Interior.

2. In April 1920, the geographic board approved Alcock as the name of a mountain in Cassiar district, B.C. The name Brown has not been applied to any feature as there are so many existing features named Brown, that the addition of another would cause confusion.

3. Answered by No. 2.

Department of Railways and Canals:

1. A Canadian National station has been named "Lindbergh" in honour of Colonel Chas. A. Lindbergh, the first solo flier to cross the Atlantic.

2. In May, 1929, the name of "Alcock" was assigned to our station at mileage 18.8 on the Ashmont-Bonnyville branch in Alberta, in honour of Sir John Alcock, the first flier to cross the Atlantic from Newfoundland to Ireland in 1919. This was done prior to assigning the name "Lindbergh". The use of the name "Brown" in honour of Sir Arthur Whitten Brown was also considered, but unfortunately it could not be used on account of several stations and post offices already bearing that name in Canada. Consideration was also given to the use of the name "Whitten" but that was found to be out of the question on account of there already being a post office "Whittone" in Saskatchewan. It is a policy of the Canadian National Railways not to adopt station names that conflict with the names of any other stations or post offices in Canada.

3. Answered by No. 2.

PRISONERS RELEASED ON PAROLE

Mr. IRVINE:

How many prisoners were released in each of the nine provinces, on parole, during the calendar year 1928?

Mr. RINFRET:

Quebec	240
Ontario	137
Saskatchewan	75
Alberta	68
Nova Scotia	58
Manitoba	52
British Columbia	50
New Brunswick	25
Prince Edward Island	10
Total	715

[Mr. Rinfret.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—SALES OF PROPERTY AT HALIFAX

Mr. QUINN:

1. Has the Canadian National Railways, the Department of Railways or any department of the government, sold any lands, houses or tenements in the city of Halifax, since the 31st of March, 1927?

2. If so, which, and what are their respective locations?

3. What was the amount received for each property sold?

4. To whom were such sales, if any, made?

5. Were the sales effected by tender or by private sale?

6. If by tender, were tenders open to the public?

7. If so, who tendered in each case and what were the respective tenders?

Mr. DUNNING:

1. Yes; by Department of Railways and Canals on recommendation of Canadian National Railways.

2. Properties on the south side of Atlantic street, Nos. 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36 and 38.

3. $11,000 in all.

4. F. W. Dickie and Samuel Buttler.

5. By public tender.

6. Yes.

7. Ten tenders in all were received—five for the properties en bloc, and five for individual properties or groupings of same. The list of tenderers includes: A. J. Cote, Fried Bros., B. B. Bean, F. W. Bisset, J. H. Clark, E. Rafuse, W. G. Simpson, M. A. Miller, F. L. Weatherbe, F. W. Dickie Co. Of the above tenders, only two cash offers covering all the properties were received, and the highest offer was also a cash offer. It is not the practice of the railway management to reveal the figures of unsuccessful tenderers.

FISHERIES EXPERIMENTAL STATION, HALIFAX

Mr. QUINN:

1. Does the Department of Fisheries pay the board and lodging of students attending the fisheries school at the biological or experimental station at Halifax, Nova Scotia?

2. Does the department make an allowance to the board and lodging or maintenance of such students?

3. If so, how and to what extent is such allowance or payment made?

4. Does the department exercise any control over the choice of hotel or lodging houses of such students?

5. If so, are such lodging houses selected by tender or otherwise?

6. Did the department make inquiries of various hotels in Halifax during the current calendar year as to the rates at which the respective hotels would accommodate such students?

7. If so, what hotels were asked to furnish such quotations?

8. What are the names of the hotels which furnished quotations and what were the quotations in each case?

9. Were the students referred to in question 1 allocated to or did they reside at any hotel or hotels in Halifax city?

10. If so, at which?

11. Why and how were these selected?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. No, but the biological board, following consideration of the matter with the department, made a grant of $45 each to fishermen who would take a six weeks course of instruction at the fisheries experimental station at Halifax, towards the cost of their maintenance during the course. These fishermen made their own arrangements for board and lodging.

2-11. Answered by No. 1.

LEASE OF BOAT FROM S. E. SEAMAN

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland):

1. Did the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or any other department of this government, purchase a boat from Mr. S. E. Seaman, of Wallace, Nova Scotia, during the years 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929?

2. What price did they pay for same?

3. For what service was said boat purchased?

4. Did Mr. S. E. Seaman supply men to operate said boat? If so, how many, and what were the names and rate of pay to each?

5. What amount of fuel was supplied, from whom was it purchased, stating quantity used, amount supplied and price paid, and whether same was supplied by tender or otherwise? If otherwise, state particulars.

6. Were any provisions supplied by said Seaman? If so, give particulars as to kinds, quantities by tender or otherwise. If otherwise, state particulars.

Mr. CARDIN:

1. No, but the Department of Marine and Fisheries hired the motor boat "Lulu T" from Mr. S. E. Seaman for about 2½ months in each of the years 1927 and 1928 for lobster fisheries patrol.

2. In 1927 at the rate of $600 per month the owner to provide and pay for the engineer and the department to supply the fuel and oil. In 1928 the rate was $400 per month, other conditions being the same.

3. It was hired for lobster fishery patrol.

4. Answered by No. 1.

5. In 1927—415 gals. gasoline at 23½ cents, $97.53. In 1928—435 gals. gasoline at 22½ cents and 24 cents, $107.63. Purchased from the Imperial Oil Company. The above prices were the regular wholesale rate to the Dominion government.

6. Not at the cost of the department.

NATURALIZATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. What is the total number of certificates of naturalization issued by the Secretary of State since January 1, 1927?

2. What is the total number of such certificates issued to residents of each of the nine provinces?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Number of certificates of naturalization issued from the 1st January, 1927, to the 1st April, 1929—16,902.

2. Naturalization is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion and has no relation to the provinces, for that reason the certificates issued are not listed with respect to the provinces and the information is not available.

NATIONAL REVENUE COLLECTED AT NOVA SCOTIA PORTS

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland):

What was the amount of revenue at each of the ports of Oxford, Pugwash, Wallace, Advocate, Apple River, and River Hebert, in the county of Cumberland, province of Nova Scotia, in each of the fiscal years 1925-26, 1926-27, and 1927-28?

Mr. EULER:

	1925-26	1926-27	1927-28
Oxford—			
Import duty..	$2,820 47	$1,031 92	$1,033 68
Excise taxes..	8,109 93	6,872 00	5,642 27
Total.. ..	$10,930 40	$7,903 92	$6,675 95
Pugwash—			
Import duty..	$250 81	$301 51	$162 89
Excise taxes..	444 52	519 09	256 45
Total.. ..	$695 33	$820 60	$419 34
River Hebert—			
Import duty..	$167 02	$156 65	$ 8 69
Excise taxes..	661 25	684 98	27 14
Total.. ..	$828 27	$841 63	$35 83
Wallace—			
Import duty..	$220 60	$404 22	$3,510 15
Excise taxes..	53 65	107 48	600 79
Total.. ..	$274 25	$511 70	$4,110 94
Apple River—			
Import duty..	$6 56	$4 15	$37 87
Excise taxes..	1 24	89	6 66
Total.. ..	$7 80	$5 04	$44 53
Advocate Harbour—			
Import duty..	$44 23	$14 71	—
Excise taxes..	8 83	2 97	—
Total.. ..	$53 06	$17 68	—

PUBLIC WORKS—CHAR SERVICE

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What is the total number of women cleaners engaged in Ottawa by the Public Works department?
2. How many of these are widows?
3. What are their working hours?
4. Are they allowed wages in times of sickness? If so, on what conditions, and how much?
5. What is the per diem allowance?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. 779.
2. 636.
3. Average working time two hours and one half.
4. Yes, full time if they provide a substitute, otherwise they are paid for actual working time, as in similar classes of employment at prevailing rates.
5. $1.25.

MARINE AND FISHERIES—FISHERIES LABORATORY

Mr. BLACK (Halifax):

1. Have the buildings for the purpose of an experimental station of the Department of Fisheries been constructed at the eastern passage in the county of Halifax?
2. If so, by whom was such construction done?
3. Was it done by tender or private contract?
4. If by tender, were tenders open to the public and in what newspapers were advertisements published asking for such tenders?
5. Who submitted tenders and what were the amounts of the respective tenders?
6. If by private contract, on whose recommendation was the contract awarded?
7. What sum, or sums, have been paid to date for such construction, and to whom?
8. Are any additional sums accruing due or claimed either as part of the contract price or as extras in respect of such construction?
9. If so, how much: (a) as balance due under contract, (b) extras?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. A building for use as a fisheries laboratory was built there.
2. Foundation work—R. K. Steeves, Halifax, N.S. Building—A. S. MacMillan, Halifax, N.S.
3. By tender and lowest tenders were accepted.
4. Tenders were invited from various firms doing the class of work required.
5. Foundation work—R. K. Steeves, Halifax, N.S., $1,895; R. G. Beazley, Halifax, N.S., $2,200; Standard Construction Co., Halifax, N.S., $2,260; W. F. Bedwin, Halifax, N.S., $2,472; McDonald Construction Co., Halifax, N.S., $2,474; A. S. MacMillan, Halifax, N.S., $2,984; S. A. Marshall & Son, Halifax, N.S., $2,992.

Building—A. S. MacMillan, Halifax, N.S., $16,649; Standard Construction Co., Halifax, N.S., $18,212; R. G. Beazley, Halifax Dredging Co. Ltd., Halifax, N.S., $19,299.88; Keefe Construction Co., Halifax, N.S., $19,500; A. M. Stuart, Dartmouth, N.S., $21,056.

6. Answered by No. 3.
7. R. K. Steeves, contract for foundation, $1,895; A. S. MacMillan, contract for building, $16,649, extra for grading, $300.
8. No.
9. Answered by No. 8.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—PASSES TO CLERGYMEN

Mr. EVANS:

1. What are the names and addresses of all clergymen to whom free passes are issued on the Canadian National Railways?
2. Why are these passes issued?

Mr. DUNNING:

1 and 2. Clergymen as such are not entitled to free transportation on Canadian railways. The passes in question are issued on account of employees of either the Department of Colonization, Canadian National Railways, or of the Department of Immigration and Colonization, Ottawa.

The issue of this transportation is in accord with the provisions of the Railway Act and of the Immigration Act, which are applicable to all Canadian railways, and the issue of these and all other passes is subject to scrutiny by the Board of Railway Commissioners as provided by legislation.

As competing lines are not required to publish similar information, the Canadian National railways management feel that it is not in the interest of the national railways that the names and addresses of these employees should be published.

RIDEAU HALL—EMPLOYEES

Mr. EVANS:

1. How many government employees are kept at Rideau Hall?
2. What are their respective names, duties and salaries?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. Thirty-eight.
2. Name—Duties—Salaries or wages per month:

R. O. Croll, superintendent, $190 (plus house allowance).

J. E. Fagan, stenographer, $95.

A. E. Challies, head gardener, $140 (plus house allowance).

C. J. Schoenherr, greenhouseman, $120.

Hubert S. Awcock, greenhouseman, $100.

Leo. A. Schroeder, greenhouseman, $120.

Bertram C. Best, gardener, $90.

T. J. Smith, stationary engineer, grade 2, $125.

A. W. Hughes, stationary engineer, grade 2, $125.
Jos. Dicaire, fireman (seasonal), 5 months, $105.
S. Banning, fireman labourer, $105.
Philip Carpenti, fireman labourer, $105.
Leo Coyer, fireman labourer, $105.
Nap. St. Germain, fireman labourer, $105.
Fred Stevenson, fireman labourer, $105.
Zelph. Plouffe, fireman labourer, $105.
Mrs. Alice O'Hara, seamstress, $85.
Wm. L. Moore, upholsterer, $178.28.
Frank W. Rabbe, carpenter, $159.52.
U. Soucy, carpenter, $159.52.
Thos. Kingston, painter and paperhanger $131.36.
J. A. Handy, painter, $121.98.
Ed. McCann, plumber and fitter, $178.28.
E. Richard, labourer, $84.44.
F. Savard, labourer, $84.44.
N. Sarault, labourer, $84.44.
Theo. Dagenais, labourer, $84.44.
Frank Carpenti, labourer, $84.44.
Thos. Doyle, labourer, $84.44.
Jno. Letang, labourer, $84.44.
Jos. Poulin, labourer, $84.44.
Wm. Berthelette, labourer, $84.44.
Harvey Marion, labourer, $84.44.
Hermas Parent, labourer, $84.44.
J. A. Munro, labourer, $84.44.
A. Grenier, electrician, $150.14.
Art. Wyman, teamster, 45 cents per hour.
Mrs. A. Whittenberg, charwoman (part time), $2 per day.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

GRAIN TICKETS

Mr. KENNEDY:

1. What elevator companies issued the so-called high powered grain tickets in: (a) the crop year of 1927-28; (b) the crop year of 1928-29?

2. What was the amount of grain received into store by each elevator company and for which the so-called high powered grain tickets were issued in: (a) the crop year of 1927-28; (b) the crop year of 1928-29?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

ENFORCEMENT OF UNITED STATES REVENUE OR LIQUOR LAWS

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all complaints received either by letter, telegram or otherwise, by the government or any member thereof, or by any official in relation to the periodic visits of American armed cruisers or other American craft in Canadian waters on the great lakes, or Canadian harbours, or boundary waterways, seeking enforcement of American revenue or American liquor laws, including any complaints received of said American ships firing on alleged offending vessels in Canadian waters, contrary to the provisions of existing treaties, and a return showing what steps are being taken to protect Canadian interests and to collect damages for any breaches, if any, of treaty aforesaid.

VANCOUVER HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS—LEGAL FEES

Mr. ESLING:

For a return showing the amount paid out for legal fees by the Vancouver harbour commissioners for the years 1922 to date, and to whom the said legal fees were paid.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—LUNENBURG COUNTY BRANCH LINE

Mr. ERNST:

For a copy of all reports, surveys and other documents made or prepared by officials or engineers of the Halifax and South-Western Railway and/or the Canadian National Railways, or any person or persons acting on their behalf, relating to the construction, cost of construction, or anticipated revenues of a branch railway line from Riverport to Lunenburg and/or Riverport to Bridgewater, in the county of Lunenburg.

INSPECTION OF STOCK CARS

Mr. FRASER:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, memoranda or any other documents relating to the refusal of the Department of Agriculture (Health of Animals branch) to pay J. Pendrelt Smith, of Kamloops, British Columbia, for the inspection of 146 stock cars during the five months from August 1, 1926, to December 31, 1926.

INCOME TAX REFUNDS

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River) moved:

For a return showing:

1. The names of persons to whom refunds of not less than $500, under the Income Tax Act, have been made in the past five years, and the amount of such refund in each case.

2. The names of all persons or corporations in arrears or default of income tax, during each of the past five years, and the amount involved in each case.

Hon. W. D. EULER (Minister of National Revenue): There is no disposition on my part to keep any information from the hon. member, but it is contrary to the principle laid down in section 81 of the Income Tax Act to disclose information respecting the private business of any person or concern. I hope, under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman will allow the motion to drop.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not feel inclined to let the motion drop without a statement in regard to it. I am satisfied the time has come in this country as it has come in the United States—

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is not debatable. We will say: Stand.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Possibly the minister could permit the amending of the motion so as to enable him to give the house the total amount of the refunds made in each of the past five years.

Mr. EULER: I will look into the matter.

Motion stands.

BIENFAIT LIGNITE PLANT

Mr. THOMAS CANTLEY (Pictou) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the honourable Minister of Mines, or any officers or department of the government, and any persons or firms, in any way relating to the transfer to the Western Dominion Collieries of the rights of the Lignite Utilization Board in the Bienfait plant, undertaking or equipment; also a copy of all papers, contracts and other documents in the possession of the government in any way relating to this matter.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of Mines): The government will be perfectly willing to bring down everything they have in their possession in accordance with the request of the hon. member, but more than one government has been interested in this plant and of course I cannot undertake to bring down documents in their possession.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to that restriction, the motion is carried.

Motion agreed to.

PEAT FUELS LIMITED

Mr. THOMAS CANTLEY (Pictou) moved:

For a copy of all agreements, contracts or releases thereof, entered into between the Minister of Mines or any department or officer of the government and Peat Fuels Limited; also a copy of all correspondence between the right honourable the Prime Minister, the honourable the Minister of Mines or any department of the government and Peat Fuels Limited, or any officer or employee of that corporation.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of Mines): Perhaps it would be wise to let this motion stand until I have an opportunity of discussing the matter with the hon. gentleman because, while we are perfectly willing to bring down the correspondence, the motion, if passed in its present form, would necessitate bringing down a great deal of matter which is entirely foreign to the correspondence. If I could have a discussion with the hon. member, I think the motion could be amended to meet his wishes and so that all the relevant correspondence could be brought down.

Motion stands.

[Mr. Speaker.]

ADVISORY BOARD ON TARIFF AND TAXATION

Mr. THOMAS CANTLEY (Pictou) moved:

1. For a copy of report and recommendations made to the Advisory Board on Tariff and Taxation during 1927 and 1928 by Dr. W. A. McIntosh.

2. A copy of reports of Dr. A. W. G. Wilson since 1926 on matters of metallurgical research.

3. A copy of reports of Prof. W. R. Maxwell, when employed in 1928.

4. A copy of reports made by J. D. Fraser since date of his employment in November, 1928.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): Frequently in the course of its inquiries the Advisory Board on Tariff and Taxation arranges with the different industries throughout Canada to send experts to examine their books with the understanding that the information will not be made public. I am sure my hon. friend and the house will at once see that if we break faith with those industries, the result will be that the activities of the board will be curtailed and it will be difficult to secure information that it is desirable the department should have in order to reach a fair conclusion. Having pointed that out to the hon. member, I hope he will drop the motion. In the first place, it is not in the public interest that we should give out this information and in the second place, to do so would be breaking faith with the different industries throughout Canada.

Mr. CANTLEY: I do not see why I should drop the motion. I do not think I am asking for any information to which the house is not entitled.

Motion negatived.

VANCOUVER HARBOUR DREDGING

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): I should like to call attention to question No. 3 which I put on the order paper a month ago in reference to the cost of dredging for the new pier in Vancouver harbour west of the Ballantyne pier. The question is a very simple one and I think the answer ought to have been given before now. Will the minister please facilitate the answer to this question?

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): My hon. friend understands of course, that we had to refer the question to the Vancouver harbour commission. The answer has not yet been received, but I will endeavour to expedite it.

DISTRIBUTION OF HANSARD

Mr. J. ARTHUR DENIS (St. Denis) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, on March 6, last, the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) presented the first report of the select standing committee to supervise the official report of the debates. The following recommendation was included in this report:

> After careful consideration of the matter your committee beg leave to recommend that the present number of ten copies, four of which are delivered for the files and six for mailing purposes, be increased to twelve copies, two of which shall be for the files and ten copies and no more for distribution by the King's Printer in accordance with names and addresses supplied by members of the House of Commons to the Editor of Debates, House of Commons.

Since that date, sir, French-speaking members do not receive Hansard at their rooms, while English-speaking members do. It strikes me that this is an unfair treatment towards the French-speaking members. For the last fifteen days I have in vain requested the Clerk of the House of Commons to have a copy addressed to my room. It seems to me that we should be placed on an equal footing with the English-speaking members, and that we should not be required to fill out certain forms in order to have Hansard sent to our rooms in the House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER (Translation): I am informed that formal instructions have been given to the King's Printer that Hansard be sent to French-speaking members at the same time as they are to English-speaking members.

WELFARE OF PRISONERS' WIVES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): Every year since I have been here I have asked the government what they intend to do in regard to the care of prisoners' wives, and I have always received the answer that the matter is receiving the careful consideration of the government. Would the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) be good enough to tell the house if any progress has been made in that direction beyond further consideration?

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): The matter is still under consideration.

CIVIL SERVICE

SALARIES OF PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL OFFICIALS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) or the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) whether they will lay on the table a copy of the order in council to which reference was made yesterday respecting the appointment of three gentlemen to deal with the question of salaries of the professional and technical employees of the government?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the order in council appointing Mr. E. W. Beatty, Sir George Garneau, and Doctor Murray to inquire into and report on the question of salaries of the professional and technical officers of the civil service.

REJECTIONS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE ACT—INQUIRY FOR RETURN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): On April 8 last the following motion was passed by this house:

> For a return showing the names of persons appointed by the Civil Service Commission who have been rejected under section 24 of the Civil Service Act, in each department, for the last three years, with reason for the rejection in each case.

I would like to ask if that return is not yet ready to be brought down. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that it is ready so far as some departments are concerned. As we require this information for discussion on the estimates, I would ask that the tabling of the return be expedited.

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I understand that my hon. friend alludes to a return from the Civil Service Commission. I shall endeavour to find out from them whether the return is ready, and shall table it at the earliest possible moment.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE PROSECUTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. N. CAMPBELL (Mackenzie): Last year some questions were directed from this corner of the house to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) asking if it was the intention of the department to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Customs and Excise, in which they recommend that prosecution be entered against Harry Bronfman. May I ask if the department have considered that case?

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): If my hon. friend will agree, this will serve as a notice and I will endeavour to give him the information to-morrow.

EXPLANATION—MR. POWER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): My attention has been called to the fact, though I have not yet been able to locate it in Hansard, that I committed a serious historical mistake in the course of my remarks yesterday in that I ascribed the building of the pyramids to one King Herod. My recollection of King Herod is that he was not mixed up with that, but with a lady by the name of Salome. The idea which I intended to convey was that the commission might very well ask questions in which the historical relations of people would be as much mixed as the words which I used in that connection yesterday.

SUPPLY—SIMCOE POSTMASTERSHIP

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. H. A. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the house a matter of importance in connection with the administration of the Post Office Department, and in order to do so I shall move an amendment to the motion to go into supply. This matter is one which has been the subject of considerable discussion in the press in editorial comment and open letters. I refer to the appointment of a postmaster at the town of Simcoe, in the province of Ontario, the rejection of the appointment of George E. Whittaker, a disabled returned soldier, who was appointed to that position by the Civil Service Commission, and the subsequent appointment of C. R. Bowyer, also a returned soldier, without disability, to that office. In dealing with this appointment I shall state only what I believe to be the facts, and all the facts, that are relevant to this discussion, and then I shall submit my amendment for the consideration of the house.

A vacancy in this office occurred on the 31st day of January, 1927, through the dismissal of the former postmaster. I desire, in the first place, to read two or three sections of the Civil Service Act which are undoubtedly applicable to cases of this kind. The act is chapter 22 of the revised statutes of 1927. Section 21 reads:

> Every deputy head shall notify the commission of every vacancy in any position in his department immediately after the vacancy occurs, and whenever such vacancy is to be filled, the deputy head shall request the commission to make an appointment.
>
> 2. The commission shall thereupon appoint the person whose name stands highest upon the commission's list of eligible persons for the class in which the position is found and who is willing to accept the appointment; in case there is no such list for the class, the commission shall forthwith hold an examination and, if necessary to prevent any serious interference with the public business, but not otherwise, may fill the position at once by making a temporary appointment as prescribed herein.
>
> 3. Except as to appointments to positions in the headquarters of the several departments and other portions of the civil service at Ottawa, the appointments to any local positions in any province shall, so far as practicable, be made from bona fide residents of such locality.

Section 24 reads as follows:

> The deputy head may, at any time before the expiration of six months, reject any person assigned or appointed to any position under his control or direction, or he may extend the period of probation within which such person may be rejected for another six months; and the cause of rejection, or the reason for extending the period of probation, shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission.

This vacancy, as I have said, occurred on January 31, 1927. The commission was notified on February 21, 1927, and the advertisement usual in connection with vacancies of this kind was put up. I wish to call the attention of the house to this clause in the advertisement:

> According to law preference is given among candidates possessing the necessary qualifications, first, to persons who are in receipt of a pension on account of disabilities received as a result of war service, who by reason of such service are unable to continue their pre-war occupation and who have not been successfully re-established; and secondly, to persons who have been on active service overseas or on the high seas.

Twenty-three applicants responded to this advertisement, and I think eight or nine of these were returned soldiers. The district superintendent in the Post Office Department made a report to the Postmaster General on these different applications, and I propose to read from his report just exactly what he said regarding the two applicants in question:

> Charles Rex Bowyer is a married man twenty-eight years of age. Has a good education. Resided at Simcoe until about a year ago, but is now living at Mount Albion. Has had no postal experience, but would devote his entire time to the work. Was a student previous to enlistment and since discharge has been farm manager for his father, W. A. Bowyer, and is engaged in looking after some seven or eight farms owned by his father. This applicant states that owing to his being a minor he enlisted under an assumed name, that of C. R. Musgrove, and served twenty-seven months in France with the R.C.H.A. Discharged by reason of demobilization. No physical disability. Is a fine type and impressed me favourably.

Now I think I ought to read something else as to his residence, because that is one of the qualifications referred to in the advertisement. It is contended that this man was not a bona fide resident of Simcoe. From return No. 140, at page 48, being a letter from T. H. Murray, inspector of postal service, addresed to W. J. May, district superintendent of postal service, London, Ontario, I quote the following:

With reference to the report on the ratings re Simcoe postmastership, I would say that I have made full inquiries about those mentioned and would report as follows:

Then he reports on Bowyer.

Charles Rex Bowyer. I had considerable difficulty in locating this applicant, and finally found him living in the village of Mount Albion, a short distance out of Hamilton. He again stated that he considered Simcoe as his home, but his wife and family all being at Mount Albion I cannot believe that it is other than his residence. He has resided there one month, and previous to that was on a farm some two miles distant. Bowyer states that he enlisted in 1915 at the age of sixteen in the R.C.H.A. at Kingston under the name of Musgrove, his regimental number being 7578 and overseas number 348530. He has pay book, medals and discharge papers all bearing the name of Musgrove, and is at a loss how he can give absolute proof that he is the party. He should, however, be placed in Class B.

With regard to Mr. Whittaker the report reads as follows:

George Edward Whittaker is a married man, twenty-eight years of age. Has a very good education. Has resided in Simcoe for about two years and eight months. He has no postal experience but would devote this entire time to the work. Was at school previous to enlistment and since the war has been an adjuster for the Soldier Settlement Board, and is now accountant and office manager for the St. William's Preservers at Simcoe. Enlisted in the 55th battery and served in France eight months with the 22nd battery ,and discharged as medically unfit and received 100 per cent pension. This applicant has a double amputation below the knees, and I do not think he would be able properly to attend to the duties of the office with this disability.

I am quoting this so that we will have the whole record in connection with this man. Later we shall find something more with regard to his disability. The report of the superintendent states that Mr. Murray classified these different applicants in the order of merit. Bowyer was second, and Whittaker seventh from a postal standpoint.

This report should have been forwarded by the Postmaster General to the Civil Service Commission, but for some unexplained reason it was withheld for a period of six months, during which time no less than eight letters were sent by the Civil Service Commission to the Postmaster General asking for the report. It was not until October, 1927, that he forwarded it to the commission.

The commission then took the matter under consideration, and as there was some question as to Mr. Whittaker's disability, he—Mr. Whittaker—thought it well to come down to Ottawa and interview the Civil Service Commission. He saw two members of the commission and also the Postmaster General personally. This was in the month of April, 1927. Recommendations on behalf of Mr. Whittaker were made by the following gentlemen:

N. F. Parkinson, Deputy Minister of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and director of administration of the same department; J. E. Johnston, Simcoe; Dr. W. A. McIntosh, Simcoe; P. H. Groff; George Williamson; E. J. Ashton, of the Soldier Settlement Board; the Amputations Association; B. W. Anderson and A. W. Donly.

To one of these letters the Postmaster General on February 28, 1927, replied as follows:

Dr. W. A. McIntosh,
Simcoe, Ontario.

Dear Sir,

I am in receipt of yours of the 24th inst, with reference to the postmastership at Simcoe, and I note what you say in favour of Mr. Whittaker, who is an applicant. As Mr. Whittaker is a disabled returned soldier, and as the act gives a good deal of preference to such, no doubt he will stand an excellent chance before the Civil Service Commission who have the absolute control in a position of this kind.

Yours truly,

P. J. Veniot.

Now as I have said, Whittaker came to Ottawa, and the Amputation Association, who I understand have recommended that for disabled returned soldiers postal work is particularly suitable, became interested in his case, and a letter was sent making a suggestion as to a way of determining whether this man was really fit for the position for which he had made application. I find in this interesting file a letter from the secretary, I believe, of the Canadian Legion, dated April 3, 1928, and addressed to the Civil Service Commission. The letter reads:

Re George Edward Whittaker, applicant for the position of postmaster, Simcoe, Ontario.

Sir:

As there is doubt as to whether or not the above noted ex-service man is physically able to carry on the duties of postmaster at Simcoe, because of his war disability, the Canadian Legion suggests that he be orally examined at Ottawa by an advisory board consisting of representatives of the Post Office Department, the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and the Canadian Legion.

There is strong opinion that Mr. Whittaker is physically capable of performing the duties

and it is felt that before he is definitely eliminated on this ground, a careful examination of this aplicant should be made.

Officials of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment have also manifested interest in this case and for this reason it is suggested that this department be represented.

We understand that Mr. Whittaker is prepared to come to Ottawa at his own expense, for the purpose of being orally examined.

Yours truly,

J. C. G. Herwig,
Canadian Legion of the B.E.S.L.

Mr. VENIOT: What is the date?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): April 3, 1928. The next relevant letter which I find in the file, in answer to that, is one from the Deputy Postmaster General dated April 18, 1928. I do not know just how the letter got to the Deputy Postmaster General because, as I have said, the file appears to be in some respects incomplete. However, on April 18 we find the Deputy Postmaster General writing to the Hon. Doctor W. J. Roche, chairman of the Civil Service Commission, as follows:

Dear Doctor Roche:

The attention of this department has been called to a letter forwarded to the Civil Service Commission on the 3rd instant by Mr. J. C. G. Herwig of the Canadian Legion, in which application is made for the special examination at Ottawa of Mr. George Edward Whittaker in connection with his application for appointment to the vacant postmastership at Simcoe.

This matter has been carefully discussed, and, in the opinion of this department, there would be no object in agreeing to the proposition outlined by Mr. Herwig. According to the inspector's report, Mr. Whittaker, an amputation case and therefore entitled to every sympathy on the part of this department, has been re-established, and therefore his claim can only be considered in common with which are usually known as class B.

According to the inspector's report, there are other returned soldier candidates belonging to this class B who have superior qualifications to Mr. Whittaker, and, as the latter is apparently not entitled to the disability preference, it does not seem that special action is called for in his behalf.

Moreover, the experience of this department shows that it is very difficult to form an exact opinion of the physical capacity of an applicant in cases of this nature, and that it is only by actual performance of the duties that the applicant's qualifications in that respect can be judged.

Even assuming that Mr. Whittaker is capable of performing the post office duties at Simcoe, as pointed out hereabove, it does not seem that the aspect of the matter would be materially changed in view of the fact that there are other competitors better qualified.

In the opinion of the department, therefore, the interest of the service or the requirements of the case do not demand the special action requested by the Canadian Legion.

This matter has been brought to the personal attention of the Postmaster General.

Yours sincerely,

L. J. Gaboury.

So that the proposition for a special examination of this man was absolutely rejected and he was not given an opportunity, although the Deputy Postmaster General points out that it is only by actual trial that the man's capacity can be proved. The man was not given any such trial. Then the Civil Service Commission, after having seen Mr. Whittaker, appointed him on May 29, 1928. He was rejected by the Post Office Department on June 27, 1928. The only reason I find in the file is that the appointment is marked "rejected," and Mr. C. R. Bowyer was appointed on July 23, 1928.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to give to the house Mr. Whittaker's sworn statement in this transaction:

Dominion of Canada
Province of Ontario
County of Norfolk

To Wit:

In the matter of the appointment of a Postmaster for the town of Simcoe, Province of Ontario.

I, George E. Whittaker, of the town of Simcoe, in the county of Norfolk, do solemnly declare:

1. I am 30 years of age, I was married in 1920 and have two children aged seven and three years, respectively.

2. That I enlisted as a member of the Canadian Forces in the month of May, 1916, when I was sixteen years of age and attending St. Andrew's college in the city of Toronto.

3. About a month after my enlistment I proceeded overseas and in the month of October, 1916, was sent to France and subsequently became a member of the 22nd battery on the Somme.

4. In the spring of 1917 this battery moved up to Vimy Ridge and at the end of the month of May, 1917, I was wounded in action at Thelus Wood and as a result sustained the loss of both my legs, my left leg being amputated below the ankle and my right leg below the knee.

5. I returned to Canada in the month of December, 1917, and am in receipt of a 100 per cent disability pension.

6. In the month of March, 1927, in answer to public advertisement by the Civil Service Commission, I made formal application to such commission to be appointed postmaster at the town of Simcoe.

7. In the month of April, 1927, I went to Ottawa to personally interview the commission in order that the members thereof should be better able to judge of my ability to discharge the duties of the office for which I had made application. The two members of the commission whom I interviewed were surprised that I was able to move about so freely and promised to give my application their careful consideration.

8. While in Ottawa I was introduced to the Hon. Peter J. Veniot, Postmaster General, and, after explaining to him the purpose of my visit to Ottawa, he suggested that we walk together along a corridor of the House of Commons in order that he might be able to judge of my ability to walk about. I complied with his suggestion and he then said that he could

not see anything in my condition that would prevent me from discharging the duties of the office for which I applied. He also stated that, as the Civil Service Commission gave a preference to disabled men, I should have an excellent chance of securing the appointment, and I was assured that he had no objection to such appointment.

Nearly a year later, and in the month of April, 1928, Mr. Murray, post office inspector from London, interviewed me regarding my disability, he having also interviewed me nearly a year previously.

I have since been informed that this inspector had reported that if I should be appointed it might be necessary to appoint an extra clerk. I then informed the member of parliament for the county in which Simcoe is situated that if I received the appointment, and it should appear after a fair trial that an extra clerk was required, I was prepared to pay the cost of such service.

About a month later I was informed that the appointment would likely soon be made and that one Charles R. Bowyer was likely to receive the same. After receiving this information I again went to Ottawa and had another interview with the Civil Service Commission and with the Postmaster General. On my second visit the Postmaster General regarded my disability more seriously than on the occasion of my first visit, but assured me several times that the Civil Service Commission had absolute control of the appointment.

About the 1st of June, 1928, I received from the Civil Service Commission notification of my appointment as Postmaster at Simcoe and, after receiving this notice, I disposed of the business which I had been carrying on, relying upon the appointment of which I had received notice.

About a month after I had received my notification of appointment, and after I had sold my business, I was informed by a newspaper reporter that the said Charles R. Bowyer had received notification of his appointment. I then interviewed him and he produced his notification and stated that he knew he was going to get the appointment before I sold my busines and had desired to speak to me about the matter but had been warned by some of his friends not to do so.

I have been informed and verily believe that my appointment as such postmaster was rejected by the Postmaster General, although I was not given an opportunity to prove that I could discharge the duties of the office to which I had been appointed.

I then wrote an open letter to the press setting forth my position and subsequently a gentleman prominent in the ranks of the Liberal party came to me and communicated an offer of a political appointment in Brantford, Ontario, on condition that I would agree not to discuss the matter any further and that I would sign a letter to be prepared for me absolving the Liberal party of all blame in connection with the cancellation of my appointment. I declined to accept this offer and subsequently the offer of this position was renewed without any condition, but I again declined to accept the position.

I have been informed and verily believe that, between the date of my appointment and the date of the appointment of the said Charles R. Bowyer, an inspector of the Post Office department came to Simcoe to interview me but, for some reason, did not do so after interviewing some other parties here.

At the time I received my appointment the postal staff at Simcoe consisted of a postmaster and five clerks and recently advertisement for an additional clerk has been posted.

Before making my application to the Civil Service Commission I made careful inquiries to ascertain the nature and extent of the duties of the postmaster at Simcoe and obtained full knowledge thereof. I am well satisfied that, notwithstanding my physical disability, I could discharge all the duties of the said office satisfactorily to the public and to all concerned. I am informed and verily believe that the Amputations Association has recommended to the Civil Service Commission that postal work is most suitable for men of my class.

I am informed and verily believe that under the provisions of the Civil Service Act I was entitled to be given a trial on probation to determine my suitability for the position to which I was appointed. Section 24 of the said act reads as follows:

"The deputy head may at any time before the expiration of six months reject any person appointed to any position under his control or he may extend the period of probation within which such person may be rejcted for another six months; and the cause of rejection or the reason for extending the period of probation shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission."

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effct as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Declared before me at the town of Simcoe, in the county of Norfolk, in the province of Ontario, this 11th day of April, A.D. 1929.

(Sgd.) G. E. Whittaker.

(Sgd.) Harold L. Osborne,
A commissioner &c.

I have endeavoured to place before the house the bare facts of this transaction; I have not left out anything which I consider relevant, and I submit that the provisions of the Civil Service Act which I have read have been disregarded and overridden by the Postmaster General in a harsh and arbitrary manner. I submit that the plain provision of our law giving a special preference to disabled returned soldiers has been disregarded equally ruthlessly. The report was held back from the Civil Service Commission for a period of six months, and it is quite clear what was happening during that period; the gentleman who was subsequently appointed was being given an opportunity to acquire a residence in the town of Simcoe, which the inspector reported he did not have, in order that the Postmaster General might be able to insist that this man was qualified for the appointment. In the file there is a letter written from the Post Office Department to the Civil Service Commission calling attention to the fact that this gentleman, Mr. Charles Rex Bowyer, was then a resident or should be considered a resident of Simcoe. On the same file there is also a letter from Mr. Bowyer

which is very ambiguous and which does not categorically and specifically answer the report of the post office inspector to the Postmaster General with regard to his residence. It is not at all clear; to the contrary, I think it is very plain that this gentleman was not a resident of Simcoe and was so disqualified, but for some reason which does not appear the Postmaster General seemed determined to have this man appointed. The question naturally arises: Why was that attitude taken? Why was the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission rejected? Why was the offer of a special examination made by this man and the Canadian Legion so summarily rejected, even though the deputy stated that the only way to find out whether or not this man could discharge the duties of the position was by a trial? Why was not this man given a chance? I feel, Mr. Speaker, that an important principle is involved in this matter. There has been a plain violation of the provisions of the statute, and we must consider whether the statutes of this parliament may be violated in this way, whether the spirit and intent of the act shall be observed, or whether, under some pretext, they may be defeated as has been done in this instance.

I draw attention to this matter because it is not an isolated case; returns have been brought down here time after time showing similar actions on the part of the Postmaster General. I think the house will agree with me that this case deserves some consideration and, as I have said, I have endeavoured to present the case fairly and to bring out all the relevant facts. I submit those facts to the consideration of the house and, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Stinson), I beg to move the following amendment:

> That all the words after the word "that" in the motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:
>
> "In the opinion of this house the Postmaster General has acted in a most arbitrary manner and in utter disregard of the letter and the spirit of the Civil Service Act in connection with the recent appointment of a postmaster at the town of Simcoe."

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I am indeed indebted to the hon. member for having brought up this matter, but I am sorry that he brought it up in the manner in which he did. In replying to the remarks of the hon. member, I will first refer to the last remark he made. He said, "I have placed fairly before the house the facts; I have not left out anything that is relevant to the case." I wish to point out to the house that the hon. member has left out a good deal which is relevant to the case, and which is to be found in the file, a copy of which he has in his possession.

For instance, the hon. member did not read to the house the reasons which were given for sending an inspector a second time to Simcoe. The Toronto Globe, in dealing with that feature of the case, accused the Postmaster General of sending an inspector the second time in an endeavour to find something against Whittaker so that he could satisfy his political friends around the town of Simcoe. What are the facts? It is true that this report was held back by the department—I will deal with that feature of it a little later—but it is equally true that the report was held back by the Civil Service Commission for seven months before they took any action in the matter. While they received that report from the department in October, it was not until some time in the month of February, I believe the 18th, that the Civil Service Commission wrote a letter to the Deputy Postmaster General requesting that he again send an inspector to Simcoe to interview Mr. Whittaker. They stated that the first report was not sufficiently definite as to Mr. Whittaker's physical ability to perform the duties of that office. On receipt of that request from the Civil Service Commission, an inspector was sent there the second time. It is a source of pain to me to have to contradict a portion of Mr. Whittaker's affidavit, but the facts are against him. In his affidavit he states that an inspector had gone there the second time but had not seen him. That is quite true, but Mr. Whittaker forgot to state that when the inspector went there on February 28th, 1928, to interview him he discovered that Mr. Whittaker was in the hospital at Toronto. As soon as he ascertained that Mr. Whittaker had returned on the 3rd or 5th of March, he went again to Simcoe and presented a report to the Civil Service Commission, which report the hon. member did not read to the house. I would like to read a letter dated February 18, 1928, from the Civil Service Commission to the Deputy Postmaster General. The hon. member did not read this letter, but I will do so. It is as follows:

> With reference to the postmastership at Simcoe, Ontario, I am directed by the commission to say that we will be prepared to select Mr. George E. Whittaker for this position, provided the department feels that he possesses the necessary physical fitness to perform the duties.

Then it continues.

Mr. STEVENS: Read it all.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. member need not be so anxious; I will read it all. The letter continues:

I am to point out that the commission is endeavouring, in common with the Post Office department, to provide for seriously handicapped cases to as great a degree as possible, and postmasters have been mentioned as particularly suitable employment for such applications. In this case the Amputation Association is strongly supporting Mr. Whittaker, as well as the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, if his disability will not prevent the proper discharge of his duty. I should be glad, therefore, if the department could furnish the commission with a definite report at as early a date as possible with reference to Mr. Whittaker's physical fitness for the postmastership.

That was on February 18, and there was no time lost. An inspector who was qualified to make a report as to the physical, mental and other qualifications of the applicant was sent there on February 28. He did not find Mr. Whittaker at home, but he returned again on the 3rd or 5th of March, and then presented a report, which report the hon. member did not read to the house.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the date of that report?

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman will get it in a minute if he will just take his time. The report is dated March 5, and is as follows:

With reference to the memorandum from the chief superintendent of postal services, and the note from the Civil Service Commission regarding the physical fitness of Mr. Whittaker, an applicant for the Simcoe postmastership; I would say that on the 3rd instant I again interviewed Mr. Whittaker and would say that his right leg is amputated just below the knee,—

Then I break in with the letter.

M. GUTHRIE: Read it all.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): He has only forty minutes.

Mr. VENIOT: I have more than forty minutes. The report continues:

I again visited Mr. Whittaker and would say that his right leg is amputated three inches below the knee, his left at the ankle, and he walks with the use of a cane.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): "Without" the use of a cane.

Mr. BENNETT: If we were not checking the hon. minister he would get away with that.

Mr. VENIOT: I am not trying to get away with certain facts like some hon. gentlemen I know.

Mr. BENNETT: And a minister of the crown too.

Mr. STEVENS: Shame.

Mr. BENNETT: It makes all the difference in the world.

Mr. STEVENS: The difference between yes and no.

Mr. VENIOT: The report continues:

He said he was with the St. Williams jam factory three years during which time he was away for one month with a blister on a stump, also that he has to go to Toronto frequently for adjustment of his appliances. He stated it would be impossible for him to do any heavy lifting.

Mr. BENNETT: Heavy lifting?

An hon. MEMBER: Are letters so heavy?

Mr. VENIOT: I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman. The report continues:

If the Simcoe post office were a revenue post office the post master might if necessary, hire an additional clerk to perform the necessary work in connection. . . but in the case of a class 2B post office like Simcoe what is required is a working postmaster. If the department requires a working postmaster at Simcoe then my opinion is that an additional mail clerk would be necessary in the event of Mr. Whittaker's appointment, as he is not physically capable of performing any heavy duties.

Mr. BOYS: How does he know?

Mr. VENIOT: That report is signed by the inspector.

Mr. BOYS: Why did he not give him a chance?

Mr. VENIOT: Does the hon. member want to make a speech now?

Mr. CLARK: Tell us his duties.

Mr. VENIOT: Prior to the vacancy occurring in Simcoe, Simcoe was an ordinary revenue office and its classification was changed to a class 2B office. Under the classification of an ordinary revenue office, which Simcoe was prior to the vacancy, the postmaster receives a salary and commission and employs his own help.

Mr. STEVENS: And the classification was changed after the application was made.

Mr. VENIOT: No. The hon. gentleman is not stating the exact truth. I do not mean that offensively at all.

Mr. STEVENS: But the Postmaster General will admit that the change to Class 2B took place after the application was made.

Mr. VENIOT: As a matter of regulation Simcoe dropped into class 2B when the vacancy occurred and, as a consequence, it was so advertised. Hon. members will see by

the notice that applications were called for a postmaster in a class 2B office. That being the case, the class 2B postmaster comes directly under the Civil Service Commission and his salary is classed at $2,040 per annum as a minimum. He no longer has power to engage his help. That is done through the Civil Service Commission on the recommendation of the department as to the number required to carry on the work of the office. The Civil Service Commission regulates the salary and the number of employees in the office. That is why the inspector, in sending in his final report, stated that if we required a working postmaster, a class 2B postmaster, then Mr. Whittaker, on account of his disability, was not fitted for the position. The work of a class 2B postmaster is continuous from the time the office opens in the morning until it closes at night with the exception of the hours that he takes off for his meals. The class 2B postmaster as well as his assistants must handle mail bags and in this case there is only one male assistant, the others being lady assistants. When the condition of affairs was pointed out by the inspector to Mr. Whittaker, the latter stated that, according to that report, he did not feel he was physically fit to do that heavy work. I happened to go to Simcoe. I had been invited to go there months before this incident took place.

Mr. GOTT: On a political mission?

Mr. VENIOT: If it was on a political mission, it would not have been different from what I know my hon. friends did on certain visits to the Civil Service Commission. One thing they can never accuse me of is going on a mission to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GOTT: I deny that I ever went on a political mission to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not say the hon. member did. Of course my hon. friend has endeavoured to throw me off the track of my argument, but I will try to get back to it.

Mr. GOTT: Why does the minister make an assertion like that?

Mr. VENIOT: Because I can back it up.

Mr. GOTT: Let him give the evidence.

Mr. VENIOT: I went to Simcoe, being invited there before anything in connection with the Simcoe office took place. The people of Simcoe were giving a dinner in honour of their representative and I had accepted an invitation to attend the banquet and give an address. When this matter came up, the Toronto Globe and other newspapers

starting hitting pretty heavily at the Postmaster General, but I have fairly broad shoulders and I bore up under it pretty well. It never made me lose any sleep or anything of that kind, because I felt I was acting as I should act and in justice to all. I did not at that time intend to carry out the promise to assist at that banquet until some of the newspapers twitted me and said that I did not have the courage to meet the people of Simcoe. I went there and I want to say to the credit of the people of Simcoe that never before in all my political career of thirty-five years did I receive a heartier or warmer reception.

An hon. MEMBER: The press did not say so.

Mr. VENIOT: Of course the hon. member may have his opinion of the people of Simcoe. I have a very high one. I addressed a gathering that night of 1,200 people and while I preferred discussing other subjects, I discussed the Simcoe matter. Mr. Whittaker was in the audience and I discussed the matter without any recrimination whatever. I pointed out the facts just as they were and when I came to the second report of the inspector, in reply to the criticism of the Globe that I had sent the inspector a second time in order to justify myself, and to prove that I had nothing to do with the matter, and that the statement in the press that the inspector had gone there and had never visited or interviewed Mr. Whittaker, was wrong I read that report as I have read it in the house. As I say, Mr. Whittaker was in the audience and I asked him whether that interview was correct or not. I there and then made the statement that if that were not correct and if the inspector had reported what was false; if Mr. Whittaker would tell me at the meeting or come to me after the meeting and show me it was false, I would have the inspector dismissed inside of twenty-four hours. Mr. Whittaker never said a word in the meeting. He met me after the meeting and he did not attempt to contradict anything contained in that report.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): He has since contradicted it.

An hon. MEMBER: Under oath.

Mr. VENIOT: Not under oath.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I have not said, "under oath."

Mr. VENIOT: Not under oath, because under oath he does not refer to the visit of the 3rd of March. He refers only to the visit

somewhere around the 18th or 20th of February. Therefore he did not contradict the report, and he cannot contradict it.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): He has contradicted the minister's account of what occurred at the meeting.

Mr. VENIOT: I make the statement that that took place at the meeting. Does the hon. member wish to contradict that?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Whittaker contradicts it.

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. member for Leeds does not know, I think, if I may say so without wishing to be impolite, that he ought to keep silent.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I know what Mr. Whittaker said.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not want to discuss the matter with any heat if I can avoid doing so, although I feel I have been wrongly criticized.

Mr. GOTT: With or without occasion?

Mr. VENIOT: I do not think my hon. friend can complain very much of the Postmaster General.

Let me point out one other matter on which the hon. member for Leeds forgot to enlighten this house. He says that I acted in direct violation of the Civil Service Act; that under that act six months' probation or trial must be given to every successful applicant. I want to say to my hon. friend that if he had read all the documents on that file, and I think he did, he would have found a decision on that point given by no other than our friends opposite when they were in power in 1919. What is that decision? The Civil Service Commission was attempting to enforce that section of the act with reference to the six months' probation to which my hon. friend has referred, and the Tory government of that day, no doubt for political reasons, asked the Justice department to give a ruling on the point because they did not agree with the commission. Before giving that ruling, I will quote the section of the act. Subsection 1 of section 13 of the Civil Service Act of 1918, which is the same provision which my hon. friend quoted, reads:

> The deputy head may at any time before the expiration of six months reject any person assigned or appointed to any position under his control or direction, or he may extend the period of probation within which such person may be rejected for another six months; and the cause of rejection, or the reason for extending the period of probation, shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission.

My hon. friend chose very carefully to stop reading right at that point, and that is the gentleman who wishes to give all the facts and details to the house. But let me go further. Let me show wherein the hon. gentleman erred and was not fair in his presentation of his case. Let me show that he was not fair when he attempted to say that I had acted in this matter in violation of the Civil Service Act. What do we find? Here is a ruling of the Department of Justice, dated December 9, 1919, asked for by the Tory government and given by a Tory department of justice, not by a Liberal department of justice. What do they say in that ruling? Here it is:

> If the deputy be reasonably satisfied upon preliminary examination of the person nominated that the latter is unsuitable or not qualified for the duties of the office or employment to which he is assigned, I think he may, if he thinks it advisable, reject him without entrusting him with the charge of any duties; otherwise it is conceivable that cases of considerable prejudice to the public service may arise.

There is the opinion of the Justice department.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Will the Postmaster General allow me a question? Does he say that that ruling is on this file?

Mr. STEVENS: Where is it?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): If he does, I wish to say to him that he is mistaken. It is not on this file.

Mr. VENIOT: It may not be.

Mr. BENNETT: Then why say it was?

Mr. VENIOT: I had not the file in my hand.

Mr. STEVENS: But you said it was on the file, and you charged the hon. member for Leeds with deceiving the house.

Mr. VENIOT: One moment, please. The hon. member for Leeds asked me a question and I am going to answer him.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Postmaster General has charged me with bad faith in not disclosing to this house the ruling which he has just read, and which he said was on this file, but which I now tell him is not on this file, and I had no knowledge of it.

Mr. VENIOT: Is the hon. gentleman going to make a speech?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I think the Postmaster General ought to accept my statement and withdraw any charge of unfairness or misrepresentation of the facts against me. I want to assure him that I have tried to present the facts fairly.

Mr. VENIOT: Since the hon. gentleman says that I was mistaken in saying that that ruling was on the file, and he now states that it is not on the file, I certainly accept his statement, but I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman that ignorance of the law is no excuse.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. VENIOT: When the hon. gentleman was preparing his brief to submit to this house he should have gone fully into everything connected with this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. VENIOT: Let me go one step further.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Where are the files?

Mr. CLARK: The Postmaster General has no more teeth to put into it.

Mr. VENIOT: There is one thing perhaps I can boast of; I think I have as much brains to spare as the hon. gentleman, if not more.

Mr. HANSON: You have a good opinion of yourself.

Mr. VENIOT: I take it that this is a little friendly banter, and I know that hon. gentlemen opposite who are interjecting will be sports enough to take my interjections in the same spirit.

Let me go a step further. I am told that the certificate issued by the Civil Service Commission should be accepted as a direct appointment of the applicant to the position, and that there is nothing which proves otherwise. Now, what does the notice contain which is sent out to the successful applicant who has qualified as eligible for the position? This is what it says—

Mr. CAHAN: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Postmaster General has read from what purported to be an opinion of the Justice department. Having read from that opinion it is his duty to table it, so that it may be available for hon. members to read.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not know that I will unless the Chair says so. I do not think that is a proper point of order. However, I have no objection whatever to tabling it since that has been requested—not that I consider it a proper point of order—as soon as I have had the opinion of the Justice department properly certified. I have not got it here properly certified, but I know it is correct because I copied it myself.

Mr. CAHAN: I suggest that the hon. gentleman lay on the table what he is reading from.

[Mr. H. A. Stewart.]

Mr. VENIOT: I have no objection whatever to tabling it after I get through using it, although I am not compelled to do so. I was going on to refer to the certificate.

An hon. MEMBER: Do not leave any words out.

Mr. VENIOT: That was only a slip of the tongue, not a slip of the mind.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): My hon. friend the Postmaster General has referred to that very point on many an occasion. I may say that for my part I have not been educated along the line that I make slips that serve my own purpose.

Mr. VENIOT: I think the hon. gentleman ought to be asked to take back those words, Mr. Speaker, if by those words he meant that I made a slip of the tongue here to-day to serve my purpose. That is unparliamentary, and I shall not go on with my speech until I get a ruling from the Chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is a well-known rule that the word of an hon. member must be accepted. The hon. minister in making his statement said it was merely a slip of the tongue, and his word in that respect must be accepted by the hon. member.

Mr. GOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. You gave a ruling; then I asked the Postmaster General to accept my word and retract the intimation that he hurled at me.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. GOTT: What do you want?

Mr. POWER: Show your education.

Mr. ERNST: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman in his remarks made no reference whatever to the Postmaster General.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Macdonald) was referring to a statement made by the Postmaster General.

An hon. MEMBER: He was not.

Mr. VENIOT: Let him say so.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. member for Richmond in the remark he made was not referring to me, then I think he ought to say so and not leave another hon. gentleman to say it for him.

Mr. GOTT: But the Postmaster General—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: Come on, Richmond.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I think the hon. member for Richmond should be ready to comply with that request. If he was not referring to the Postmaster General, it is an easy matter for him to say so.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, bosh.

Mr. GEARY: Do I understand the ruling of the chair to be that because an hon. member has made some reference which some other hon. member may apply to himself if he choose, the hon. member making the reference must withdraw it? He has not indicated anybody.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I heard the hon. Postmaster General reading from a document, and it was charged that he had left out the word "without", referring to some gentleman using a cane. I also heard the statement of the hon. member for Richmond, and I took it that he was referring to that incident.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If he was not, it is for the hon. gentleman to say so.

Mr. BENNETT: He does not have to say so.

An hon. MEMBER: Let him say so.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Speaker, you have given your ruling, and until that ruling is obeyed by the hon. member, or reversed by this house, I do not think I should be called upon to go on with this debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

An hon. MEMBER: Suit yourself.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not feel that any injustice is being done to the hon. member for Richmond. I think Hansard will show that I am justified in asking him to say whether or not he referred to the hon. Postmaster General.

Mr. BENNETT: Absolutely no.

Mr. STEVENS: The Speaker has no such right.

An hon. MEMBER: Stand up, Richmond.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker has no right to cross-question a member of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) will tell you that the Speaker's function is not to cross-examine a member as to what he said.

Mr. MARCIL: In answer to the leader of the opposition, I may say it is the invariable custom of the house that the ruling of the Speaker is not subject to debate, but may be appealed from.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I rule that in my opinion the hon. member for Richmond did refer to the Postmaster General, and I ask him now to withdraw his statement as applied to the Postmaster General.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, the remark I made was not applied to the Postmaster General. It referred to a certain statement which he made in reference to my mentality.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to accept the hon. gentleman's statement. I am very sorry indeed if—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. VENIOT: One moment. I am very sorry indeed if any reference of mine to the mentality of the hon. gentleman has offended him.

An hon. MEMBER: Well, withdraw it.

Mr. VENIOT: I would be the last person in the world to do so; but the hon. gentleman must not forget that there was considerable banter being exchanged across the floor, and if he is not sport enough to take, as well as give, some of it, it is not my fault.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is enough.

Mr. BENNETT: The Speaker is responsible.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I think my hon. friend should go a little further,—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member rising to a point of order?

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Yes. I think my hon. friend should go a little further as regards his remarks to certain members on this side of the house; he should withdraw those remarks.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Speaker, when this interruption took place I was referring to the certificate generally issued by the Civil Service Commission. This is what I find—

Mr. GOTT: That is where I come in.

Mr. VENIOT: I never referred to my hon. friend.

Mr. DUNNING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Surely the minister should be given an opportunity to make his speech to the house. During the last fifteen minutes there have been continuous interruptions.

Mr. VENIOT: Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite do not want any speech. If so, there is one way open to them, and it is quite easy. There are old enough parliamentarians opposite to know what I mean by that.

Mr. BENNETT: Is that a threat?

Mr. VENIOT: Now, I find the following in this certificate from the Civil Service Commission:

> This is to certify that you have been selected to fill the position named above after examination in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act, 1918, as amended, and of the rules and regulations thereunder, and that you are qualified to be appointed on probation at the salary shown above.

That is as far as the Civil Service Commission can go. But "appointment on probation" was in 1919 interpreted by the Justice department to mean that the deputy minister, who has the power to refuse a certificate, is not compelled to place anyone on probation. But allow me to read the next paragraph:

> Please note that no arrangements should be made to report for duty until instructed to do so by the Post Office Department. In this connection your attention is especially called to section 15 of the Civil Service Act and to the interpretation of that section as given by the law officers of the crown as quoted below.

Here it is, and this is what I say was on the file that the hon. gentleman had before him.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the Postmaster General permit a question there?

Mr. VENIOT: Certainly.

Mr. STEVENS: I am asking this for the sake of accuracy. I have before me the file, and in it I find, "Copy P.O. 37882 certificate of appointment of postmaster." I presume that this is the document to which the Postmaster General refers. It is addressed to Charles Rex Bowyer. Is that the one?

Mr. VENIOT: No, I am reading from the Whittaker one.

Mr. STEVENS: There is no reference on this form—

Mr. VENIOT: It is the Whittaker one. Now, the fourth clause in small type at the bottom of that certificate issued by the Civil Service Commission contains the ruling of the Justice department. It is here, and I will pass it to the hon. gentleman if he wishes.

Mr. STEVENS: On this form I do not find those words; that is all.

Mr. VENIOT: At the time this controversy took place in the press all these points were brought out and published, and I am surprised if the hon. gentleman did not notice it. I know that from expressions of opinion I have heard this afternoon from the opposite side any statement I may make regarding my attitude towards the returned soldiers may be taken with a good deal of doubt by my hon. friends. But I want to say this: No man has a higher regard for the returned soldiers than I have. I had occasion during the war to pass many sleepless and worried nights because of my own boys who were fighting at the front; and when such newspapers as the Toronto Globe and the London Free Press have seen fit to ask the public, "What has this man Veniot or his family ever done for Canada?" I think that to-day I may be excused if I make a personal reference to myself and my family in order to dispel that feeling which these newspapers are trying to spread abroad, that I acted as I did in connection with the Simcoe matter because I was antagonistic to returned soldiers being properly treated.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to go back to the records of the militia department, turning to the year 1915. The records then will show what the Veniot family did in the last war, beginning immediately after its outbreak. It will show that two of my sons went to the front and won their spurs on the battle field. It will show that the old man himself, when he felt that the enemy was pressing us, had enlisted to go to the front and was turned down for political reasons. It will show that two of my other sons, who are medical men, enlisted and that because they had to receive the title of honorary captain they too were turned down and others taken in their place. It will show that in 1917, when the destiny of the empire hung in the balance and it was thought necessary by some that conscription should be enforced, I gave my services to Canada and Great Britain free, and that I enlisted no less than almost one whole battalion of the French Acadian people of my native province. And it never cost the Dominion of Canada one dollar for my services. A public meeting was called in the town of Bathurst where I resided and the town council was asked to vote $500 for ex-

penses to keep up a recruiting office; and we were asked to name a volunteer recruiting officer who would give his time free. I was not blessed very much with the goods of this world; I could not contribute large amounts in cash to help to carry on the war. But I had my health; I had the ability; and I knew I could influence my own people to enlist. I was chosen at that meeting, a public meeting in the town of Bathurst, and within five hours after I was chosen word came from military headquarters at St. John that P. J. Veniot's services could not be accepted, although I offered them free. That is something to the credit of the Veniot family. And let me say here that the youngest boy of my family enlisted when he was only sixteen years of age. He was in the same position as this boy Bowyer of Simcoe. If you read the newspapers that have attacked me on this question you will find that never once in their editorial criticism did they mention the fact that Rex Bowyer was a returned soldier; they left the impression throughout Canada that I had consented to the appointment of a civilian instead of a returned soldier by the name of Whittaker. So widespread was that impression in Canada that I received letters from branches of the legion in Kamloops, in Victoria and in Vancouver, calling my attention to the situation and condemning me for giving this position to a civilian. But when I pointed out the facts I received back from each one of these organizations the finest letter that could possibly be written to a man.

It is true that Mr. Whittaker as a returned soldier and a disabled man deserves all the sympathy and assistance that can possibly be given him, and it is not because he receives 100 per cent disability that I would attempt in any way to prevent him from earning anything so that he might add to the pension he already receives. But I wish to lay this down here and now and I wish it to be understood: I know that the returned soldiers of the Dominion of Canada do not require, in the public service of this country, that any of their comrades should be taken into positions where, under properly qualified officials, they are reported as being physically fit, thus preventing other returned soldiers from getting their due—soldiers who up to that time had received no recognition from the country for which they fought and bled.

What was the Bowyer case? Young Bowyer, sixteen years of age—

Mr. BENNETT: The same age as Whittaker.

Mr. VENIOT: When Bowyer enlisted he was sixteen; he was sixteen when he wished to go overseas. At that time, under the law, his parents had to give their consent, and the parents refusing to give such consent to their child sixteen years of age, the boy deserted home; he ran away and enlisted under the name of Musgrove. And as such he was recognized on the army list; as such he returned from the front; as such he got his certificate of discharge. When he applied—and now I am coming to the point where I will explain why there was a delay in proceeding at the beginning—when, I say, young Bowyer applied for this position he applied under the name of A. Rex Bowyer—I am not quite sure of the initials, but the name was Rex Bowyer anyway. Report come in to my department from the inspector wherein it was pointed out, as read by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart), that the boy had enlisted under and was discharged under the name of Musgrove. But here he appeared applying as Rex Bowyer. I immediately gave instructions to discover what it meant. I felt there was fraud somewhere; I felt that somebody was attempting to perpetrate a fraud. Here was a returned soldier applying for a post office under the name of Rex Bowyer, while his discharge papers showed that he enlisted under the name of Musgrove. A quiet investigation took place; I interviewed the Department of National Defence and had them follow his record from the day he enlisted to the day he returned; I traced him from then until the date of his application, and it was about two months before I was sure that young Bowyer was not attempting to perpetrate a fraud on the department.

With reference to the question of residence, that file will show that it was I who took up the question of non-residence and directed an investigation to be made in order to ascertain the facts. That took more time and finally, after receiving a report from the inspector setting out the circumstances, I notified the commission that in my opinion Bowyer was a resident of that place. However, under the act the duty of deciding the residence of an applicant devolves upon the Civil Service Commission and not upon the Postmaster General.

That was the position to that point. I had to decide the matter on the report of the only officer qualified under the Civil Service Act to make a report as to the mental and physical qualifications of an applicant; when that report was placed before me I decided that Mr. Whittaker was not physically fit for the work. Therefore, after consulting with the deputy

minister, who had the power of accepting or rejecting the recommendation of the commission, the certificate was rejected. I did not recommend anyone to the commission; I never do. When there is a rejection the commission is asked to make another choice, and as their second choice they picked Rex Bowyer, who to my mind should have received the appointment, notwithstanding the suffering Mr. Whittaker went through and notwithstanding the affliction he endures. I believe a large number of the returned men throughout Canada will be satisfied with this decision when they learn the facts and when they find that I gave this recognition to a young man who, in order to serve his country, deserted his own home and went to the front under an assumed name. That is the position I take.

Mr. CAHAN: Does the Postmaster General regard it as a special merit that this young man enlisted under an assumed name rather than under his own name?

Mr. VENIOT: Certainly I would not consider it a disgrace to any young man to change his name and fight for his country after his people refused to permit him to enlist.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no evidence in the record that his parents declined to give him permission to enlist. The parents of the other man consented to his enlistment.

Mr. VENIOT: There is nothing in the record to show that Whittaker's parents consented, but what difference does it make?

Mr. GEARY: Whittaker was also under age when he enlisted, was he not? They were both mere lads of sixteen.

Mr. VENIOT: Then they both deserve credit for it. I am not attempting to disparage Mr. Whittaker at all; I did not know his age.

Before I conclude my remarks, or my defence—because I understand that this is a motion of censure against the Postmaster General—let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that I find no fault with their method of procedure. If they are convinced that I should be censured because of my conduct in this matter they are quite at liberty to entertain that opinion, but that will not change my feeling that in all fairness and justice, after reviewing the case and considering my duty to the department, to the public and to the returned men, I did what was right.

Mr. CAHAN: Simply to satisfy my own mind, would the Postmaster General state to the house the nature of the heavy work which was required to be done at the Simcoe post office and which precluded Whittaker from the appointment?

Mr. VENIOT: I have already defined the work of a class 2B postmaster.

Mr. CAHAN: I have listened very patiently but I have not been satisfied as to the nature of the heavy work which would have been imposed upon this applicant if he had been appointed.

Mr. VENIOT: I have said all I can say in that regard, and I do not think I should be called upon to say any more in order to attempt to satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. CAHAN: If the hon. gentleman feels that way about it we will discuss the matter further later on.

Mr. VENIOT: In case something may be thrown across the floor of the house after I have finished speaking, with regard to the general impression that while speaking at Simcoe I made a threat that if my decision was changed I would resign as Postmaster General—

Mr. HANSON: No chance.

Mr. VENIOT: That is another interjection to which I might reply in a like manner, but I am afraid my hon. friend would be offended if I did so.

Mr. HANSON: I do not want to hurt the feelings of the Postmaster General; if he feels that way about it I will take it back.

Mr. VENIOT: Thank you. I have here a certified verbatim report of what I said at Simcoe, including my remarks in that connection. Among the audience was a qualified shorthand reporter who took down what I said and who has prepared a certified transcript, and after reviewing the whole situation I went on to say:

> And if I had for one moment a doubt that I did an injury; if I for one moment had a doubt that I did wrong—yes, I'd change that decision, and I would do it with a heart and a will. Convinced as I am that I have done no injustice—

I was speaking to about 1,200 people in Simcoe:

> —to anybody, convinced as I am that I have kept strictly within justice and within the law, that decision will remain as it has been taken, and if changed P. J. Veniot can remain no longer Postmaster General of Canada under our system of responsible government.

There is no threat to resign in those words; I was stating facts. If my colleagues in the government considered that I had done

wrong; if they took up the point and decided against me, under our responsible government only one course would be left open to me. Of itself their action would have placed me outside the executive council, and I would have had to abide by that decision. That was the statement I made, but certain newspapers have called upon the government to take action because I threatened to resign. There was no necessity for me to make any threats of any kind. To-day I am administering one of the heaviest departments of the government; it has pleased the Prime Minister to call me to his cabinet, and he has entrusted me with the responsibilities of my present position. For that I feel deeply grateful to him; he has honoured me and the people whom I represent, and I should be loath indeed to do anything which would place an additional burden upon the shoulders of my leader and my colleagues in the government. Acting as I did in this case, I acted with the full responsibility of a head of the department. I reviewed the whole situation and took ample time to go into everything, and having reached that decision I have no remorse whatever. There is no remorse of conscience on my part, and were I called upon to-morrow to consider a similar question I would treat it in exactly the same way.

Our friends opposite seem to be so keen for the returned soldier, but allow me to direct their attention to a duty which they are not performing. If they are the champions of the returned soldiers, why did they not stand up for them at all times and upon all occasions? Why did they not stand up for them when the Civil Service Commission was turning down returned soldiers and appointing civilians in their place? I am accused of turning down returned soldiers, but I have never turned them down unless I felt I had a good reason to do so, and civilians were not always appointed in their places. I have a list of certain appointments which were made by the Civil Service Commission and I would like to comment on a few of these cases.

The first case refers to Kinkora, P.E.I. The application of a returned soldier named Monoghan, was turned down by the commission and a civilian named Carvill was appointed in November, 1928.

The next is Becancour, Que. A returned soldier named Peloquin was turned down and a Mrs. Dube, a civilian, was appointed by the commission in June, 1920.

The next case refers to Dutton, Ont. A returned soldier, named Henry Locke, was turned down and a Miss Kellop got the appointment in February, 1923.

The next refers to Fergus, Ont., where the vacancy occurred in 1922. Applications were received from six returned soldiers and two civilians. Three were found to be non-residents, another named McDonald, withdrew, and a returned soldier named Steele remained. Insinuations as to character were made, and J. B. Bayne, a civilian, was named by the commission in place of Steele.

The next case I wish to refer to is that of St. Marys, Ont. Postmaster Robson resigned in June, 1917. Doctor M. Steele, the representative of that county at the time, was written to and asked to recommend a soldier. He replied that there was no soldier available, and recommended Berton Fox Lancaster. Lincoln Rice, a soldier, applied but was not considered.

The next case refers to Stanley, N.B., and my hon. friend will see that I have not forgotten this case. There were several applications made in this instance, and I think two were from returned soldiers. A returned soldier suffering from tuberculosis was put in temporary charge of the office pending a permanent appointment through the commission. He applied for a permanent appointment along with another returned soldier. Two civilians also applied for this vacancy. When the inspector went to Stanley to investigate this matter he saw the returned soldier in charge of the office, and the civilian applicants, but did not see the other returned soldier. He reported to that effect, and said:

> I had an interview with his wife. She is a well-educated and smart woman, and the neighbours tell me that this man is all right.

He had been a carpenter by trade previous to the war. On the basis of this report the commission issued a certificate in favour of the second returned soldier, but I refused to accept the certificate on the ground that the other man, who was temporarily in charge was a disabled soldier and should be recognized.

Mr. HANSON: Was the report to the effect that the returned soldier was not qualified or capable of filling the position?

Mr. VENIOT: No.

Mr. HANSON: That is the report, because I have read it.

Mr. VENIOT: The interim report was not to that effect.

Mr. HANSON: You tried to get your district superintendent to change the report.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not.

Mr. HANSON: You had some of your men do it for you.

Mr. VENIOT: It was not done at my request nor at my suggestion.

Mr. HANSON: I will have to take that answer, I suppose.

Mr. VENIOT: Of course you will.

The inspector reported that owing to the tubercular condition of this applicant, and from what he had heard from the people, it might be dangerous for this man to be left in the office. Acting under the regulations, I then ordered a medical examination of this man. That examination was held and I received a doctor's certificate to the effect that that infection would not be a danger to the public. After I received the letter from the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) with reference to the physical condition of this applicant and stating that he was about on his last legs and asking me to look into the matter, I immediately got in touch with the medical authorities. I received a report to the effect that this man had a very severe attack of tuberculosis and would live but a short time. I then gave instructions to my deputy to write to the Civil Service Commission withdrawing the refusal of the first returned soldier and accepting his certificate. I gave as my grounds for that action the fact that this man's physical condition prevented him from continuing at work, and also that he might die in a very short time.

Mr. JONES: Why did the Postmaster General not consider the four returned soldiers who made application for the postmastership at Norton? Messrs. Homer, Read, Ward and Price were all applicants, together with a number of civilians.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. member is taking me at a disadvantage, but I think I know something about the Norton case.

Mr. HANSON: The Postmaster General knows all about that case.

Mr. VENIOT: The vacancy occurred in either 1923 or 1924. An investigation was held into a charge against the postmaster of political partisanship. This occurred at least three years before my time.

Mr. JONES: The postmaster was not changed until last February.

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. member will follow me he will see whether or not I am stating the facts. I may be a little out in my dates, but I know we received applications from returned soldiers. A certificate was issued in favour of Ward, a returned soldier, which was left in abeyance. I took charge of the department on either the 23rd or 25th of September, 1926. From 1927, on, between

times, I was going over the records of the department to ascertain what matters were left in abeyance, so that I might be able to dispose of them and start off with a clean sheet. Among others I found this case at Norton and I let it drift along as it had drifted along under the former Postmaster General. After about a year or less than a year in cleaning up these matters in abeyance, I refused to accept the certificate issued in 1924, I think it was, or 1925, as the case may be, in favour of Ward and I ordered that the postmastership be declared vacant and the position advertised.

Mr. HANSON: Why?

Mr. VENIOT: Because I was not going to accept responsibility for something that had been pending for five or six years. I wanted a clean sheet.

Mr. HANSON: The minister wanted another man.

Mr. VENIOT: The vacancy has been advertised and I believe the reports are in the department or before the commission, I do not know which.

Mr. JONES: No postmaster is appointed yet, only an acting one. The Civil Service Commission would not allow the minister to override them.

Mr. VENIOT: I never appealed to the Civil Service Commission in the matter. There cannot be found in the files of the Civil Service Commission a document to which my name is attached in connection with any of these appointments attempting to influence the commission one way or the other. When I had occasion to write to the Civil Service Commission, I wrote to them openly and freely. Everything is there to be seen. There is nothing to be hidden in the matter.

Mr. STEVENS: I understand that, under the act referred to by the minister sometime ago, the Postmaster General or, I think, technically the Deputy Postmaster General, has the right, after an appointment has been made by the Civil Service Commission, to reject the nominee and ask for a further consideration. In each of these cases cited by the Postmaster General in regard to returned soldiers during recent years, did the Postmaster General exercise his power under that section?

Mr. VENIOT: I have no power under that section.

Mr. STEVENS: The Postmaster General did not quite catch my question. I want to be fair to him. I said that technically it was the Deputy Postmaster General, but we all know it is the Postmaster General.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not know that I am bound to reveal to the house what takes place between my deputy and myself. We follow the act.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the Postmaster General be good enough to follow my question?

Mr. VENIOT: I have answered the hon. member's question.

Mr. STEVENS: I should like to make it clear. Has the Deputy Postmaster General, whether in consultation with the minister or not, exercised his power under section 13 of the Civil Service Act of 1918 in regard to the appointments to which he has referred?

Mr. VENIOT: I beg the hon. member's pardon. I did not catch the first question. The deputy has exercised his power and he has a right to exercise it.

Mr. STEVENS: I see a colleague of the minister laughs. I am not deluded at all by the answer of the Postmaster General.

Mr. EULER: I laughed because the hon. member laughed.

Mr. STEVENS: Go ahead. Our turn will come later.

Mr. VENIOT: Let me come to a case that is quite close to home, that of Elora, Ontario. This occurred in the post office at Elora, I think sometime in the month of October, 1928. This was during the time when the newspapers were attacking me so severely in regard to the Simcoe matter and pointing out that the chairman of the commission was the proper person to state whether a man was qualified for the position of postmaster or not, and that, he having so pronounced, I should accept his decision. I want, if I may use the term, to clear the skirts of the chairman of the commission. I never received any official word from him pointing out that, in his opinion, Mr. Whittaker was the proper person and physically fit. I am referring only to what I saw in the press and I am taking it as I found it. It was stated in the press that the chairman of the commission was the one qualified to say whether Mr. Whittaker was physically fit or not and that, he having said so, I should accept Mr. Whittaker for the position as he was a disabled soldier. What do we find at Elora? Within fifteen days after all the trouble at Simcoe, a vacancy occurs at Elora; applications are made; the Civil Service Commission receive a report from the Post Office Department and they decide on the question. There are three soldiers who are applying for the position at Elora. One is Mr. Bell, a returned soldier, but not a disability man. The second is a Mr. Brikker, a 20 per cent disability man, and the third is Mr. J. K. Macdonald, an 85 per cent disability man, but with his limbs unaffected. I received a certificate from the Civil Service Commission in favour of Bell, a non-disability man. I held up that certificate and I am still holding it up because I consider under the ruling of the Civil Service Commission, fair play was not given to those two disability men. In this case I wrote a letter to the commission asking why the 20 per cent disability man and the 85 per cent disability man were not considered and the position given to a non-disability case and pointing out that each of these men was reported by the inspector as being physically fit to do the work of that office. I received a reply something to this effect: That in the Macdonald case in answering the question: "Have you been reestablished?" he said: "Yes, on my return from the war I was given a place by the Canadian National Railways, a lower position than I occupied before with less wages and with no hope of promotion." The Civil Service Commission consider that sufficient to reestablish a soldier. I say: It is not, and I have as much right to interpret reestablishment in that case as has any member of the Civil Service Commission. I am holding up the Bell appointment until the matter can be gone into further. I make reference to this matter to show that all the blame for the non-appointment of returned soldiers should not be placed upon the Postmaster General.

Let me take, as another illustration, the case of the Williamstown post office. A certificate of appointment was given in 1923 to Alexander T. Macdonald, a civilian, a man who is not a returned soldier, while another applicant, Angus B. Sullivan, a returned man, was turned down by the Civil Service Commission.

I do not wish to take up much more of the time of the house. Let me, in conclusion, refer to the great hullabaloo, if I can use the term, that has been made as to my political bias in questions of this kind. I want to admit to the house that I am a Liberal. I have always been a Liberal, believing in the policies of the party to which I am proud to belong. I have been a hard hitter, as is well known in my native province. I have been hit hard and I have hit hard. I ask for no quarter and I give none. I am prepared at all times to stand on the decisions I give, the actions I take, after mature deliberation in regard to them. But I wish to add to that: notwithstanding my adherence to Liberal principles, there is advocated by the Liberal party one principle from which

during my whole political life I have never turned aside, and that is, conscientiously do your duty to yourself and your country, and brook no interference with what you consider to be such. I see some hon. gentlemen over there laughing. They are judging your humble servant by their own half-bushels; there is no doubt about that, because we have had example upon example when they were in power of the way in which they cut the political hedge. Why, Mr. Speaker, the record of our friends opposite in the matter of dismissals and appointments when they were in power is such that really if I were a member of that party, when I compared its record with my own, I would hang my head in shame. What do we find hon. gentlemen opposite doing when they were in power? I do not mean the gentlemen opposite me to-day, but their party, although some of them were no doubt members of the party then. I have been accused of guillotining hundreds of postmasters since I came into office. It is true that I have dismissed some postmasters. It is true that some postmasters have had to go by the board for certain offences. It is true that there have been some dismissals—I am not talking now of civil service appointments—because I felt that the public would be better served by the appointment of someone else. But if you look at the record of our friends opposite, and compare that with my record in three years, during which 490 changes in the different post offices throughout the country have taken place upon various grounds, which I shall not undertake to enumerate now—

Mr. JONES: If that is the total number of dismissals under the present Postmaster General, they must have all been in the maritime provinces.

Mr. VENIOT: No, they were not; they were spread all over Canada, and these dismissals took place for reasons that could be given. But my hon. friends opposite never hesitated. There is the record to show that in the province of Quebec the dismissals were so numerous that the postal superintendent of the district of Quebec had to write to Ottawa and ask for more help because he could not get the new postmasters into their positions quickly enough to maintain the service. Inside of a period of eighteen months our friends opposite, when they were in power, dismissed no less than 1,890 postmasters.

An hon. MEMBER: When was that?

Mr. VENIOT: From 1912 to 1914.

Mr. ROWE: That was when rural mail delivery came in.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. VENIOT: They were not rural postmasters.

Mr. STEVENS: I want to ask the Postmaster General to state in fairness to this house whether these dismissals to which he refers in 1912 to 1914, totalling as I see by the record under my hand, some 1,600, were not caused by the closing of post offices due to the establishment of rural mail routes, the number of which established during that period was some 1,800, according to a return made by this government on April 4, 1929.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to go into these matters. I was simply making a general statement, but if any hon. gentleman opposite wishes to have the evidence, I can produce it. The hon. gentleman wishes this house to believe that all those dismissals that took place when his party was in power were due to the establishment of rural mail routes.

Mr. STEVENS: I did not say that.

Mr. BENNETT: Most of them.

Mr. VENIOT: I say not one-tenth of them, and the records show it.

Mr. STEVENS: No, no.

Mr. VENIOT: They were all postmasters properly established, and let me give you an example of the way hon. gentlemen opposite were dismissing them.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The conditions were different altogether. There was no Civil Service Act.

Mr. VENIOT: No, there was no Civil Service Act, but of the four hundred odd changes that I have made since I have been in office, seven-tenths of them did not come under the act, and yet my hon. friend says I am applying the political guillotine.

Mr. HANSON: Many of them were taken out from under the act.

Mr. VENIOT: Not in the post office department.

Mr. HANSON: Yes, before your time.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman has brought this matter up, so let us see how some of these dismissals were made. Take the Bankhead post office. Let us see how that dismissal was made in 1912.

Mr. BENNETT: It was made on my recommendation.

Mr. VENIOT: Certainly; I knew the hon. gentleman would admit it. Let us take another one at—I will spell it—B-i-s-h-e-r, or c-h-e-r.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not know it at all.

Mr. VENIOT: Let us take the Carstairs post office, there is another.

Mr. BENNETT: And Cochrane is another.

Mr. VENIOT: Cochrane is another. The hon. gentleman remembers them all. Let me go a little further. Last year or the year before I put on record in this house that during the time of that shadow government election, there were no less than eight postmasters in the county of Antigonish dismissed by telegram sent from Ottawa to the superintendent of the postal service in the province of Nova Scotia. I could go on ad infinitum with these dismissals by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MANION: When the hon. gentleman was telling it in the house he did not stick very close to the facts.

Mr. VENIOT: I stuck to the facts. I had the telegrams and I read them in the house, and I can produce the file if the hon. gentleman wishes to have it. I will produce it if he will read it in the house.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that I was winding up my remarks. There is not much that I can add. I wish first to thank the members of this house for their patience in listening to me at such length. I wish to thank my friends of the opposition for their interruptions, because they always seem to stir me up and give me more spawl to defend myself. I wish to thank the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart) for having brought this question up, so that now it can be properly aired on the floor of the house and a vote taken upon it, and I hope when the vote is taken, after the question has been thoroughly aired, that we shall have heard the last of it.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The Postmaster General said that the delay in sending the reports to the Civil Service Commission was due to inquiries as to this man's residence.

Mr. VENIOT: Part of the delay.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Would he be good enough to tell the house when inquiry was first made as to Bowyer's residence? My reason for asking is that the first I find in the file was in December after these reports had been sent to the commission and long after the six months had expired.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not feel that I should attempt to confine myself to dates. I do know that orders were issued to have this matter of his residence looked into long before that date.

An hon. MEMBER: Why is it not on the file?

Mr. VENIOT: We do not always issue orders in writing. You call your officials in, direct them what to do, and they do it. That is done in every department. That I think was what was done in this case.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the house is much edified by the self-adulation of the Postmaster General. There is a saying, somewhat old, "Let another praise thee."

Mr. VENIOT: You ought to follow that.

Mr. McINTOSH: Take a hint.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sure the Postmaster General has not heard that saying, or if he has heard it he has not profited by it. A very considerable part of his speech consisted of self-adulation, self-glorification, a statement of his consistency in matters political, an affirmation of his convictions, and the great claims he had to public recognition because of the merits of the services he had rendered to Canada. I do not consider that to be at all relevant to the matter now under consideration.

The next part of his speech consisted of allegations in respect of dismissals that had taken place under former administrations. Some of them related to the time when there was no Civil Service Act, and, speaking for myself, a large number of those that he mentioned were cases in which dismissals were made because of violations of the terms and conditions of an order in council approved by the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, providing that where civil servants, including postmasters, had been guilty of offensive partisanship, as certified by a member of parliament, dismissal should follow. This was the case in Willow Bunch last year; the offending postmaster was dismissed. It was the case in Cochrane and in Carstairs. That should be the case with respect to the chairman of the tariff board—and one day possibly will be.

Mr. DUNNING: Will my hon. friend permit me? Why is it right when my hon. friend does it—and I do not question his right—and wrong in the case of the member for Willow Bunch and some other members? I am puzzled by the distinction.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not for a single moment, Mr. Speaker, suggest it was wrong.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): What is wrong?

Mr. BENNETT: With that nice choice of English that always characterizes the mem-

ber for Saskatoon, he has asked a question. But it is difficult to hear it. It is something like his objection a few days ago in connection with the conduct of this house—very violent in one place, very restrained here.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BENNETT: But at any rate, Mr. Speaker, I have not found any fault with respect to what has been done where there has been justification within the terms of the regulations to do it. What we are contending to-day is that the Postmaster General has himself given reasons why this house should censure him. The reasons that he himself has given this afternoon would of themselves be ample ground for the motion now launched, if there were no other reasons in the world; for I say no dispassionate, judicial body listening to the Postmaster General's speech could fail for a single moment to record the judgment which we ask this house to record, namely, that his conduct has been oppressive, unfair, and contrary to the spirit and intent of the Civil Service Act with respect to Whittaker, the applicant, for the postmastership of Simcoe.

This, like many other matters mentioned by the Postmaster General, to him seems to be just an insignificant instance in the history of a great country such as this. In that regard I cannot express my views better than by quoting from an editorial in the Toronto Globe:

> During the past few days, in the consideration of this unusual and intensely human issue, the Globe has learned how largely the so-called little things of life loom in the public estimation—the tug on the heartstrings, the poignancy of sympathetic memories, the keen sense of decency and justice. There is nothing the matter with the sentiment and the spirit of Canadians. They have not forgotten, nor has the oft-deplored materialism of the age warped or destroyed the British instinct for fair play. The communications from women—from mothers—in all parts of the province are most impressive, and it is a good omen for the weal of our Dominion that party politics are pushed into their proper place. A very considerable share of the protests—the most emphatic protests—are from Liberals. One mother whose eldest son is sleeping in France says that she was "brought up in a Liberal home, and have always worked for the Liberal cause, but gratitude and justice to the dear boys who sacrificed themselves for all of us come first. If Mr. Whittaker does not receive justice, then I am a Liberal no more, or at any rate not the kind of a Liberal who will support a party who does that sort of thing."

That quotation from the great organ of Liberal opinion indicates how it regards this matter, small though it may be in importance so far as the great number of cases is concerned, but tremendously important as affecting the life of Whittaker.

Now, sir, it has been apparent during the latter part of the address made by the minister that his principal object in speaking as he did for the last twenty minutes was to attack the Civil Service Commission. He hurled complaint and criticism against that body. The Civil Service Commission was set up by parliament in an endeavour to remove from this country the bane of political patronage. Whether or not it has succeeded remains to be seen. But every enemy of the commission cheered vigorously the observations of the Postmaster General, and every hon. gentleman who desired that the patronage of this country should be exercised on the basis of merit freed from political control was silent during those attacks. For some reason that I cannot understand the hon. minister as one of his instances cited what took place in November of last year when he said that a man who had disability as a returned soldier was passed over by the commission and someone else put in his place. The statute has never said that being a returned soldier alone qualified a man for a position in the civil service. It merely said that preference should be given to him. I cannot understand why these attacks are being made against the Civil Service Commission, this continual sniping, the members of the commission not being here to answer for themselves, the attacks being in a sense a reflection on the administration itself, because it is the duty of the minister of the crown under whose department the Civil Service Commission may fall to see that the commission is defended in this house and ample opportunity given it properly to present its case to this tribunal. That opportunity was not afforded to the Civil Service Commission this afternoon. An attack was made—

Mr. POWER: What about the tariff board?

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister of Finance defended that board. An attack was made against the Civil Service Commission this afternoon by the Postmaster General, and no attempt was made to point out what were the conditions applying to the cases he cited. I would remind him of this, the very procedure to which he had recourse in this case, namely, the refusal of his deputy to give his approval, has always been open to the minister with respect to all the cases he mentioned. Then why should he point out this case as one in which he exercised those powers and fail to state that he could have invoked those same powers in the other cases in refer-

ence to which he attacks the Civil Service Commission? That is the position which I am sure will suggest itself to every hon. member. I confess I cannot understand why he should have taken that course.

What are the facts of the Whittaker case? That is the case under discussion this afternoon, and upon the principle involved in the failure of the department to appoint Mr. Whittaker to the postmastership at Simcoe a motion of censure against the Postmaster General has been moved. He has seen fit to deal with a large number of cases in New Brunswick, Ontario and various other parts of Canada, and if the facts as he related them are correctly stated, and, as he said, he had to deal with them very hurriedly, then certainly this vote of censure should not be limited to the Simcoe case but should be general in its application to the whole conduct of the hon. gentleman as Postmaster General.

Now, let us look for a moment at the advertisement. It contained these words:

According to law preference is given among candidates possessing the necessary qualifications, first, to persons who are in receipt of a pension on account of disabilities received as a result of war service, who by reason of such service are unable to continue their pre-war occupation, and who have not been successfully re-established; and secondly, to persons who have been on active service overseas or on the high seas.

Those terms are an integral part of the advertisement upon which Mr. Whittaker and others offered their services to the country. It gives a preference—mark you, not necessarily the whole preference, but a preference—first to the disabled man and secondly to the man who is not reestablished.

There were several applicants for this position. Amongst those applicants were Mr. Whittaker and Mr. Charles Rex Bowyer. Mr. Charles Rex Bowyer did not come within the first description of the preference mentioned in the advertisement. He was not a disabled soldier; he was not in receipt of any disability pension. That you will find at page 70 of the return. Therefore, so far as Mr. Bowyer was concerned, he did not come within the conditions of the advertisement under which a preference was to be given. I do not think there will be any difficulty about that; it is clearly established. And that may be the explanation for the cases mentioned by the minister this afternoon when attacking the civil service. It may have been that the cases to which he referred, of returned soldiers having applied for other positions, were cases in which they were not disabled and therefore were not entitled to first preference.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is not leaving the impression that returned soldiers who are not disabled have no preference?

Mr. BENNETT: If my hon. friend had followed me he would not ask that question. I read the two sections of the advertisement. I am sorry I read so rapidly; I will read them again for the minister.

According to law, preference is given among candidates possessing the necessary qualifications, first to persons who are in receipt of a pension on account of disabilities received as a result of war service, who by reason of such service are unable to continue their pre-war occupation, and who have not been successfully re-established.

That is the first. The second is:

To persons who have been on active service overseas or on the high seas.

Preference therefore is given to returned men, but there is a first preference given to disability cases, which preference does not attach to other returned men. But added to the disability there must be the other secondary conditions, namely, not having been successfully reestablished, and being unable to take up previous occupation. Mr. Bowyer came within the second class of cases. He was not in receipt of a disability pension, although he was a returned soldier.

Now the minister dwelt at some length on the fact that Bowyer enlisted under the name of Musgrove at the age of sixteen. The record shows that such was the case, stating that he was a minor. It also shows that Mr. Whittaker enlisted at the age of sixteen, presumably with the consent of his parents. Further, it is perfectly clear that when the applications came in, so far as the Civil Service Commission was concerned, they showed that there was no man named Bowyer who had war service. Therefore Mr. Bowyer did not come within the class entitled to first preference as returned soldiers. But the minister says it was disclosed later to the commission that he had a record as a returned soldier under the name of Musgrove, under which name he received his medals, his discharge and his recommendation. That was cleared up. But the Civil Service Commission had no knowledge of it. The minister said he had; and why did the minister intervene? Is not this the fact? The member for that riding, as I shall presently show, and the Liberal organization in that county, said, "We must interfere and get this job for Bowyer". That is the record, as I shall show in a moment. The name appears of Mr. Taylor, the member for the riding, and certain statements he made were printed in the Globe newspaper. It is clear that what transpired

was this—that friends came to him as they come to all of us. And why should they not come to us? They come and ask to have certain appointments made. I am not going to be so unfair to the member for that riding as to suggest that it was not in good faith that friends of Bowyer came to him and proposed that this was a position he could fill, expressing the desire that this man should be appointed as postmaster at Simcoe. But it was apparent, when this effort was made, that there was no man named Bowyer who came within the preferential class; and the facts were then uncovered, which appear on the file, showing that Bowyer had served in the war as Musgrove. But still there was a difficulty. The Civil Service Commission made a recommendation. Mark you, it is not denied in this house that Mr. Whittaker came to this city of Ottawa and met the Postmaster General, that he walked with him down the corridor in these halls and indicated to him just how well he could walk, how great his disability was, what his injuries were, and how fit he was to discharge the duties of the office at Simcoe. That is not denied. And bear in mind further that the Postmaster General, on the very threshhold of the matter, saw fit to write a letter in which—and I say this in fairness to him—he placed himself on record as indicating on whom he believed the responsibility rested. For in 1927, on February 28, he wrote a letter in which he said:

> I am in receipt of yours of 24th instant with reference to the postmastership at Simcoe, and I note what you say in favour of Mr. Whittaker, who is an applicant. As Mr. Whittaker is a disabled returned soldier—

Mark these words, the minister himself drawing the distinction.

> —and as the act gives a great deal of preference to such, no doubt he will stand an excellent chance before the Civil Service Commission, who have the absolute control in a position of this kind.

Now, those are the words the minister used, and which he used again this afternoon. Is it any wonder that a resolution is now before this house censuring him for his conduct, when he writes a letter in which he states that the Civil Service Commission has absolute control in a position of this kind? The Civil Service Commission, having the absolute control, having received the applications and having regard to the terms of the advertisement, sent out their notice in due course to Mr. Whittaker under date of May 29, 1928. However, before that notice was sent it is well for this house to remember that two members of the Civil Service Commission, Doctor Roche and Mr. Tremblay, had seen Mr. Whittaker and that the minister himself had seen Mr. Whittaker, who had walked up and down the corridors of this building to indicate that he could walk without a cane, although he had had amputations below the knee in both cases. The knee joints articulated on both legs, as the minister pointed out, one leg having been amputated below the knee and the other below the ankle. Mr. Whittaker demonstrated that he could walk, and according to his affidavit which was read into the record this afternoon, and which in his solemn, sworn statement, the minister told him he could not see any reason why he was unfit to be postmaster. That statement has not been denied.

This is a serious situation. What happened? You have several applicants, one of them a disabled returned soldier, who therefore is entitled to first preference. In the second place you have a returned soldier who is not disabled and who is working on his father's farm; he does not come under the first preference but is included in the second preference.

Then my hon friend reminds me of something else of which I intended to speak. The advertisement required that applicants should reside in that locality. At the time it is quite apparent that Mr. Bowyer was residing at Mount Albion, which is not far from Hamilton, Ont., while Simcoe is some considerable distance from that city. According to Mr. Bowyer's own letter, which was read this afternoon, he would not take the responsibility of saying he was a resident of Simcoe; he had moved away to this place where he was looking after a farm. His residence would be designated as Mount Albion according to any standard which might be applied in order to determine residence, but he still had some property at Simcoe and he said, "I think I might be said to be a resident of Simcoe because I have property and am assessed there." That was the way he put it; he did not attempt to deceive anyone but merely stated the facts. Under these circumstances the following notice was sent to Mr. Whittaker:

> Civil Service Commission of Canada
>
> Notice of Appointment of Postmaster
>
> Date: May 29, 1928.
>
> Post Office: Simcoe, county of Norfolk-Elgin, Ontario.
>
> Name of appointee: Mr. George Edward Whittaker, O.A.S.
>
> Address of appointee: Simcoe, Ontario.

Salary rate: $2,040 per annum, with an annual increase of $120 until a maximum of $2,280 has been reached.

(Appointment subject to physical fitness.)

Then the certificate goes on to state:

This is to certify that you have been selected to fill the position named above, after examination, in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act, 1918, as amended, and of the rules and regulations thereunder; and that you are qualified to be appointed on probation at the salary shown above.

Please note that no arrangements should be made to report for duty until instructed to do so by the Post Office department. In this connection your attention is especially called to section 13 of the Civil Service Act, and to the interpretation of that section given by the law officers of the crown, as quoted below.

By order of the commission,

Secretary.

There is no doubt that Mr. Whittaker received notice that he had been selected by the Civil Service Commission for the postmastership of Simcoe; that is quite clear. It is also clear that in the notification he received it was stated that he was not to go to work until he received notice from the Post Office department, and that his appointment might be only on probation. There can be no doubt on that point. That did not involve his appointment, but the Postmaster General says this afternoon—and I cannot understand any minister of the crown endeavouring to take that position—"I have no right to do this; it is the deputy minister who can approve or disapprove of these appointments, not the minister." I cannot conceive of any minister trying to shelter himself behind his deputy, because a deputy who would do what the minister did not permit or authorize would lose his position forthwith.

Mr. VENIOT: I would like to offer a word of explanation, because I think my hon. friend misunderstood me. I am not trying to shelter myself behind my deputy; I take full responsibility.

Mr. BENNETT: Not for a moment would I think the Postmaster General, after his strong statements as to his great courage, would endeavour to hide behind the skirts of anyone else in a matter of this kind, but the fact is that he blames the deputy minister and will not accept responsibility himself.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not say that.

Mr. BENNETT: We will see what Hansard says.

At six o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, April 18, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

First report of the joint committee on the printing of parliament.—Mr. Marcil.

Second report of the select standing committee on standing orders.—Mr. Morin (St. Hyacinthe).

THE LATE HON. J. W. EDWARDS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that this House of Commons has witnessed a more sudden passing of one of its members than that which has taken from our midst the Honourable Dr. J. W. Edwards, member for Frontenac-Addington. Not twenty-four hours ago, honourable members on all sides of the house were glad to have the opportunity of expressing their pleasure at Dr. Edwards' return to his accustomed seat in this chamber, after an absence of but a day or two, occasioned by what at the time was regarded by many as a severe though not serious indisposition. It is now but too evident that Dr. Edwards must have known, even on Monday last, that his days were numbered. In the circumstances his coming back into the house yesterday afternoon was but one more example of great personal courage and of a sense of public duty which were characteristic of the whole of his public life.

That the House of Commons has been deeply touched by the death of one who has had a long association with its affairs, was apparent this morning when, despite the lack of opportunity of having public intimation made of the funeral service which was held in the forenoon, most of the members of this house, and, I venture to say, all who were aware of the service, were present in person to pay their last tribute of respect to his memory. That tribute, and the one which was paid by his fellow-members yesterday, is much more real and adequate than anything which it would be possible to express in words.

At the same time, I may, perhaps, be permitted, speaking more particularly for those of us who sit on this side of the house, to say how much we, in common with hon. members opposite, feel the loss which our country has sustained in the death of one who, though still in his sixty-fourth year, had had a long career of public service, in the course of

which recognition of his abilities found expression in his appointment as a minister of the crown.

As one who was a graduate in arts and medicine of one of our leading Canadian universities, and who had followed the profession of teaching as well as that of a physician, Dr. Edwards with his native ability was well qualified to take an important part in the public life of this country. That those who knew him best were of this view is evidenced by his return to parliament in 1911, 1917, and 1925 and 1926, and by his appointment as a minister of the crown in 1921, to which I have just referred. We who were his fellow members in the House of Commons also shared that knowledge.

I confess that those of us who sat immediately opposite to our late friend felt, at times, that some of his criticisms and censures were unduly severe; that they proceeded from a sincere motive and from an undaunted courage, none of us doubted.

There was, however, another side to the doctor's nature which was apparent to us all, and by which I am sure he would most wish to be remembered; it was his wide knowledge of public affairs, his ability and fearlessness as a public speaker, and, above all else, a great faithfulness in the discharge of his public duties as a member of parliament.

While his loss to the commons will be great, it will be particularly felt by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I desire, on behalf of the members of the government to extend to my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition and to those who sit about him, our sincerest sympathy in the loss which he and the Conservative party have sustained in the passing of one of its foremost members.

There is one other expression of sympathy which I know all hon. members will wish to have made at this time, and which perhaps you, Mr. Speaker, will be kind enough to convey, and that is a mesage of profound sympathy to Mrs. Edwards and to her son and daughters in their overwhelming bereavement. I am sure few things we have witnessed have touched any of us more than the constant devotion, one to the other, of Dr. and Mrs. Edwards. Through all the storm and stress of his political life she was an ever faithful companion. I can see them now as they walked together toward these parliament buildings but a day or two ago, and I shall always recall the kindly smile which greeted me as we passed.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

It was that greater mellowness which came with years and which helped to reveal in increasing measure a keen sense of humour and a genuine kindliness of heart that won for Dr. Edwards the place which he had in the esteem and regard of members of this house. It will be remembered more and more as we leave behind the harsher aspects of the conflicts of party debate which, after all, are but of the day.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the very touching tribute which the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has paid to our fellow member is greatly apreciated by those who sit to your left. Doctor Edwards was our colleague, and perhaps we who were more intimately associated with him better understood his nature and appreciated his merits, but the observations of the Prime Minister leave no room for doubt that in this house he had made the influence of his personality strongly felt, and as the years passed, his true worth was but the better recognized. We mourn Doctor Edwards as one of the stalwarts of our party, one whose exposition of the principles of the party with which he was associated was at all times given with conviction, with earnestness and sincerity, and for that reason our grief is more than mere passing sorrow.

While we have lost a great party leader and might say with one of old, "A Mighty Prince has this day fallen in Israel," the loss to his constituents and to his country must not be under-estimated. No constituency was more loyally or more faithfully served by the member representing it in this house than the constituency represented by Doctor Edwards. His profession enabled him to have a very singular hold upon the affections of his constituents, for every medical man who is a member of the house realizes that he has a great advantage in being able to speak to his constituents in terms denied to many others of us. That Doctor Edwards was greatly beloved by those he represented many of us have reason to know, for we have seen manifestations of their affection in more ways than one.

While the loss to our party and to his constituents is great, I feel that the loss to this Dominion is greater still. I know of no man who had a greater love and affection for his country and a more real devotion to its well-being than Doctor Edwards. He had a firm faith and a profound conviction that

this country was destined to play a very great part among the peoples of the world. He yielded to no man in his confident faith and belief that our true destiny was to be found within the empire of which he was so devoted a servant, and at all times, whatever might be the matter engaging his attention, he made reference to that fact.

I think you will agree with me, sir, when I say that in losing Doctor Edwards we have lost a great member of parliament. I cannot recall of whom that observation was made, but certain it is that it was made with respect to one who about two centuries ago played a great part in the parliamentary history of England. Doctor Edwards was a great House of Commons man. He believed in our traditions. He had faith in representative government; he believed in the institutions of parliament, and respected and revered them. He had regard for forms, not for form's sake, but because he believed as most of us do, that in the maintenance of those forms we have the best guarantee for the preservation of the institution which we call parliament.

Then there was that side of his life which was so little known to many of us until we knew him more intimately—he was a great friend. His loyalty to his party was known to all, but his devotion to his friends was little understood. He was honoured by thousands of his fellow-Canadians by being placed in a position of very great authority in a powerful organization in this country, and yet I recall his saying to me that no man could point to a single observation that he had ever made in which he attacked any man's religion or denied to any one of his fellow-citizens the right to worship his own God under his own vine and fig tree. He had that tolerance which sometimes was denied to him. He had it to a singular degree. His love for his friends was very strong, and in this House of Commons, though sometimes his courage and the strength of his convictions found expression in terms that some of our friends took exception to, yet upon analysis, stripped of the surroundings under which the words were uttered, I think few could find cause for complaint or for just criticism.

We have indeed lost a friend, loyal, devoted and faithful friend, one whose service to his country cannot be measured by the accumulation of material possessions, but who has left behind him by his example and by the magnificent addresses which he delivered from the Atlantic to the Pacific a feeling of faith in his country, based upon a stalwart Canadianism, coupled with a firm belief in the destiny of our empire and of this Dominion. These things will not easily nor soon be forgotten and as the years pass on I am satisfied that the feeling which was manifested yesterday when he returned to this House will be recalled as indicating the true measure of esteem and regard in which he was held by his fellow members. I recall, as the Prime Minister has mentioned, the words he spoke to me in the hospital only two days ago, and his appreciation of the manifestation of interest in his well-being shown by those whom he regarded as his political opponents, their inquiries as to his health and the hopes they expressed for his ultimate recovery, touched him greatly. I feel certain that his coming back to this house yesterday was influenced largely by a desire to express to those who had been so kind and had taken such an interest in his well-being his appreciation of their interest in his recovery.

I can say nothing more except this, that we do sincerely appreciate the observations that have been made by the Prime Minister, and we grieve with the devoted wife and family in the loss they have sustained. I should like to join with what my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has said in that regard, for only the day before yesterday I saw sitting beside the doctor's bed his devoted wife. Such relations are indeed an inspiration to every man who sees in them the development of the best in family life which, after all, is the foundation and the strength of all the institutions of our country. Love of wife and family, devotion to the companion of his life and to his children, were strongly manifested in our deceased colleague. It might be said of him, that though dead he still liveth amongst us. While there may be acute differences about many matters, there can be no difference of opinion as to the sincerity of his motives, the singleness of his purpose, the probity of his conduct, the integrity of his character, his great love for home and wife and children, his generous affection for his constituents and kind-hearted regard for his fellow men, his devotion to his country, his love for his empire and respect for this house of which he was so long a member.

We will long mourn him as a faithful and devoted friend whose loyalty was beyond question, whose devotion was beyond cavil, and whose single purpose in life was to serve

his country well and who loved his fellowmen to the fullness of his great heart. I am sure too that we had too little appreciation of the breadth of his vision, the greatness of his intellect, and the power that he wielded throughout this country for the well-being of the commonwealth. Perhaps the words of a great poet truly express our sentiment:

> He has outsoared the shadow of our night;
> Envy and calumny and hate and pain,
> And that unrest which men miscall delight,
> Can touch him not, and torture him again.

Mr. ROBERT GARDINER (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, when the house rose last evening at six o'clock we did not anticipate that we would be called upon to mourn the loss of one of its prominent members. When we saw Dr. Edwards in the chamber yesterday afternoon we all hoped that he had fully recovered from his indisposition of Monday, but unfortunately we are now called upon to mourn his death.

The late Dr. Edwards had taken a very prominent part in the public life of this country for many years past. He was a man of strong convictions, and he was not afraid to voice those convictions on all occasions, and he showed a fearlessness in debate which it would be well for most members of this house also to display.

He was a great humanitarian. Those who had an opportunity of knowing him only slightly became aware of the tremendous interest that he took in the inmates of our penitentiaries, and it was one of his life-long ambitions to see that the men and women who for the time being were restrained of their liberty should be given a better opportunity to become useful members of the community than had been accorded them in the past.

Primarily, on behalf of the prairie provinces, may I express our appreciation of the deep interest which the doctor took in our welfare. We have heard him many times in this house debate the question of the return of our natural resources, and he discussed it on many platforms. I am sure that the western people appreciate very fully the tremendous amount of labour which he expended on our behalf in order to see to it that the western provinces were placed on an equality with the other provinces of the Dominion. I am sure we all regret that he had not lived to see the fruition of his labours.

We in this corner of the house desire to be associated with the remarks of the Prime Minister and of the leader of the opposition in conveying to Mrs. Edwards and to the family our sincere regrets on this occasion.

[Mr. Bennett.]

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CUSTOMS PROSECUTIONS IN PRINCE COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings):

1. How many cases for infringement of the Customs and Excise Acts were prosecuted in Prince County, Prince Edward Island, during the last fiscal year?

2. What are the names of the justices of the peace before whom such cases were heard?

3. How many convictions were procured?

4. In how many cases was an attorney employed by the department, and what are the names of the respective attorneys?

5. What remuneration was paid to each of such attorneys for services?

6. How many customs and excise officers have been employed in Prince County during the last year, and what are their names and respective salaries?

7. Was any payment made to said officers out of moneys received from the sale of seized liquors? If so, what amount and to whom?

8. How many appeals were taken to superior court, and what were the results of such appeals?

9. What attorney was employed by the department in prosecuting such appeals, and what amount was paid to such attorney for his services?

Mr. EULER: Mr. Speaker, in order to give the information asked for in this question a great deal of time and labour would be required, as the records of the information desired are not kept according to counties. We could give the information for the whole province of Prince Edward Island. If the hon. member would be content with such information we would be glad to give it to him in the form of a return.

Mr. SPEAKER: Answered.

WILFRED D. BOURGEOIS

Mr. PRICE:

1. How many years' service did Wilfred D. Bourgeois have to his credit, as fishery guardian, in Cocagne district, Kent county, New Brunswick, and also on fishery patrol boat Pontiac, on Northumberland straits?

2. Were his services satisfactory? If not, why was he permitted to continue?

3. Did he apply for appointment as fishery overseer for Kent county and did the Civil Service Commission recommend him?

4. What information was laid against him, if any, of what nature was the complaint and by whom was the information laid?

5. On what grounds was he rejected and upon whose recommendation?

6. Did Wilfred D. Bourgeois serve in France during the war?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. He was not employed on a yearly basis. He was engaged the following number of days in the following years:—

		Days
1920-21	May 24–Mar. 31	265
1921-22	Apr. 1–Mar. 31	288
1922-23	April 11 days	
	Aug.-Nov. 65 "	76
1925-26	Nov. 21-30	8
1926-27	Aug. 13–Nov. 7	87
	Engineer on C. L. "Pontiac"	
1927-28	Sept 1–Oct. 9	39

2. Though they were so regarded by the fishery overseer for the district, a commissioner who inquired into the efficiency with which he discharged his duties in 1921 and 1922 did not find that they were efficiently performed.

3. Yes.

4. The report of the commissioner referred to in No. 2, was on record. Also the member for the constituency stated that the appointment of Mr. Bourgeois would not inspire cooperation on the part of the fishermen and would not be in the best interest of the service.

5. The best interest of the service. Answered by No. 4.

6. It is understood he did. The man selected is also a returned soldier and was equally rated by the civil service examiners with Mr. Bourgeois for the position.

WARDENSHIP OF BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY

Mr. McQUARRIE:

1. When did the position of warden of the British Columbia penitentiary become vacant?
2. When did Inspector Jackson assume duty as acting warden?
3. Has the said Inspector Jackson while acting as warden been residing at night at the Georgia hotel or any other hotel in Vancouver?
4. What expenses have been incurred by the said Jackson since becoming acting warden?
5. Did the said Jackson make the investigation and report on which the late warden, Lt.-Col. Cooper, was asked for his resignation?
6. Was the warden's residence at the said penitentiary burned at night while the said Jackson was in charge of said penitentiary but at a time when the said Jackson was sleeping in the said Georgia hotel in Vancouver?
7. Was the said residence a total loss?
8. What was the value of same?
9. How did the fire originate?
10. Was any insurance carried?
11. How many escapes have there been from the said penitentiary during the time the said Inspector Jackson has been acting warden?
12. When did the position of deputy warden become vacant?
13. When was the Civil Service Commission asked to fill the said vacancies?
14. Will appointments be confined to residents of the province of British Columbia?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. February 17, 1928.

2. February 25, 1928.

3. Yes, Inspector Jackson resides at the Georgia hotel in Vancouver, at night.

4. Total expenses—five thousand four hundred and thirteen dollars, and fifty-five cents ($5,413.55).

5. Inspector Jackson made reports in connection with two investigations held into the management of the penitentiary at New Westminster by ex-Warden Cooper. Ex-warden Cooper was not asked for his resignation.

6. The Warden's residence at British Columbia penitentiary was discovered to be on fire at about two a.m. on February 7, 1929. Inspector Jackson was sleeping at the Georgia hotel, Vancouver, that evening. He was at the fire before it had assumed serious proportions.

7. Yes.

8. It is difficult to place a fair valuation on the warden's house. It was built early in the nineteenth century, and was for a time the residence of the governor of British Columbia when same was a crown colony. It was condemned many years ago on account of "dry rot." British Columbia newspaper accounts value it at about five thousand dollars ($5,000).

9. The fire is believed to be of incendiary origin.

10. No. The general policy of the government is not to insure any of its properties.

11. Inspector Jackson has not been deputy warden. During the time he has been in charge of the prison as acting warden, there has been one escape.

12. May 31, 1928.

13. The warden, 26th March, 1928: The deputy warden, not yet.

14. No.

RADIO COMMISSION

Mr. CHURCH:

1. When will the report of the radio commission be presented to parliament?
2. Will any legislation be introduced this session based on the recommenation thereof?
3. Will there be any change in the granting of station licenses which expire the end of April?
4. What steps will the government take to eliminate the advertising nuisance which now exists?
5. What regulations to protect the public will be afforded during the coming year?
6. Does the government propose to continue the present system on May 1st next, re the granting of those licenses?
7. Have any complaints been received from radio fans about the advertising nuisance, and regarding what stations, and will the complaints be tabled?
8. What has been the cost of the radio commission, and what salaries, living allowances and travelling expenses have been paid each member of the commission and officials?

Mr. CARDIN:

1 to 7. The royal commission to inquire into the radio broadcasting situation in Canada which is composed of Sir John Aird, Chairman, Mr. C. A. Bowman and Dr. A. Frigon, with Mr. D. Manson, an officer of the department as secretary, has not yet completed its inquiries. It is not anticipated that the commission's report will be received in time to present to parliament at this present session. It is not expected that there will be any change in policy regarding broadcasting until the report has been considered. Complaints about advertising have been received from time to time. This matter is being considered by the commission and will be covered in its report.

8.

	Remuneration	Living allowance	Travelling expenses
Sir John Aird ..	$2,900	$1,150	$2,688 12
Mr. Bowman ..	3,185	1,380	753 06
Dr. Frigon	3,080	1,460	920 84
*Mr. Manson, secretary ..	—	1,080	934 96
Office expenses: Stationery, telephones, telegrams, etc.			$1,478 43
Total to 31st March, 1929..			$21,010 41

*Mr. Manson is paid as an officer of the department.

WELLINGTON BARRACKS

Mr. QUINN:

1. Did the government or any members of the government receive a copy of the resolution passed by the city council of Halifax, the Commercial club and the Progressive club, in connection with the restoration of the Wellington barracks?

2. Is it the intention of the government to make the necessary repairs to the Wellington barracks, injured during the explosion of December 6, 1917, in order that the same may be used again by the military authorities?

3. Is the government contemplating the return of the headquarters of the Royal Canadian Regiment to Halifax?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Yes.

2. Under consideration.

3. Any movements of troops from time to time will be governed by existing need and the interests of the service.

[Mr. Church.]

CALL LOANS

Mr. GIROUARD:

1. What amount of money was loaned by the Canadian banks in call loans during the year 1928, and for the months of January, February and March, 1929: (a) in Canada; (b) elsewhere than in Canada?

2. What proprtion of the amount so loaned was the property of the depositors?

3. What rate of interest was received by the banks on the amounts so loaned: (a) in Canada; (b) elsewhere than in Canada?

4. What rate of interest was received by the depositors on their money so loaned?

Mr. ROBB:

1. (a) Call and short loans in Canada outstanding at December 31, 1928, were $265,799,886 as compared with $241,964,697 at the end of the previous year, an increase of $23,835,189; at January 31, 1929, the total was $268,037,092, being an increase of $2,237,206 over the figure for the previous month and at February 28, 1929, the total amounted to $268,422,281, an increase of $385,189 in the month. March returns not yet received; (b) Call and short loans elsewhere than in Canada outstanding at December 31, 1928, amounted to $292,693,175 as compared with $290,584,174 at the end of the previous year, an increase of $2,109,001; the amount outstanding at January 31, 1929, was $326,763,021, being an increase of $34,069,846 over the figure for the previous month, and at February 28, 1929, the amount outstanding was $328,133,789, being an increase of $1,370,768 in the month. March returns not yet received.

2, 3 and 4. Not reported under Bank Act.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

BEDFORD POWDER MAGAZINE—ADDITIONAL UNITS

Mr. BLACK (Halifax):

1. Were any additional units to the powder magazine, at or near Bedford in the county of Halifax, constructed during the calendar year beginning January 1, 1928?

2. If so, was the construction work done by contract or otherwise?

3. If by contract, to what person, partnership or company was contract awarded?

4. If not by contract, what person, partnership or company did the construction work?

5. Were tenders asked for in respect to such construction?

6. If so, were they asked for by public advertisement, and in what newspapers?

7. If not asked for by public advertisement, by what method were tenders called for?

8. What persons, partnerships or companies submitted tenders and what were the respective amounts of such tenders?

9. What amount has the person, partnership or company which did the construction work actually received as payment or part-payment in respect of the same?

10. Are any further sums payable, or claimed, in respect to such construction?

11. If so, what amount or amounts (a) as balance of contract price; (b) as extras?

SALARIES OF DEPUTY MINISTERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the Secretary of State (Mr. Rinfret) to an answer made to a question yesterday. The question is as follows:

What are the names and salaries of all deputy ministers, and of all acting deputy ministers for the fiscal year 1927-28?

You will note, sir, that I asked for information respecting all of them. I find in the answer brought down that the names, for example, Dr. Doughty of the Archives, the Clerk of this house, and the Civil Service Commissioners, are omitted, and there are very many other omissions which are quite apparent. I now desire to ask the Secretary of State to bring down this additional information.

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I may tell my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, that there is a distinction between deputy ministers who serve under ministers, and superior officers having the rank of deputy ministers. If in a new question my hon. friend would specify the officers that have been omitted I will see that he gets the proper answer.

SIMCOE ONT., POSTMASTERSHIP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Postmaster General if he will lay on the table the opinion of the Department of Justice to which he referred yesterday; also the correspondence upon which that opinion is based?

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): Yesterday I laid on the table what I had read; but I have not the correspondence. If there is any I will table it.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Vote 314, page 71 of the estimates. When the committee had this vote before it yesterday it was decided to take it item by item.

Outside Service — Salaries and allowances, $17,295,464.40.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Can the minister furnish the committee with an estimate of the revenue and expenditure of his department for the year expiring March 31, 1929? The last report which we have is for the year ended March 31, 1928, which report has been printed and distributed. I think the committee would be glad to have the figures, either complete or estimated, for the year just closed.

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): The returns for the fiscal year 1928-29 have not yet been completed and it would be quite difficult to submit those figures. We may be able to give partial figures up to the 31st of January. However, I will have the matter looked into with a view to submitting all the figures we have. When a quarter is completed it generally takes a couple of months to get in all the returns from outside, compile them and have them ready; my secretary tells me it requires three months. Any information we have I will certainly try to have ready.

Mr. HEAPS: When a similar item in the estimates was being discussed last year the question of wages paid to postal employees was brought to the attention of the committee, and on this occasion I wish again to discuss that question. I believe the wages these employees are receiving run from $90 to $120 a month, and out of this sum there is deducted 5 per cent for superannuation. This is in itself an actual reduction in pay, because in a great many cases no equivalent is given to the postal employees for the money they pay into the superannuation fund. I believe the Postmaster General has placed on the records of the house certain corespondence that passed between himself and the Civil Service Commission, and it was indicated that he was favourable to giving an increase to the postal employees but that the Civil Service Commission stood in the way of the proposal. Somehow or other, while I appreciate the efforts made by the Postmaster General to give to the postal employees an increase in wages such as they are entitled to, and which I believe is endorsed generally by members in all parts of the house, I do not think he has gone quite far enough. I believe that if the government were determined to give to these workers increases in salaries, ways and means could be found to do it. During the past few days there has been done by the government something which in my opinion places the question now in a completely new aspect. I understand that

parliament created the Civil Service Commission for the purpose of determining the salaries and the conditions under which employees of the government should be engaged; and if the government have confidence in the Civil Service Commission then I presume it is quite right and proper for them to accept all the findings of that commission. Within the past few days, however, the Minister of Finance has intimated to parliament the appointment of a special commission which, so far as I can see, is brought into existence for no other reason than that he has no confidence in the findings of the Civil Service Commission. If such is the case with regard to professional and technical employees of the government, I want to know why the same action should not be taken with regard to the postal employees. If a special commission is to be appointed to investigate the salaries of professional and technical employees, in my opinion there is a thousand times more need to investigate the salaries of men receiving less than $100 a month. The Minister of Finance informs the house that he has appointed three big business men to constitute that commission. My opinion is that the appointment of this commission by the government amounts to a vote of want of confidence in the Civil Service Commission. If the government had confidence in the Civil Service Commission it would not be necessary to appoint a special commission to review their findings; and if the government had no confidence in the findings of the Civil Service Commission with respect to professional and technical employees, I cannot understand how they can have confidence in the commission's findings so far as postal employees are concerned. In spite of the fact that the Postmaster General and members on all sides of the house recognize that the salaries paid postal employees are too low, no action is taken by any responsible minister to appoint a commission to investigate the salaries of these employees. I would offer a suggestion to the Postmaster General. There is certain legislation on the statute books in the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, and I see no reason why the government, having appointed one commission to investigate matters with regard to certain employees, should not put that act into operation and appoint a board representative of the postal employees and the government, with a third party, to investigate salaries in this connection. I do not want to discuss what has been in the past the policy or platform of the Liberal party with regard to employees of the government; that I think is well known to minister themselves, but I do say that, living as we do in an era when it is claimed there is so much prosperity in Canada, the employees of the government have a right to expect a decent living wage. No minister of the crown, no member of this house, can stand in his place and claim that $90, or $100, or $110, which is being paid to postal workers, is anything approaching a living wage. Therefore when the salaries of postal workers are under discussion I think the Postmaster General should make an explicit statement as to the attitude of the government and of himself towards these employees.

Mr. VENIOT: In reply to the hon gentleman, or rather hon. member—

Mr. HEAPS: Gentleman too.

Mr. VENIOT: Of course—both. I cannot give any explanation about the appointment of a special commission touching technical officers; that is not in my line. All I can say is that the postal department has followed as closely as possible the act in its recommendations, where it thought fit, in the matter of increased salaries to postal workers generally throughout the department. There are some technical men in my department, but they come under another class; and so far as I am concerned, as head of the department, I have always felt that wherever it was possible, and wherever deserving, our employees should be paid adequate salaries. But the act fixes a rate, and certain regulations are laid down to be carried out by the Civil Service Commission. When an application is made to them for increases or additional help, which in some cases would mean promotion, the head of the department has nothing whatever to do with the fixing of salaries; it is entirely in the hands of the commission, and as I said before I must, as head of the department, abide by their decision.

Mr. HEAPS: Would the Postmaster General tell the house why, when recommendations were made by the commission to the government in the case of technical employees, the government did not accept those recommendations?

Mr. VENIOT: I am not in a position to answer that question; I can only speak for my own department.

Mr. HEAPS: But I would point out that the commission was not appointed by a minister but by the government; consequently the Postmaster General is bound to assume some responsibility for the appointment.

Mr. VENIOT: Certainly I would share my responsibility with the other members of the government, but the answer to that question is not supposed to come from me.

Mr. McGIBBON: Can the Postmaster General give me any information as to why the postmaster at Rathburn was dismissed; also as to whether or not anyone has been appointed to fill the vacancy, and if so, upon whose recommendation.

Mr. VENIOT: The information I have is that action with regard to the dismissal of the postmaster at Rathburn was taken by the department following the discovery of a shortage of $196.62 in his accounts through an inspection made on October 5, 1928, and a further shortage of $63 found during an inspection of October 18, 1928. I will not say any more; I will leave it at that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the position with regard to the postmastership at Kitchener?

Mr. VENIOT: An order has been issued for the dismissal of the postmaster at Kitchener, and notice of the vacancy is to be advertised immediately.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What were the grounds for the dismissal?

Mr. VENIOT: On the ground of a very grievous irregularity.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is a very general term.

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. gentleman wants the information I will have to give it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have been requested to ask for the information.

Mr. VENIOT: I will give it. For some time it was suspected that certain moneys were being lifted from envelopes, mail matter, in that office. At first suspicion was not directed towards the postmaster but towards others, but through our secret service system the postmaster was discovered mishandling these letters. On that evidence being produced to me, to my deputy and to the officials of the department I suspended the postmaster. I have gone further into the matter and found it was even more serious than at first reported, and as a consequence his dismissal has been ordered.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has there been any prosecution in the matter?

Mr. VENIOT: Not yet.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does the government contemplate taking steps to prosecute?

Mr. VENIOT: We do not always prosecute.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is there any reason for not prosecuting in a case so grievous as this?

Mr. VENIOT: There are reasons for which we do not prosecute for offences of that kind.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I know there are a large number of prosecutions directed against letter carriers and men occupying similar minor positions; has the minister any good reason to suggest why there should be no prosecution in this case?

Mr. VENIOT: Sometimes it is quite easy to prosecute, and at other times it is quite difficult.

Mr. McGIBBON: It is never difficult to dismiss, though.

Mr. VENIOT: Not when they are stealing; no.

Mr. STEVENS: Has the minister a right publicly to brand a person with stealing when he intimates that he has not sufficient evidence upon which to base a prosecution? If there was an offence which would warrant the use of the word "theft" as applied to any citizen of this country, surely there is reason for prosecution. If there is not enough evidence for that prosecution, no such stigma should be attached to the name of any man.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not use the word "theft" in regard to this man.

Mr. STEVENS: The Postmaster General used the word "stealing," at any rate.

Mr. VENIOT: No, I said "a grievous offence." I related the facts and hon. gentlemen can interpret them as they wish. An hon. gentleman opposite made some reference to dismissals, and I said, "Yes, when they are stealing."

Mr. STEVENS: Does the Postmaster General think he can use that phraseology in this house in answer to an hon. member and then wiggle out of the dilemma by saying he was not referring to this man? The sole topic of conversation between the minister and hon. gentlemen on this side of the house was this particular case at Kitchener, and I want to register a serious objection to a minister of the crown, under the protection of parliament, attaching to citizens of this country a stigma by telling us the offence is grievous and then going on to say that there is not sufficient evidence on which to proceed with a prosecution.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not say we had not sufficient evidence on which to proceed with a prosecution; I said that in some cases it was

difficult to prosecute and in others it was quite easy. That refers more to the circumstances of the offence rather than to the facility with which a prosecution could be proceeded with. It was not my object to attempt to disparage the character of any official who unfortunately has become guilty of irregularities under our system of administration, but hon. gentlemen opposite publicly asked for certain information. I would prefer not to make such statements; when an hon. member asked with regard to Rathburn I felt inclined to ask him to come over and have a look at the report instead of reading that report to the house. When the matter of Kitchener came up the questions directed at me by hon. gentlemen opposite came so rapidly that I endeavoured to give the details in order to justify my action in dismissing this official.

Mr. HANSON: Is it not the well-defined policy of the department to prosecute in all cases where there is sufficient evidence of theft? I have understood that to be the policy for many years. I recall a case which occurred in my own constituency in the spring of 1921, before I became a member of this house; a boy, a clerk in the post office at Fredericton, whose name I am not going to mention since he has been punished and is now trying to redeem himself, was caught stealing money from unregistered letters. The mother came to me in great agony, as naturally would be the case, but on taking the matter up with the district superintendent I was informed that it was the invariable rule of the department to prosecute such offenders, and if he had been sentenced by the police magistrate to three years' imprisonment there could be no suspension of sentence.

Mr. BENNETT: Which is the minimum sentence.

Mr. HANSON: There was no suspension of sentence under the criminal code, and this man served his time, or such part of it as he had to serve until he was released on parole. I was told that they had no recourse; that it was not up to the Postmaster General to withhold the necessary instructions for prosecution. It seems to me that this is a case which requires a little further explanation on the part of the officials of the department or of the Postmaster General.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know anything about the details of this case, although it has been referred to me as being a very grave one. From the answer of the Postmaster General I would assume that there was something very bad in the conduct of the former postmaster at Kitchener. I gathered from the remarks he made a few minutes ago that the irregularities at least amounted to theft. If that be so, and I understand that is true, why is not this man prosecuted? Does the Postmaster General take the position, when in possession of the facts, that he can idly stand by? Surely no minister of the crown is going to hush up a criminal offence.

Mr. BENNETT: Hush, hush is the policy.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The law provides that a man who does not take steps to prosecute under these circumstances may himself be liable for the offence of compounding a felony. I always understood that in regard to the Post Office department of Canada every offence was prosecuted. Our criminal code contains special provisions covering thefts in connection with post offices. A man who steals a dollar or two from a till may go to gaol for ten days, but if he steals one cent from a letter he must go to gaol for three years. That is the minimum sentence the law allows in the case of theft from a postal letter. I would ask the minister if there is anything in this case which precludes him from giving the facts to the house.

Mr. VENIOT: No, I have all the facts.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not want unnecessarily to interfere with or embarrass any person, but the house is entitled to the facts. Kitchener is one of the important cities in western Ontario, and inquiries have been made of me, and others in this house, as to the facts of this case. I made inquiry on a former occasion and the only answer I received was to the effect that the postmaster had been suspended. I think the minister should elaborate the matter a little more than he has done, and give some reason why prosecution has not been instituted.

Mr. VENIOT: I have given all the details regarding the irregularities which would point to anything in the way of dishonesty. There was another irregularity in connection with the matter, the excessive drinking habits of the postmaster. I think that was the point which induced me rather to condone—if I may use that term—the action of which he was first accused. I am told that in the condition he was in that night he would perhaps not be responsible for the act which was committed.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not a defence in law.

Mr. VENIOT: I know it is not; I am not a lawyer, but I know that that is not a de-

fence. Whether rightly or wrongly, whether or not my judgment was astray, I did decide that dismissal would be sufficient punishment for the man under those conditions. When I had the matter in hand I considered his family, and also the fact that if the matter came into the hands of the court I could not interfere. I thought it would be better to show leniency in this case, as I have shown it in other cases. I do not wish to deny that I have shown leniency in many cases where I felt I was justified in doing so, and I will show it again.

Mr. HANSON: I asked the minister to declare the policy of the department, but he has ignored me absolutely. I do not mind that personally, but I think we are entitled to an answer.

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot answer them all at once.

Mr. HANSON: I would like to know who gives the Postmaster General discretion in cases of this kind. Does he submit them to the Department of Justice? Why should one man be singled out for leniency, and another prosecuted? Who made the Postmaster General the judge as to who should be prosecuted and who should not? I was told nine years ago that the department had a well defined rule on this point, and that nothing could be done in the case of a man who had been caught and had confessed. In this case a very serious misdemeanor—

Mr. VENIOT: And who was in the hands of the law at the time.

Mr. HANSON: I am not just sure about that; I am rather inclined to think that that is the case. But that does not alter the principle which underlies the whole procedure. I suggest that it is a funny state of affairs when the Postmaster General can constitute himself a judge as to whether or not a man shall be prosecuted. Such discretion should not be vested in any man. If there has been thieving and dishonesty in a particular case, the man should be prosecuted. I understand that the department, under Mr. Murphy, laid down that policy years ago, and that it has been rigidly adhered to ever since. I am astonished to learn that the Postmaster General exercises a discretion as to whether or not any of his friends or his non-friends shall be prosecuted.

Mr. VENIOT: I will say to the hon. gentleman that there is no such thing as friendship.

Mr. HANSON: Let me point out to the minister—

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman had his chance and he sat down.

Mr. HANSON: No, I did not. I am not quite through; I have one more observation to make. It was this kind of administration which undermined the customs service of this country. We had a striking illustration of that fact in an answer given the other day by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler), when he told us of the money which had been lost to this country by reason of the administration of that department under a previous minister.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Was a report made by the inspectors regarding this matter?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister give that report to the house?

Mr. VENIOT: The investigation upon which that report is based was carried on by the secret service of the department. I would not like to give that portion of the report which would reveal the name of the person making the report, because that would break down the discipline, so to speak, of the secret service.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Perhaps the report itself will give us all the information we want. Will the minister read it?

Mr. VENIOT: I have not the report here.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Let the item stand.

Mr. VENIOT: I will take a note of it and have the report here this evening. Since I have made the mistake of showing leniency in the past, I will guarantee that I will show none in the future.

Mr. BENNETT: A moment ago you said you would.

Mr. HANSON: That is pure bluff.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then we have gained a point.

Mr. VENIOT: Not in this discussion.

Mr. BENNETT: Surely the minister does not mean to ask this house to accept seriously what he said a moment ago, "and I will do it again," and he was cheered by his supporters.

Mr. McINTOSH: Not very loudly.

Mr. BENNETT: That is quite right, but he was cheered. He now says he will not do it again; that he will see that the law is enforced.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman says that I am not carrying out the law, and they blame me for that; I am going to carry it out

Mr. BENNETT: The Postmaster General is a servant of the people of Canada. He is bound by statute to discharge his duty; if he fails in his duty he is subject to the censure of this parliament. He has now, from his seat in the house, told the people of the country that he plays favourites in the administration of the criminal law of Canada.

Mr. VENIOT: That is absolutely not true; I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. BENNETT: This is the section.

Mr. VENIOT: That section does not prove that I said what the hon. member said I said.

Mr. BENNETT: I am going to say what he said. Sections 364, 365 and 366 deal with the question of theft from post offices. Section 364 reads:

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for life, or for any term not less than three years, who steals,
> (a) a post letter bag; or
> (b) a post letter from a post letter bag or from any post office, or from any officer or person employed in any business of the post office of Canada, or from a mail; or
> (c) a post letter containing any chattel, money or valuable security; or
> (d) any chattel, money or valuable security from or out of a post letter.

It is the duty of the Postmaster General to place the report and the precis of evidence before the law officers of the crown. He is not the law officer of the crown to decide what shall be done. What wrecked Ramsay MacDonald's government? It was wrecked because there was an interference with the administration of law, or there was thought to be one on the part of the law officers of the crown, and on a vote in the house the government was defeated and had to resign. That was in respect to an editor called Campbell.

Mr. POWER: Was there not a letter involved?

Mr. BENNETT: There was, and the Ramsay MacDonald government was destroyed on account of a lesser offence than that which the Postmaster General to-day said he was guilty of in this case. The hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) says: "What?" This is what: The Postmaster General says that an officer of this country was guilty of theft. Did he prosecute him? He says no. When he was asked: Did you put it before the law officers of the crown? he replied: I did not. He said that he exercised his discretion. He used the word "condone." Now he says: "I will do it again." Loud cheers! Now he says: "I will not do it again." Groans! I put this question to the house, and from the house to the country: Is a postmaster general, whose duty is as defined by law, permitted to do what an attorney general in England was not permitted to do? My hon. friend yonder is an eminent member of the legal profession.

Mr. POWER: I am not.

Mr. BENNETT: He remembers Sir Patrick Hastings, the Attorney General, was thought to have interfered slightly with the prosecution of Campbell, and because he did that, the government went out. This country has always been jealous with respect to the administration of law. I know what is going on in other cases and let there be no mistake; before this committee finishes with the Post Office estimates, there will be many other cases discussed. The discussion of these estimates is only starting. This is only one of a long series of matters in which the Postmaster General has marked his inefficiency and incapacity for this high office. This is not my opinion; it is the opinion of the Toronto Globe and of the Farmers' Advocate, a perfectly independent journal, which, in an editorial that came to hand this morning, reviewed his activities. I think, until we get further evidence, until the minister brings down his report, we can let the matter stand.

What is the duty of the Postmaster General? I know I can bear out what his predecessors thought their duty was. Where they had evidence of wrongdoing that might amount to theft, they understood that their duty was not to arrogate to themselves the responsibility but to place the report in the hands of the law officers of the crown, whether it be the crown prosecutor of the county or the law officers of the crown through the Department of Justice, and allow them to say whether there should be a prosecution or not.

I know two cases which were launched in my constituency. It is true they resulted in dismissal because there was not sufficient evidence on which to base a conviction, the evidence being that of an accomplice; but they were launched. Let me ask the Postmaster General: Has he a record of any cases in which theft has been charged against high officials and in which no action has been taken, and where they are still in the employ of the government and not dismissed? This is being treated as a joke, but it is something of the same sort as wrecked a government in England.

Mr. VENIOT: I am not treating it as a joke.

Mr. BENNETT: If one were selfish in one's desires, all one would ask for would be for my hon. friend to continue what he is

doing. That however, is not the desire. The point is not that we may reap some political benefit; but what is more important than all the political benefit there may be, is that the administration of justice should be without suspicion and without the possibility of there being dark passages in the history of judicial processes in this country.

Mr. CANNON: Is it not a fact that in those proceedings in England, to which the hon. member refers, proceedings had been instituted and were then stopped? That is where the trouble came in.

Mr. BENNETT: I said: there was thought to be an interference by the law officers of the crown in the case against Campbell. I referred to that because the Postmaster General put himself in the position of saying: I am going to stop proceedings before they start. I do not think the Solicitor General was present when the Postmaster General used the word "condone." It is the duty of the Solicitor General to advise his colleague and the government. I put this question to him: As a matter of law, is it competent for the Postmaster General, under the provisions of the criminal code, to condone a felony, to say: We will not take proceedings? Does that not rest with the law officers of the crown, whether they be of the county or of the Dominion itself, through the Department of Justice?

Mr. CANNON: There cannot be any such thing as condonation of felony unless proceedings are taken. My hon. friend knows that.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend did not quite mean that, or else he did not understand my question, or else he is not serious. The very essence of the provision of the criminal code is that compromising in order to prevent an offence being prosecuted, is in itself an offence. Perhaps my hon. friend has the code beside him. The difficulty is that the minister is arrogating to himself the position of a judge and of a crown officer. We are not contending that the crown officers may not report against proceedings being taken. There is not one of us who does not know what this responsibility involves, but it is one of the prices we pay for being in public life and it is one of the prices we pay for our citizenship. I know when I was actively engaged in the practice of my profession, I had, in connection with corporations, to deal with exactly the same problem that the Postmaster General had to deal with. I realize in a private company the position is one of extreme difficulty in regard to compromising in the case of offences. I know railway companies that are compelled to prosecute by reason of the responsibility involved. I know the case of a bank where a prosecution was taken and where the accused was convicted and sentenced to four or five years' imprisonment, but in two or three months he was out on ticket-of-leave. That is the executive as distinguished from the administrative side of government. The administrative side of government has to see that the law takes its course. If, after the conviction has been made, the executive sees fit, for reasons that may be good, to lessen the punishment, that is a matter of the exercise of clemency by the executive. There may be extenuating circumstances, but it is distressing, unpleasant, that men who occupy positions of authority, have these disagreeable things to do. I trust some hon. gentlemen read the speech of Mr. Asquith when the case involving Sir Patrick Hastings, Campbell and Ramsay MacDonald came up, because it is a speech every public man might do well to read. It showed how extremely determined people in England were to see that the law was properly administered; that there should be no possible suspicion. Is it putting the Postmaster General in a fair position to have him say: In one case I did not prosecute; in another I did. Suppose it should turn out that in a case in which he did not prosecute a political supporter was involved, and that in a case in which he did prosecute, it was otherwise; would not that put him in a very difficult position, in a highly improper position? I think he will agree that that is so. Under those circumstances I think the minister has indicated certainly a very strange disregard for what we conceive to be his duties. He says: I will do it again. He says: Just because you have said that, you watch how I will administer the law—the inference being: Some of our friends are going to get into trouble.

Mr. VENIOT: No. That is unfair.

Mr. BENNETT: Then why this defiant attitude of saying: "I will do it in the future," in view of what we have said here?

Mr. VENIOT: Because you felt constrained to point out to me what you thought was my duty, and if I am convinced that you are right, I do not intend that you shall in future ever find it necessary to say that I did not carry out my duty in that respect.

Mr. BENNETT: This attitude of mind is so new and novel as to permit us to offer our hearty congratulations to the minister.

Mr. VENIOT: It is a fair and an honest one, at least.

Mr. ADSHEAD: With regard to this item for allowances for postmasters, I was present at the convention of the postmasters last year, and while they appreciated very much the salary increase which the Postmaster General had granted, they felt that he was giving them something with the one hand and taking it away with the other, because the commission which they had received for many years on the sale of postage stamps and money orders was taken away from them. That was a serious cause of complaint, and I would direct the attention of the Postmaster General to it and ask him to restore to the postmasters throughout the rural districts the commission which they formerly received on the sale of postage stamps and money orders.

So far as the Civil Service Commission is concerned, I would be the last to advocate putting the appointment of civil servants and the question of their salaries into the hands of members of parliament, yet rightly or wrongly, I find that there is a great deal of discontent with the decisions of the Civil Service Commission. One class of civil servants, the postal employees, have come to me and asked that they be taken out from under the Civil Service Commission and be administered either through patronage or direct through the Postmaster General. I have had another class come to me who felt satisfied with the Civil Service Commission, and who said that under no circumstances did they want to be taken out from under it. I do not know whether it would be well to have a commission to investigate the Civil Service Commission, but some of their decisions have been unsatisfactory to a considerable number of the civil servants.

In regard to the postmasters in the rural districts, I would ask the Postmaster General to restore the commission on the sale of postage stamps and money orders so that the rural postmasters will really be getting the salary increase which they were promised.

Mr. GEARY: I hope the point raised by the hon. member for North Winnipeg will not be passed by. Similar representations have been made to many of us; I am not alone in that. I expect every hon. member has had representations made to him and has studied the question in regard to the pay of men such as those to whom the hon. member for North Winnipeg has referred. I would ask the Postmaster General to indicate the view of the government so that we may see if there is not some way of getting over the difficulty and getting something for these underpaid men. It is all very well to put up the Civil Service Commission as a buffer, but as I understand the commission's attitude, it is that if they raised the pay of this class they might have to raise the pay of another class. Well, if the other man's pay is such that it ought to be raised, that is no answer. In some way we should see that justice is done to these men, who are shamefully underpaid at the present time. For instance, some were supposed to get an increase of $120 or $240, I forget which, but as it worked out, when you take the cost of living bonus into account, they are really receiving a lower rate of pay than they were before the increase was granted. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this house should take up this matter, and in some way or other find itself able to do justice to these men. If the only objection in the minds of the Civil Service Commission is that if they give these men fair play, they will have to give the other men fair play, it seems to me the house might remedy the whole thing by giving consideration to a plan for meeting the situation.

There are men receiving $75, $80 and $110 a month. That is not enough for a man to live on. This government should have no man doing a class of work which is worth a living wage to whom it does not pay a living wage, and there are as well men in higher grades who seem plainly entitled to more pay than they are getting. I would ask the minister to take this matter up a little more fully in the house and explain the exact situation, and perhaps we may be able to find a solution that will do justice to these men. I shall have more to say when the minister has answered me.

Mr. McGIBBON: There is a case I want to bring before parliament and the country which I think presents the most disgraceful exhibition of partisanship that has ever been exhibited in the Dominion of Canada. I refer to the dismissal of the postmaster in the small village of Uffington, a man who had efficiently discharged the duties of this position for thirty-one years, a man who is crippled and has not walked since he was five years old, and who to-day is seventy-one. He was kicked out of office, so to speak, by this government, without even the formality of a notice, and a young able-bodied man was appointed in his place. This aged man who was dismissed has now to depend upon the charity of the people of the county. I make this indictment against the Postmaster General because he is the high executioner of officials in this country. I have asked for the correspondence. I have gone through it

as it had been brought down by the department, presumably official and presumably complete, and there is not one single charge made in all this correspondence against that man. He drew a small salary of $220 a year, not very much it is true, but still enough to keep him from poverty. I think I can say this on behalf of the Postmaster General, that he acted in this case without a knowledge of the facts. I sent him a wire to that effect at the time, stating that I did not believe he would be a party to this man's dismissal if he knew the facts. There has been sent to the government a petition signed by practically every resident who gets his mail at that post office, but the government has refused to reopen the question and to-day this old man is dependent upon the cold charity of his fellow citizens of the township. I say that when political partisanship is carried to such an extent that a man who has given the best years of his life to the service of his country is kicked out on the street, after thirty-one years of service, it is a disgrace to the government of Canada and a disgrace to any department of the government.

Mr. VENIOT: Was that the Uffington post office?

Mr. McGIBBON: Yes. I could excuse the dismissal if some restitution had been made, but no restitution has been made although as I say, a petition has been sent to the government signed by practically every individual who gets his mail at the post office. Worse than that, sir, there were three returned soldiers living in the municipality, any one of whom could have been appointed to this position if necessary. They informed me that each of them offered to take the position and hand over the salary to the late postmaster in order that he might enjoy the remaining few years of his life in ease. That was not done. The post office was moved a quarter of a mile away from the centre of population, and the position given to a young able-bodied man who is quite capable of making a living in any field of endeavour that he may select.

I feel I should be derelict in my duty to my riding and also to the principles of the Conservative party if I did not bring this case before parliament and ask the Postmaster General, even at this late date, to give some redress. Surely the poverty-stricken public servants of this country who give the youth and the mid-day of their lives to the service of their country should not be kicked out in their old age and left to the charge of their fellow-citizens. Again I ask the Postmaster General to redress this wrong, and I ask also that this house urge him to take appropriate action.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. member for Muskoka has painted a very sad picture of the condition of the former postmaster as a result of his being thrown out on the street in his old age. I must admit the old gentleman was a cripple, but when my attention was drawn to certain conditions in connection with the office that fact was not known to me. However, I doubt very much whether I would have desisted in the course I took had his condition been made known to me. My hon. friend perhaps has not all the record of this office. For years past irregularities had taken place. I am doing now what perhaps charity should prevent me from doing, but when I am forced with my back to the wall, in self-defence I think I am justified in this action. I hate to have to expose these things to the public, but I am compelled to say that that man on different occasions was found short in his accounts. Irregularities were found in his office—

Mr. McGIBBON: Might I ask the minister a question?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. McGIBBON: Was that the reason he was dismissed?

Mr. VENIOT: That was one of the reasons.

Mr. McGIBBON: I will answer that later.

Mr. VENIOT: That was one of the reasons, together with complaints that the office was not in a centrally located place.

Mr. HANSON: That is an old complaint.

Mr. VENIOT: It was suggested that the office should be shifted to the larger business centre of the district. Those considerations combined were what drove me to make the dismissal. My hon. friend says there is a salary of some few hundred dollars attached to the office.

Mr. McGIBBON: There is a salary of $220.

Mr. VENIOT: It was not at that time; it was only $60. It has been raised, I think, to $100 in the ordinary way. I find the total revenue of the office is only $252.

Mr. McGIBBON: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. VENIOT: One moment. I am pointing out that the revenue is only $252, therefore the salary could not be $220. Now, Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to bring forth such evidence as this. It is not my fault;

I have to do it in self-defence. Hon. gentlemen who are attacking me on these changes in office must take the responsibility. On the one hand, I am accused of not wishing to prosecute this one or that one for theft; on the other hand, I am condemned because I am not leaving in office men who are found short in their accounts. Let me explain that I do not use the word "shortage" as synonymous with the word "theft." There are many cases of shortages where the postmaster is thoroughly honest, but a continuation of these shortages shows that the postmaster is not administering his office as it should be administered, and consequently he should not be left in charge.

Mr. McGIBBON: Would the Postmaster General say that this postmaster was dishonest?

Mr. VENIOT: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. McGIBBON: I am asking the question.

Mr. VENIOT: I said there were many cases in which irregularities could not be treated as dishonesty.

Mr. McGIBBON: Was he dismissed for dishonesty?

Mr. VENIOT: I did not say that. I said one of the reasons for his dismissal—

Mr. McGIBBON: I am asking for information, and I am entitled to it.

Mr. VENIOT: I will give the answer. One of the reasons for his dismissal was irregularities. I pointed out that on occasions he was found short in his accounts, and he made good the shortage.

Mr. McGIBBON: Will the minister be good enough to read the correspondence bearing on that?

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. McGIBBON: I have the whole correspondence before me, and there is no reference on the file to any such thing.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman will find out that there is.

Mr. McGIBBON: There is not such a thing in this file.

Mr. HANSON: It is an incorrect return.

Mr. STEVENS: The old practice—a deleted return.

Mr. McGIBBON: Is the hon. minister through?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. McGIBBON: Then my first complaint is that this house has been deceived by the return tabled. I say any minister that would so deceive this house is not worthy of his office. I demand that the Postmaster General lay upon the table the document from which he quoted. It is a rule of the house. I make that demand, Mr. Chairman, and I ask you if I am not within my rights.

Mr. VENIOT: My hon. friend is within his rights.

Mr. McGIBBON: Very well. Then I want to know why that document was not in the return ordered by this house. Its omission is absolutely in defiance of the order of this house. I am going to insist as a matter of right that every file tabled shall be an honest and truthful file. The file produced is not an honest and truthful file if the minister's statement is correct. But let me go a step further. Again I ask him, as I asked him a moment ago, if this postmaster was dismissed for dishonesty.

Mr. VENIOT: I gave the reply. I said the word "dishonesty" could not be applied in many cases to the word "irregularities," but that this postmaster had been found irregular in his accounts.

Mr. McGIBBON: And that was one of the reasons why he was dismissed?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: How long ago?

Mr. VENIOT: This has been standing three years, and with the complaints coming in from people as to the location of the office touching—

Mr. HANSON: Was that against the postmaster?

Mr. VENIOT: No. There were complaints as to the location, that the large tourist business carried on in that section necessitated that the site be changed, the old office not being centrally located. In view of that I went into the whole record, and finding these other evidences against the gentleman I thought it was time that the change should be made.

Mr. BOYS: Was an investigation held in connection with it?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, the inspector held an investigation and reported.

Mr. BOYS: Surely the minister will admit that the report should have been part of the return.

Mr. VENIOT: I certainly do, and I cannot understand how it is not.

Mr. STEVENS: The same as happened yesterday in another case, precisely—deliberately left out.

Mr. VENIOT: I may say to the committee that I did have a conversation with the hon. gentleman touching the matter. He will remember. I called him aside and told him what the report would reveal; I said the report would reveal shortages. I went further and referred to another matter not connected with the post office and which I do not wish to mention here; it was between the hon. gentleman and myself. I told him I would bring the returns if he so desired, but that these returns would show that the postmaster had been found short on certain occasions. Now if that is not there it certainly is not my fault, and I will see why the full report has not been brought down.

Mr. McGIBBON: The Postmaster General has said either too much or too little. He has indicated very clearly to-day that this postmaster was dismissed on account of shortages in his accounts.

Mr. VENIOT: I said that was one of the reasons.

Mr. McGIBBON: One of the reasons, very well. I will take the Postmaster General at his word and I will read to the committee a letter signed by him dated September 26, 1928.

Rev. John Coburn,
Room 518, Wesley Buildings,
299 Queen St. West,
Toronto 2, Ontario.

My Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of yours of the 25th instant with reference to the change of the postmastership at Uffington, Ontario, and note your representations in favour of Mr. Buckler, who, you state, is a cripple and has been so from his birth; and you further state that he has given entire satisfaction to the whole community and this action will not only inflict injustice upon him but will very greatly displease a large number of people.

For your information, I may say that it has been represented to this department that the location of the post office was in a private residence and was very inconvenient for both the residents of the place and also for a large number of tourists who visit Uffington. It became necessary therefore, in the interests of the public, to have this office placed in a better location.

I want the committee to note the next sentence:

This is the only reason for the change.

Am I to believe the Postmaster General when he dictated that letter or am I to believe him to-day? That is the question to which I want an answer. I do not believe that any man can successfully lay a charge of dishonesty against that postmaster. The Postmaster General cannot do so. I ask therefore: Was the Postmaster General telling the truth when he dictated that letter, or is he telling the truth to me this afternoon when he is on his defence? I ask for a reply.

Mr. VENIOT: I was, yes, to a certain extent telling the whole truth, just the same as I told the hon. gentleman himself privately; I did not wish to divulge to the public the shortcomings of this postmaster.

Mr. McGIBBON: I am demanding it.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not wish to divulge his shortcomings in a letter to a private individual; and of course, if I am to be condemned for that and an attempt made to prove I am lying—

Mr. RYCKMAN: Why did you say it was the only ground? You did not have to say so.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not want to tell the gentleman the other ground.

Mr. McGIBBON: My duty to my constituents is to voice their grievances in this house. Much as I love the Postmaster General I do not pretend to be derelict in my duty. I want him to give to the committee any evidence he has as to the dishonesty of this postmaster.

Mr. VENIOT: I will give it; I will have the return.

Mr. McGIBBON: I want it now.

Mr. VENIOT: You cannot get it just now.

Mr. McGIBBON: Then I say it is not in existence. Furthermore, it is not true.

Mr. LETELLIER: Withdraw.

Mr. STEVENS: Withdraw nothing.

Mr. VENIOT: I want the hon. gentleman to go on record as making these statements. I did not say withdraw. I want him to go on record.

Mr. McGIBBON: If the Postmaster General thinks he can put anything over me like that he is mistaken. I am here to see that my people get a fair deal, which they have never got from the Postmaster General. And I am not through yet; I have other cases as well.

Mr. PARENT: You are welcome.

Mr. BENNETT: I am greatly interested in what the Postmaster General has said be-

cause it affects the whole public life of Canada. He reads a letter in which he says, "This is the only reason I take this course," and he now says it is untrue. He knew it was untrue at the time he wrote it.

Mr. VENIOT: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. My hon. friend said that the reason he wrote that letter in that way was that he did not desire to make public the real reason, the man's shortcomings.

Mr. McINTOSH: He simply wanted to protect the man as far as he could.

Mr. VENIOT: Who would not in charity?

Mr. BENNETT: The Postmaster General talks about charity. It covers a multitude of sins, but—

Mr. VENIOT: I don't see any of it over there.

Mr. BENNETT: But that is not the point. The Postmaster General is laughing, but it strikes at the foundation of our institutions if I cannot believe what a minister of the crown writes me with respect to a transaction—when he comes to parliament and says, "I did not tell the truth because I wanted to protect someone." That is the whole story.

Mr. VENIOT: That is not the sense in which it should be taken.

Mr. BENNETT: But that is the story. The minister writes a letter to the Rev. Mr. Coburn of Toronto, and in a single sentence he makes the statement, "This is the only reason why this man was dismissed." Now he says that was not the reason at all; he says the reason for the man's dismissal was a shortage in his accounts.

Mr. VENIOT: No, one of the reasons.

Mr. BENNETT: One of the reasons, then. Therefore when he said "only" he was stating what was not true. And he says it was not true. I ask him, I ask the house, I ask the Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon) whether a falsehood of that character can be justified—because that is the correct term.

Mr. POWER: The Solicitor General is a law officer of the crown and not keeper of the Postmaster General's conscience.

Mr. BENNETT: Keeper only of the privy purse and not of the king's conscience. But my hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power) will admit that it is a rather serious thing. Suppose the people of Canada could get a sort of photograph of the minister's loud laugh with respect to this matter concerning a falsehood told to a minister of the gospel for the purpose of trying to protect someone. That is the position now and he justifies it. That is the position he takes, and I am perfectly content that the people should know it.

Mr. McGIBBON: I want the minister to tell the committee the extent to which this man was short in his accounts, and whether he made them up or did not make them up.

Mr. VENIOT: I said he made them up.

Mr. McGIBBON: To what extent was he short in his accounts and how often?

Mr. VENIOT: $142.59.

Mr. McGIBBON: On more than one occasion, or is that the total?

Mr. PARENT: You could not get any more out of the revenue of the post office.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Will the minister tell us—

Mr. McGIBBON: I have asked a question: How many times was he short in his accounts? I think the house should remember that in many of these little country post offices all the revenue goes into one little box, from which all payments are made and from which the postmaster also deducts his commission, so that if the inspector walks in on a certain day and does not find the amount of cash in the till which should be there, it is hardly fair to say that the postmaster is short in his cash and is dishonest.

An hon. MEMBER: He did not say he was dishonest.

Mr. McGIBBON: Then if he was not dishonest why should he be dismissed for dishonesty?

Mr. POWER: If he cannot keep his accounts he is incompetent.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would point out that he was considered quite competent for thirty-one years under Grit and Tory administrations, until the present Postmaster General took office. However, I have asked for some information and I think I am entitled to receive it. I want to know how often this man was found short in his accounts and whether he has made up the money or is reluctant to make it up.

Mr. VENIOT: He made it up in part. He was to send the money to the bank the next day; he sent only $110 and on June 2 he made up the other $20.

Mr. STEVENS: In what year?

Mr. VENIOT: In the year 1927, and that left a shortage of $12.51, which I understand was made up later on.

Mr. McGIBBON: When was he dismissed?

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot give the exact date.

Mr. McGIBBON: Then I will tell the Postmaster General: It was last fall, a year after he was found temporarily short in his cash.

Mr. STEVENS: Was that information upon the file?

Mr. McGIBBON: No, none of this information was on the file, although it should have been there. I say a minister is not playing fair with public servants when he comes to the house with an excuse of this kind. In the first place, if the Postmaster General was convinced that this postmaster was dishonest he should have dismissed him at the time, but this man was left in office for a year and a half, when he was dismissed at the instance of the defeated Liberal candidate in that riding. That correspondence is not on the file either. I say that when a minister comes to the house and tries in this way to justify the dismissal of a public servant a year and a half after he has been found temporarily short in his accounts; when a minister blackmails that official in this parliament and throughout the country in this way, he is not playing fair with his great office. I say that the public officials of Canada have a right to have their reputations as well as their positions protected by ministers of the crown. If the Postmaster General were consistent and honest, and if he believed what he has said here to-day, he would have dismissed this official at the time and prosecuted him in the courts. Having done neither of these things I say it ill becomes him or any other minister to come to parliament two years later with the excuse he has brought here to-day.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he would answer my question as to whether he has considered giving back to the rural postmasters their commissions on postal orders and postal notes.

Mr. VENIOT: That commission has not been taken off in the way my hon. friend seems to understand it. The commission on postal orders, postal notes and stamp sales has been bulked and raised from 50 per cent to 70 per cent. In some cases we have discovered that this has been working some injustice, and we are now regulating the matter as we receive the returns. No injustice will be done the postmasters after the procedure is all ironed out.

Mr. IRVINE: The matter to which the hon. member for East Calgary has just referred is one in which I am particularly interested. I know some rural postmasters have declared that they have suffered somewhat under under the regulations made last year, and I am glad to hear the minister say that he intends to look into the matter and straighten it out. Most of these postmasters give excellent service to the public; on the whole I think they are perhaps underpaid, and I am glad the minister will take up the question.

Mr. VENIOT: The commission is 70 per cent on the first $1,000 of revenue, with a minimum salary of $100; 30 per cent on revenue from $1,000 to $10,000 and 20 per cent on revenue over $10,000. That is the present scale for rural postmasters. If this scale does not give fair play, matters will be adjusted the moment we are notified, and we are considering this question to-day.

Mr. FRASER: Could the Postmaster General tell us the effect of the change of regulations?

Mr. VENIOT: I think the previous rate was 4 cents per order; we have done away with that.

Mr. FRASER: What was the charge for such an order?

Mr. VENIOT: My deputy tells me that an order up to $10 costs 5 cents.

Mr. FRASER: And of that 5 cents the postmaster received 4 cents? Then what change has been made?

Mr. VENIOT: The commissions have been bulked. The former commission on stamp sales was 50 per cent, and when the new regulations took effect the commission on postal orders, notes and stamps was raised to 70 per cent.

Mr. FRASER: Then the previous commission on postal notes was 80 per cent.

Mr. VENIOT: The postmaster would receive 40 cents for a $100 order.

Mr. FRASER: I am afraid the minister does not see the point.

Mr. VENIOT: I see the point but I cannot give my hon. friend the answer just now; it requires some figuring, and I cannot do that mentally.

Mr. FRASER: That very point has been brought to my attention on several occasions; it has been intimated that the amount received by the postmasters has been reduced notwithstanding the fact that the commission has been raised from 50 per cent to 70 per cent on all revenues, so it is not, as the Postmaster General would lead the public to believe, an increase of 20 per cent in their commission.

Mr. VENIOT: We received some complaints along those very lines, which have been or are now being looked into. We received some definite and specific complaints from postmasters claiming that their salaries had not been increased because of the action in increasing the percentage. When their specific cases were laid before the department it was shown quite clearly that they were mistaken. I do not say that it will not affect the post offices with revenues of $10,000 and upward, or even those with revenues from $1,000 to $10,000, but it does not affect those below $1,000. All the cases which have been represented to us are the subject of investigation, and if it is found that that percentage does not give them what was intended, then another system will be adopted which will give them what they are entitled to.

Mr. FRASER: Following up the argument of a moment ago, that the postmasters claim that their salaries have not been increased under the new regulations, there is another thing which has been brought to my attention in connection with the rental of post office boxes. I believe the revenue which the postmasters derive from these boxes has also been reduced, and the two things put together make a substantial reduction in their revenue.

Mr. VENIOT: The rental from the boxes in rural post offices goes to the postmaster; we do not get anything.

Mr. FRASER: The rate of rental was lowered from $4 per year to $2.50, or something like that.

Mr. VENIOT: We increased the rental of boxes at certain places. I think I stated to the house during the session of 1928, in answer to a question as to why we had not increased the rentals in certain places, that the rentals on boxes in two hundred places were below the general rental throughout the Dominion. In order to put those places on a uniform basis, we increased the rate. In some places where the rate was $2, we made it $3; in other places where it was $3, we made it $4, and so on. There has been no reduction in box rentals that I know of.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. HANSON: The rental at some places was $10.

Mr. VENIOT: That is for the large double box. There must be something wrong with that statement that the rentals have been decreased.

Mr. FRASER: I do not think I am wrong. I am sorry I have no correspondence regarding the matter. I had several discussions with one of the postmasters in my constituency, and he pointed this matter out to me. I have nothing in writing so I am rather at a loss.

Mr. VENIOT: I can assure the hon. member that there has been no reduction.

Mr. FRASER: On my side, I can assure the minister that there has been a reduction, but I am sorry that I cannot prove my case.

Mr. VENIOT: I will go into it and if I discover the hon. member is right I will let him know.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of this discussion my colleague from North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) introduced a matter which I consider to be of very great importance. Particular cases were brought up and the attention of the Postmaster General was diverted from this particular matter. The hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Geary) came back to the same question, but before he could get an answer some special cases came up again and attention was again diverted.

I refer to the salaries which are paid to postal workers. It is very generally acknowledged that these salaries are not as high as they should be. This is not a matter which concerns a few individuals, as do the cases which were brought up, however important they may have been, but it is a matter which concerns thousands and tens of thousands of employees of this government. I would suggest further that it is a matter of very great interest to the citizens generally, because there is not a class of civil employees who come into such close contact with the general public as do the postal workers.

There are two aspects of this matter which we should consider. The first is: What are the services of these postal workers worth? I submit that they are doing work of an extremely important and responsible character. There are occasional instances where theft occurs, but I am glad to say that they are only occasional; I wonder that they are not more frequent. I do not say that because a man is being paid a low salary he should yield to temptation, but when a man is en-

gaged in a responsible position he should not be subjected to the temptations to which the low paid postal worker is subjected. These men are required to collect money on their routes; they should be paid with some regard to such responsibilities. Further, there is an immense amount of detail connected with their routine work. We are all accustomed to receiving our letters with great regularity, and it is remarkable how efficient the service is. I submit that the men who are so largely responsible for that efficiency of service are not being paid accordingly.

When the matter is considered from the angle of what is required in order to allow a man to live decently, I think we must admit that these men are not being paid a decent living wage. There are individuals receiving as low as $75 and $80 per month, and large numbers who receive less than $100 per month. I do not think that anyone in this house will say that $100 per month is a living wage for a man with a family to support. A large number of these postal employees are married men, and on account of having a steady position many of them have established homes. They should be paid sufficient salaries to enable them to occupy a decent position in the community.

I have not the statistics at hand, but they have been placed on Hansard again and again and no object would be served by having them placed on Hansard once more. We all know the range of salaries, and we all know how low those salaries are.

I think the member for South Toronto is quite right when he insists that the government should be a model employer. It is not even up to the average. When one considers the responsibilities which are placed upon the ordinary postal workers, the government is much less a model employer. I am afraid that in many instances the low salaries received by the postal workers is apt to lower the general wages paid in the community. I know of particular cases in my own constituency where postal workers have been receiving less than allowances being granted by the charity organizations of the city. A condition like that is nothing less than a disgrace, and should not be allowed to continue —simply because there is no group that has the political strength effectively to demand the rights of these poorly paid workers.

The Post Office department is a self-supporting department, in fact it is the only revenue producing department in connection with the government. Why, then, should we be niggardly in dealing with the people who are largely responsible for producing this very large revenue? The Postmaster General has had this called to his attention again and again, and he tries to hide behind the Civil Service Commission. I do not think that is fair. Some of us have been very strongly in favour of a civil service commission. We have tried our best to prevent any return to the old patronage system, but if the Civil Service Commission is in the wrong, we should right that wrong and force action on the part of the commission. As far as I can see the Postmaster General is simply making this an excuse. Again and again this matter has see-sawed backward and forward between the Postmaster General and the Civil Service Commission, until we do not know just where the responsibility lies. The other day we had the case of the professional and technical officials of the government; the government refused to take the advice of the Civil Service Commission. Perhaps they did right, but the fact is that they refused to take the advice of the Civil Service Commission and when the commission did not advise in the way the government liked, the government took the responsibility of appointing a commission. That commission was announced the other day and I presume its report will largely override the position taken by the Civil Service Commission.

My colleague, the hon. member for North Winnipeg, urged this afternoon: if it is necessary or if it is possible or if it is advisable to take such action in the case of technical officials, might it not be done in the case of these poorly paid employees? I do not think the Postmaster General can escape that responsibility. In reply he simply says that he had not the sole responsibility: that the cabinet must act. He is a member of the cabinet, and if he is in earnest about securing higher wages for the men in the employ of his department, he will ask the cabinet to do what was done in the case of the technicians. There is no reason why he should not do so. A commission could be appointed, or if the minister were in earnest the matter could be otherwise dealt with, by the government itself. I would therefore ask again the question which the Postmaster General has not seen fit to answer: Does he regard the action of the Civil Service Commission as final? Does he approve the action of the Civil Service Commission in refusing to raise salaries? I would like to have an answer to that question, and then I have one more.

Mr. VENIOT: I think I laid on the table of the house the other day the correspondence in connection with that matter, and it will be found that, in reply to the letter of the Civil Service Commission stating that they

could not see their way clear to change their decision, I expressed my regret that such a worthy class as those postal officials, whose class had been seeking readjustment of salaries, had not been differently dealt with.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then, as I understand the matter, the Postmaster General admits that the salaries now being paid are not sufficient?

Mr. VENIOT: I said so. I would not otherwise have recommended an increase.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Further, he regrets the position taken by the Civil Service Commission. Then I ask: Will the Postmaster General, in the case of the men in the employ of his department, do what was done in regard to the technical men of the civil service? Is he prepared to do that?

Mr. VENIOT: I have no answer to that.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Postmaster General shakes his head. Then I have a very slight regard for the interest the Postmaster General has in the matter, and I think we have to discount very largely the protestations he has made so far.

Mr. HEAPS: I would like the Postmaster General to state explicitly whether or not he is prepared to follow the precedent set by the Minister of Finance and appoint a commission, or committee, or board under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, to inquire into the salaries of the postal employees. He can say yes or no, so that we shall have it recorded in Hansard.

Mr. VENIOT: I think it is unfair for the hon. gentleman to ask me to give an answer to that. It is a question of policy with the government, and I do not think any one minister could give an answer in that way.

Mr. HEAPS: At an earlier stage of this discussion, the Postmaster General said that the Minister of Finance was responsible for his actions and that the Postmaster General was responsible for his own. In other words, the Postmaster General did not wish to assume any responsibility for the appointment of the commission appointed by the Minister of Finance. If that be the case, then he assumed his full responsibility for his actions in his own department. Why is he trying to shunt that responsibility on to the whole cabinet? I am quite willing to allow the item to stand over until he has consulted his colleagues, if he wishes to do so.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May we ask if the minister is prepared to make that recommendation to the cabinet?

Mr. VENIOT: I will consider it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We have asked a definite question and I do not think an unreasonable one. The minister has stated that the salaries now being paid are inadequate and that the Civil Service Commission is the cause of the difficulty. Is he prepared to take action and recommend to the cabinet such a course as that suggested?

Mr. VENIOT: All I can say is that I think the hon. gentlemen ought to give me some little time to consider the matter.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would ask that the item be held over till the minister has considered the matter.

Mr. MacLAREN: Will the Postmaster General define the term "postal helper"? It is not clear to me what class or classes of men it includes. For example, does it include letter carriers?

Mr. VENIOT: Postal helpers are those who come into the service and begin, so to speak, at the foot of the ladder. We call them postal helpers in the city and town post offices. There is a pool, as it were, there, and from those postal helpers are taken the men who become letter carriers and so forth.

Mr. STEVENS: Does that include sorters?

Mr. VENIOT: Sorters may be taken from there by way of promotion, but generally from the pool go the porters, letter carriers and so on by way of promotion.

Mr. MacLAREN: Then the term "postal helper" does not include a letter carrier? Is that correct?

Mr. VENIOT: The letter carrier would once upon a time have been a postal helper.

Mr. MacLAREN: But not as such?

Mr. VENIOT: No, he would be promoted from postal helper to letter carrier.

Mr. CLARK: I would like to suggest to the minister not only that he let this item stand, but that he withdraw his estimates for the time being. It appears, to me at least, that the minister has only to do with political partisanship. Here we have a matter of government policy and the minister says that he cannot speak in regard to policy. Surely this is the first time that a minister responsible for a department has come before the house

and stated that he has no power to speak on matters of policy. Yet he seems to have full power to indulge in dismissals and refusals to accept nominees sent to him by the Civil Service Commission. He does not hesitate to disregard the law as it stands on the statute book, but when it comes down to being a responsible minister, responsible to this house and to the people of Canada, responsible for providing a decent livelihood for his own employees, he tells us that he cannot speak for the government in such matters.

Mr. STEVENS: Who can, then?

Mr. CLARK: If the Postmaster General cannot, I think we should invite the acting leader of the government, in the absence of the Prime Minister to tell the house what is the government's policy in this regard? The minister tells us that the postal workers in this country are underpaid. If he has come to that conclusion, he has probably known it for two years, if not longer. He comes to this house to-day with that admission. Furthermore, he came to the house two or three days ago and admitted that it was possible to deal with such a situation because in a similar instance where the Civil Service Commission had failed to deal equitably, in the view of the government, with another section of the civil service, the government determined upon a different course. Here is a much worse case, in my opinion. It involves a very large body of civil servants in this country, the most poorly paid of all the civil servants. They are doing a very responsible work for the benefit of everyone of us as citizens of this country. I believe it is the duty of the government to take this matter in hand and to see that these civil servants are equitably dealt with and if it is proven conclusively to the government that they are not being fairly dealt with, not being paid a living wage, then steps should be taken immediately to deal fairly with them. If the minister cannot inform the house now how they are to be dealt with, I suggest not only that this item stand over, but in view of the spectacle we have had in this house during the last two or three days of the minister's incompetence and political partisanship, that all the post office estimates be allowed to stand until we can get a minister in the department who can answer in a responsible way for the department.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to be on my feet too often, but I think it is worth my while to reply to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I want him to understand this: Any policy which the government lays down in connection with the administration of the Post Office Department I am prepared to take the responsibility of carrying out. The question that has been brought up this afternoon arose in this way. One hon. gentleman wanted to know if in view of the fact that the Civil Service Commission had refused to recognize the recommendation which I had made on behalf of increased salaries for postal helpers, postal clerks, and so on, I would guarantee or promise to adopt some policy in that connection such as was adopted in connection with the technical and professional men. To that I replied that was a policy for the government to determine. There has been no policy determined upon in that respect so far as I know, and for that reason I said that as Postmaster General I was not able to speak for the government as to whether or not they would extend that policy to other departments. That is the whole situation. There is no attempt on my part to shirk responsibility or to excuse my actions in the department on the ground of the non-compliance of the Civil Service Commission in the recommendation that I made to increase the salaries of the civil servants that we are dealing with at the present moment.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We have a curious triangle here. We have, first of all, the Postmaster General. On the other side, we have the Civil Service Commission. Apparently divided authority! No one knows who is ultimately responsible. No one will face the issue. The Postmaster General, in an attempt to escape blame, now suggests a third party, and that is the government. Apparently he does not and cannot speak for the government. He dissociates himself more or less from responsibility for governmental action. So we have the three parties: The Postmaster General, in one corner; the Civil Service Commission, in another corner, and the government in a third corner. We would like to know how to get at this puzzle.

Mr. POWER: Perhaps I can help the hon. member. If he will help me to abolish the Civil Service Commission, we will then have only two parties instead of three.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not think that is the solution, and with all due thanks to the hon. member. I would suggest that it is the Postmaster General who will have to answer this question. If the Civil Service Commission has to be abolished, if it is incompetent, if it is failing to function, let us get rid of it, or at least let us change the

personnel. We hear a great deal about responsible government. If there is an absolute division of responsibility as between the Civil Service Commission and the government and a deadlock has ensued, I think there is not the slightest doubt where we all stand for the government must be supreme, and we will have to hold the government to its responsibility.

Mr. POWER: That is good sound doctrine.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, it is, and I want to hold the Postmaster General to that to-day. As it is now, the government declines to assume its responsibility and simply keeps the Civil Service Commision as a sort of shield behind which it hides. I do not think that is fair to the Civil Service Commission. It seems to me that if the commission is in the wrong in this matter, the government has to assume the responsibility of setting the commission right, and it has actually taken steps to do that in this other case of the professional and technical officials in the civil service. The least the government can do is to take similar steps or such other action as may commend itself to the government, in the case we have now before us. But we must locate responsibility more closely than that. When it comes to post office estimates the Postmaster General speaks for the government; that is generally considered to be the case, and I think the Postmaster General is in a position even to-day to say whether the government will take action along this line. Certainly he is in a position to tell the house if he is prepared to make such a recommendation. He can clear his own skirts to that extent, by telling the house that he is prepared to do in his department what has been done in other departments. He refuses to do that. The whole country should know that it is not the Civil Service Commission that is finally responsible; it is the government. If the government will assert its control over the Civil Service Commission in this matter, I will back up the government to the extent that it is necessary. I am sure others will do the same. I am one of those who believe in the principle of the Civil Service Commission, but if the Civil Service Commission has become useless, if it has become an obstruction to progress, I urge that we get rid of it and let the responsibility rest with the government.

So I submit that the Postmaster General is confusing, or attempting to confuse, the issue here by dividing the responsibility as between himself and the government and between himself and the Civil Service Commission. We have a right to have this matter cleared up, and I urge again that this item should be held over until such time as we can have a definite reply from the government as to what remedy it proposes to adopt in what has become a very serious state of affairs.

Mr. STEVENS: Last year and the year before, together with other members of the house, I discussed this question. To-day my hon. friends to my left have discussed it with considerable vigour and certainly with great intelligence and fairness. The minister treats their appeal with silent contempt, in part at least. He has given some answers of a very irresponsible character, answers that one might accept on the hustings, perhaps, from an experienced campaigner speaking before an audience which had no knowledge of the facts and no particular right to demand them. But I want to call the attention of the minister to this fact—and I notice he is paying no attention to me; I will direct my remarks to the Minister of Finance, who is leading the house. If the Prime Minister were in his seat I would direct my remarks to him. I am going to point out to the government that this great body of civil servants in an official document made this statement. I am going to read the whole statement in a few minutes in order to give a resumé of the history of this problem, but first let me read this passage:

> In view of the above facts, are not the employees of the government thus affected justified in their dissatisfaction with the present machinery, or lack of it, for adjusting salaries?

They say there has been no response to their demands, and they continue:

> We look to you as an elected representative of the people to use every legitimate means at your command with a view to remedying the conditions outlined.

That is one of the most sacred rights of any citizen of this country—to appeal to the elected representatives of the people to present his just claims before the government or before parliament. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the most sacred right that we enjoy as members of parliament is that when the house is voting money for the running of the king's government the people's grievances shall be first adjusted. Now, this is a grievance; it is a serious grievance. The minister, I am justified in saying, ignores it. He assumes an attitude of indifference—I will put it that way. To what? To the request and demands—apparently justified, because he himself admits that he recommended them—to the request and just demands of a large body of the civil service.

I have before me an appeal, signed by Mr. Knowles and Mr. Gardner, national president and national secretary respectively of the Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada, with offices in Regina. This appeal is dated last year, and in it they present their case. I think it would be rather interesting if the committee would follow the sequence of events in connection with this matter. They say:

We are taking this method of protesting against the very dilatory and unsatisfactory operation of the Civil Service Act in respect to salary adjustments.

They are not complaining of the act. They say that the act is not being fairly and properly administered, and that they are not securing their rights under it it because of dilatoriness on the part of someone. Then they go on:

Our experience during a number of years follows, and in both the reason for our attitude and for your information.

Then they proceed, and I call the attention of the committee to this:

In June, 1923, the parliamentary committee appointed to inquire into the operation of chapter 12, 8 and 9 George V, an act respecting the civil service of Canada, reported as follows:

"Your committee therefore recommends that immediately after reorganization has taken place salary revision and adjustments be proceeded with without delay. Pending this revision the bonus to be continued."

At the commencement of 1924 fiscal year no provision was made for revision of salaries and the bonus, admittedly a necessity under the existing low salary ranges, instead of continuing as recommended was reduced 33 per cent, creating considerable agitation among civil servants generally and the lower grades particularly. The government responded by requesting the Civil Service Commission to revise salaries, commencing with the Post Office Department.

On the completion of such revision it was found that instead of removing the cause of the agitation, namely, loss of remuneration, it aggravated the loss and in a number of instances allowed less remuneration than after the bonus reduction was in operation. Protests from all over the Dominion leading to the dislocation of the postal service in some parts was one result, and the following declaration of the government policy was another:

"The government's policy is that when the Civil Service Commission has submitted its report upon the salaries for the entire civil service that opportunity will be given to the representatives of the employees of the Post Office Department or in other departments of the government who have objections to file against the salary revision proposed by the commission, to fully present their views to a sub-committee of the government and to discuss such matters of differences as fully as may be necessary to insure a thorough understanding, and it is hoped a final and satisfactory agreement on the points in dispute."

That is the quotation of the government's own declaration. Then the letter goes on:

Accordingly representatives of the employees met a sub-committee of the government on June 5, 1925, giving their evidence in writing. The sub-committee of the government did not attempt to come to any agreement, contenting themselves with listening to the evidence submitted and asking questions, subsequently notifying the delegation that no decision could be arrived at till the balance of the civil service had been consulted.

On September 14, 1925, an order in council known as P.C. 1644, wherein the minister recommends that such report be forwarded to the Civil Service Commision with a view to having that body make an upward revision of the salaries in question. Despite frequent appeals of the staff side the report of the revision was not brought before parliament until 1927, allotting a widely advertised flat rate increase of $120 with certain exceptions, the exceptions being in the majority.

Customs, postal and other employees found themselves in a position, through the manipulaton between bonuses and salaries, of being told that having received an increase in salary in 1924 of $240 per annum, that they would now only receive $60. No cognizance was apparently taken of the loss of remuneration by bonus abolition, a loss that bore most heavily on those who received the most bonus, the lower paid positions.

What is the result of the salary adjustments under the Civil Service Commission since 1919? One illustration will suffice, and be it understood that though this illustration is taken from the postal service, we could quote others from other departments who are in exactly the same predicament. Minimum salary on entrance to postal service as letter carrier, now postal helper, in 1919, $780, plus bonus of $480, making a total of $1,200 per annum. At present, salary of $1,020, no bonus, making a loss of $180 per annum, despite so-called salary increases of $240 in 1924 and $60 in 1927. Maximum in 1919, salary, $1,260, plus $396 bonus, a total of $1,656. Now receives $1,500, maximum salary, a reduction of $156, and takes a longer time to reach the maximum. As before stated, postal clerks and other grades in other departments in similar positions, especially in the lower grades, are similarly affected.

The position was brought before parliament last session and created some debate, during which the Postmaster General on behalf of the employees of his department promised to recommend to the Civil Service Commission a higher classification as a means of overcoming the difficulty. We are now informed that he made such recommendation and that the Civil Service Commission refuses to acquiesce, for reasons that up to date we have not been able to ascertain.

In view of the above facts, are not the employees of the government thus affected justified in their dissatisfaction with the present machinery, or lack of it, for adjusting salaries?

Where to put the blame for these conditions we do not know, as we are continually buffetted from department to commission, from commission to government, and vice versa, with no recourse not even that of an arbitration board.

Our requests, in view of present-day living costs, are reasonable. They are $300 increase

on the salaries of 1924, and a minimum salary of $100 per month for all full-time adult occupations in the service.

There should be no debate on the latter subject after scanning the cost of living figures in the official Labour Gazette. From 1919 to 1928 is a long time to carry on one-sided negotiations and would not be tolerated by organized employees outside the government service. We look to you as an elected representative of the people to use every legitimate means at your command with a view to remedying the conditions outlined.

This is signed by Mr. Knowles and Mr. Gardner, as I have already intimated. There is an accompanying letter in which they also appeal for the presentation of their case. My hon. friends this afternoon have presented this case once again. The minister says, "Oh, well, I recommended it to the Civil Service Commission and the Civil Service Commission didn't do anything." Then he was asked, "Did you press the matter? What is your opinion?" He replied that he wrote to tell them he regretted that they had done nothing.

I appeal to the Minister of Finance; there is very little use appealing to the Postmaster General—I am sorry to say it, but I do not think there is much use appealing to him. But I appeal to the Minister of Finance as leader of the government in the house at the present time: Is it reasonable, is it fair that these employees should be driven from pillar to post, or, as they put it, from department to commission and from commission to department, and then back to the government again? Is it conducive to good service? Does it encourage the lower paid civil servants to give to the country that willing service which alone can make for efficiency?

I do not believe I have the figures under my hand, but the other day I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) for certain information, and again we have an illustration of what I was going to call equivocation—at least it is evasion. I asked the Minister of Labour whether the statisticians of the Department of Labour, in their estimate of the minimum amount required for food and the bare necessities of life, had suggested $85 a month. That question was answered, no. Yet in answer to another question they say that it was figured out at $21.36 per week. Taking that figure, you will find it will run to about $90 odd per month; and that does not include many things known to be indispensable to ordinary decent living—not essential to comfortable living but things that are bare necessities. Now, with respect to mature employees, men with families and women if you like—mature employees, I say, not apprentices—I would ask this question: Will the government consider fixing a minimum rate of $100 a month? That, frankly, is the request, with of course, some advances for experienced and trained men. Is it an unreasonable request? The government ought to answer that question. Do they repudiate the grounds upon which it is based? The minister simply sits in his seat, ignores the question, shakes his head and says he expressed to the commission his regrets in the matter. I should like to know just what is behind the dispute between the Postmaster General and the Civil Service Commission. The lips of the members of the commission are sealed; they cannot reply to the government. They cannot reply to the minister, for if they did they would probably be removed from office pretty promptly; some excuse would be found to have this done. The minister can come into the house and throw the responsibility on the Civil Service Commission; and he does it obviously with effect, because the hon. member for Quebec South and others are constantly calling for the abolition of the Civil Service Commission. Now I want to say, from my experience of the last twenty years, that in my estimation the Civil Service Commission, with all its faults, is the finest safeguard which the civil servants in the country have. It is this, with all its faults and weaknesses; and under no circumstances should this country listen for a moment to the suggestion that the Civil Service Commission be abolished as an institution or that the Civil Service Act be repealed. It will not do for this government longer to permit the Postmaster General to treat this matter so flippantly.

What did the Postmaster General do yesterday? In case after case, instance after instance, he inferentially laid the blame on the Civil Service Commission. But he did not tell the house, he would not admit to me under questioning, that he had it within his own power, under section 13 of the act, to correct the very condition for which he was blaming the commission. Then I asked: What about your deputy? And he said, "I am not responsible for what the deputy does; I cannot control my deputy". That is sheer nonsense, sheer evasion, simply trimming and bluff. The minister has been lauded, and desks have been thumped on the other side, because hon. gentlemen there view him as a fighting minister, because he came into parliament last year and the year before—I have forgotten whether he did the year before that as well—and stood in his place and thundered forth his brazen defence of his actions, when we had not the material to query him and cross-check him. We are not in the habit

in this house of questioning the presentation of a case by a minister. It is historic in this house, I am glad to say, that when a minister stands in his place and gives to the house what is supposed to be a statement of fact the house accepts that statement. I regret very much to say it, but after witnessing the Whittaker-Bowyer case yesterday, after witnessing the case presented to-day, and allowing my mind to run back over the dismissals in regard to which the minister has thundered forth time after time in this house—after witnessing these and many other instances I would want to check the files very carefully before I came to any responsible decision on the presentation of any statement by the minister. It is a matter for regret that one has to say so. Take the instance, only this afternoon, of the postmaster at Kitchener. The minister said, first, that the man was suspected, that certain moneys were being lifted—he used the word lifted—from the post office in Kitchener. I pause to ask the house whether this picturesque language of the minister, this language of the gutter as a matter of fact, "lifted"—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, language which—

Mr. POWER: What is wrong with that? Who made my hon. friend a censor of the English language?

Mr. STEVENS: I am not a censor of the language.

Mr. POWER: If "lifted" expresses the idea the minister wished to convey, why should he not use it?

Mr. STEVENS: I am referring to the use of the word in this place—a word used in the slang of the streets.

Mr. POWER: I don't know that even that is out of place in this house.

Mr. STEVENS: All right; let it go at that.

Mr. RYCKMAN: It doesn't shake him at all.

Mr. STEVENS: Let it go. The minister said that certain moneys were being lifted from the post office in Kitchener. He said that the postmaster was discovered "mishandling these letters". And then he said: "I have gone further into the matter and found that it was even more serious than at first reported". Then he said: "Sometimes it is easy to prosecute and other times it is difficult"; and my hon. friend from Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. McGibbon) said: "It is not difficult to dismiss", and the Postmaster General then said: "Not when they are stealing". Then, when I called him to task and said he had no right to charge a dismissed official with stealing unless he had previously taken steps to prosecute that individual, the minister said, "Oh, I did not say he was stealing." What is this house to do with a minister who will evade plain and simple language in that manner? Subsequently, during the discussion pro and con, it came out that this postmaster unquestionably had been dishonest and had been stealing; the Postmaster General said he did not prosecute him and that he would not prosecute in the future in similar cases, and he said further that he condoned this particular case. After all this the minister expects the civil service of this country, who have appealed to him time and again, to have confidence and faith in his utterances, when he tells us that he recommended to the commission that certain things be done, and when they sent back the request unfulfilled he expressed his regret to them in writing. I want to tell the minister that that is not going to go.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have developed a wonderful sense of humour during the past few days; when these matters are brought up and we seek to bring case after case to the attention of the house we are met with ribald laughter instead of having the facts faced, the problems dealt with and the questions answered. There is no answer except this: The minister has not been administering his department on that plane which generally has been established throughout this country for the administration of such an important branch of the government. From all the mass of information we have, with much more to come, it is a fair inference that the minister has been playing politics with the most sacred rights of his department. Some may think that a pretty strong statement, they may believe it should be supported by facts. I venture to say that it will be well supported before long.

What has been the practice of the minister? A file is asked for by an hon. member under the rules of parliament. His request is passed unanimously by this house. The file is laid on the table, the hon. member goes to the labour of examining that file and in some cases asks the department for redress before bringing up the matter in the house. Then he comes here and presents his case, as my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Stewart) did yesterday in which perhaps was one of the most moderate and gentlemanly speeches delivered in this house this session. There was not a word or syllable, not an action of a gesture

which could be complained of in that presentation; fact after fact was brought out, and what was the answer? The minister rummaged among some papers on his desk and brought out a document from which he quoted some extracts; then he charged my hon. friend with an attempt to deceive the house. No more unfair and more unparliamentary reply has been given any member during this or many past sessions by a minister of the crown, especially when that member depended upon the fairness and the honesty of the department to furnish all the papers upon which he based his case.

This afternoon another hon. member presented another case based upon a file for which he moved in this house, as is his right; his request was granted unanimously, and again we had the same spectacle. The minister pulled out a paper from which he pretended to quote, but when he was asked to lay it on the table he could not do so and did not do so; he threw out the inference that there was something terrible in that paper which would wreck the life of my hon. friend's constituent. The minister has done that scores of times; he has tried to run the bluff, "Oh, my hon. friends are forcing me into this; I did not want to publish the name of this or that man." With tears in his voice the Postmaster General complains that we are forcing him to take this action. Why was not that report on file; why was it not disclosed? When it was disclosed, what did it amount to? It had reference to a poor old country postmaster, receiving a salary of $60 a year, who had kept his post office for thirty-one years. Two years ago an inspector walked into his office and found him short in his accounts. We have not the report of the responsible officer of the department; we have simply the innuendos of the minister implying that this poor old man, who has been in the employ of the government for thirty years, has been dishonest. He does not make the direct statement; he is too cute for that, but he makes an insinuation and an innuendo.

Mr. VENIOT: There was no insinuation about it; I told the hon. gentleman that if the file was not complete I would look into it.

Mr. STEVENS: It was an insinuation and an innuendo that the man was dishonest, and when we obtained the facts they disclosed nothing of the kind.

Mr. VENIOT: The inspector's official report is there and it will be produced.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, it will be produced, but why was it not on the file? Do not mind us; why did not the minister place it on the file for the information of his own friends, who have as much right to it as the man who asked for it? That is a document of parliament, not a document belonging to the hon. member for Muskoka.

What were the facts disclosed by the minister? They were that this old man, thirty-one years in the government service, was found short in his accounts by an inspector who walked into his house, where the office was kept, and checked him up. Everyone knows that in these small post offices scattered all over Canada by the thousands inaccuracies of account are frequently found. I do not say, with the minister, that I condone this sort of thing; I do not condone it, but I venture to say that when the report comes down—and we have a right to see the correspondence and all the documents attached to the report; we do not want any more slippery evasion—it will disclose that the responsible officer of the department did not find this man to be dishonest. But in any case, if he was dishonest why was he not proceeded against two years ago, when the offence was discovered?

Then the minister said, "Oh, that was only one of the reasons," but we find a letter written by the minister to a clergyman stating that the sole reason was something quite different. The minister gets up before the house and says brazenly, "I did not want to ruin this man's character." Let me tell the minister that there is no safer custodian of a confidential communication about a man's character than a gentleman of the cloth, a clergyman of any church; he is the proper man to whom these things might be disclosed. The clergyman to whom that letter was written was the proper person to receive any confidential information that there was something more in this dismissal, but that was not done. These facts were hidden; the report is not included in the file, and the minister says, "I would rather not do this but you are forcing my hand." When a flagrant case of violation of the act is brought to his attention, and the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) mentions an instance where the son of a widowed mother is given three years in the penitentiary for a less aggravated case, and he is asked to explain, what does he say? He says, "In future I will observe the law; I will prosecute; I will put these fellows over the road; I will show you."

Mr. VENIOT: I never used the term, "I will show you."

Mr. STEVENS: All right, I will withdraw that. There has not been an instance since the minister has been in the house where he could not slip out when he was caught in a fair argument. What did he do? He stood in his place twice or thrice and he said, "Oh, you will not have anything to complain of in the future; I will enforce this law." It is the mannerisms of the minister which convey more than his words.

Mr. VENIOT: The mannerisms of the hon. gentleman are beautiful.

Mr. STEVENS: He is peculiarly proud of his ability to bluff, and he has been trying to bluff this house for three years. Time will not permit at the present—there will be ample time to do it before the item passes —to show the instances where the minister has been less than frank with the house. It is about time that the government met and considered the whole question of the administration of the Post Office department under the hon. minister. His predecessor, the Hon. Charles Murphy, was not guilty of this sort of thing. When the hon. gentleman who now presides over this house was Postmaster General, he was not guilty of it. There was little cause for complaint with regard to the administration of this department until the hon. minister was brought up from the province of New Brunswick to take this high position. He has failed utterly to appreciate the ordinary amenities of this house. Not one of his colleagues does that, and I criticize—

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. member said the same thing last year regarding the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke); he will likely cover the whole cabinet.

Mr. STEVENS: What I said about the Minister of Immigration last year, and what I will say this year when the estimates come up, is that I had a high regard for the minister's character. I think perhaps there are few men in this house who have a finer character than he has. But that did not prevent me from saying then, as I will say when the estimates come up—the hon. minister has forced me into this argument—that the Minister of Immigration is not competent properly to administer his department. During my long experience in this house I have never known of another minister who has attempted to put his estimates through in the manner adopted by the Postmaster General.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. VENIOT: Before recess, I promised to place on the table a report in connection with the Kitchener affair. I have the report under my hand and in placing it on the table. I request that it be not made public. It is a secret report with information on which we base our action, and I feel justified in asking the committee not to allow it to go to the public.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the minister think it might be tabled leaving out the names of the operators, because we do not desire to make it public?

Mr. VENIOT: I shall place it on the table. In connection with the Uffington matter, I endeavoured to get in touch with the various branches and as I had three branches of the department to communicate with, it was impossible to do so in the short time between six and eight o'clock. I shall therefore crave the indulgence of the house to permit me to place the balance of the report on the table to-morrow as soon as the house opens.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Has the minister had time to consider the question of an increase in salary for the postal employees?

Mr. VENIOT: So far as I am concerned as the minister in charge of one of the departments, I have very seriously considered an increase in salary to the officials under discussion. Not only the latter part of last year, but the previous year I did what I considered to be my duty in connection with the recommendations I sent to the Civil Service Commission. It is not for me to criticize the action of the commission in refusing the request that I sent to them.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre asked me to state whether or not it was the intention of the government to proceed in this case along the same lines as those adopted in connection with the technical employees. I have not had an opportunity of discussing the matter with the government to find whether it is their intention to proceed along those lines; but may I point out that, to my mind, the two cases are not similar. In one case the Civil Service Commission recommended an increase to the technical employees of the various departments, and when the increase was recommended by them it was thought necessary that the matter should be further looked into in order to see how those technical men should be classified. In the case referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg

North Centre the Civil Service Commission did not recommend any increase and under the Civil Service Act, as I understand it, the matter lies there for the present. I can assure the hon. gentleman I have done what I consider to be my duty under the circumstances, and if there is any other effort I can make on behalf of those men, I am prepared to make it. I am not at this moment prepared to say in what direction that effort will be.

Mr. STINSON: The minister has been called by some papers of Canada "the political guillotine." Either he is entitled to that name or he is not, and the only way to clear up the situation is to take these cases individually, present the facts fairly, get all the information before the committee, and give the minister an opportunity of making his defence. If he makes an adequate defence, he should give us credit for affording him an opportunity to do so. If we bring these cases forward, present all the facts fairly, and give him that opportunity, then the country will be satisfied.

I purpose dealing with the dismissal of a postmaster at Picton, the overriding of the appointment by the Civil Service Commission, and the appointment instead of a nominee of the Postmaster General. I have the file from which I am going to give the facts as fairly as I can and if I leave out any documents or parts thereof that the minister thinks should be included, I should be glad if he would call my attention to the matter in order that we may have the facts fairly and squarely before the public. Smith, who was postmaster at Picton, was dismissed on the fourth day of August, 1927, for political partisanship. The order of the privy council sets forth that this was the basis of his dismissal. The case was investigated by Mr. J. A. S. Plouffe, a barrister of Sudbury, who finds him guilty, largely, in my opinion, on suspicion, and that is as set forth in Plouffe's own report of the matter. After setting forth the evidence that he had taken, he makes the following finding:

> It is interesting to note that the mail always came regularly to the box-holders, except during the electoral campaigns aforesaid. The majority of the witnesses making complaints were known to be active partisans for either Mr. Horsey or Hon. Mr. Raney. I infer from the evidence that the delay or non-receipt of the mail, as the case may be, was caused by either one of the postmasters at Picton, Wellington or Milford.

Finally, he says:

> I suspect that a great number of these irregularities originated at the Picton post office and were caused to be made by the postmaster himself or by his servants. The postmaster says that he was not aware of what was going on. It might be so, but he, who is responsible for the work, conduct and behaviour of his servants during office hours cannot entrench himself behind the excuse that he does not know what is being done or said by them. If he had no actual knowledge of what took place in these particular instances, he had at least constructive knowledge of it.

And then he finds him guilty of partisanship and recommends his dismissal. That was a dismissal on suspicion rather than on an actual finding. Smith, in making his defence, denies very categorically the charges that were made against him, and even puts it up to one witness to say whether the evidence he gave was true or false. He says:

> I also wish to draw your attention to the statement made to the court by Robert Purtelle, who seemed to act for the complainant. When I was being sworn I made oath saying I had not done one act of partisanship in any way or even knew of a single piece of mail unduly held in Picton post office. I asked Mr. Purtelle if he believed what I had sworn to, and he frankly and truly stated to the court he did so believe.

The Postmaster General recommended the dismissal of Smith for partisanship and at the same time gave instructions that the office be placed in the charge and control of Robert J. Purtelle, who was the secretary of the Liberal association, and who, in his sworn evidence, stated that he had been the organizer for both Mr. Horsey and Mr. Raney in the last two campaigns. The attention of the Postmaster General or of his department was called to the fact that a man by the name of Gerald H. Way, then assistant postmaster at Picton was an applicant for the position. He also was a soldier, with an honourable discharge given in January, 1919.

Mr. VENIOT: Does the hon. gentleman say that Mr. Way was a returned soldier?

Mr. STINSON: I said that he was a soldier with an honourable discharge. He was not overseas, and I am making no such claim.

Mr. VENIOT: I just wanted that made clear.

Mr. STINSON: The Postmaster General prior to the dismissal of Smith wrote asking to have Purtelle placed in charge, under date of July 25, 1927, as follows:

> As the postmaster at Picton, Ontario, has been found guilty of political partisanship and he will be dismissed by an order in council, just as soon as such an order is passed you will appoint Mr. Robert J. Purtelle as temporary postmaster.

Mr. HANSON: Who was he?

Mr. STINSON: He was secretary of the Liberal association, also the Liberal organizer for Mr. Horsey and Mr. Raney in the last two campaigns.

Mr. BENNETT: They being the defeated candidates?

Mr. STINSON: Yes. There is no evidence on file as to why Purtelle should be appointed over Mr. Way, who was the assistant postmaster and was an applicant for the position. Mr. Way had had some twenty-three years experience in that post office, and he was then on duty there. Apparently the only basis there was for the appointment of Robert J. Purtelle is contained in a letter written by one Masten of Bloomfield, who sets out Purtelle's qualifications in that letter. This letter was written to the district superintendent and passed on by him with his report to the Civil Service Commission. The first paragraph reads as follows:

Regarding the appointment of a postmaster for the town of Picton, I beg to present a few reasons why the present incumbent Mr. Robert Purtelle might be confirmed in the position to the advantage of the service, the gratification of his host of friends, and in recognition of his public spirit and vigorous intelligent effort in the service of the country and in promoting the cause of Liberalism.

The last clause of that letter reads:

Mr. Purtelle and his family are staunch Liberals and people of influence in this county, and I, like many others, feel that splendid service will be assured, the public pleased, and the Liberal cause advanced by his permanent appointment to the office.

That is the only thing I have been able to find on the file as a reason for Mr. Purtelle's appointment over Mr. Way, who has had twenty-three years experience in that office.

Mr. SPENCER: Who wrote that letter?

Mr. STINSON: It was written by S. Edgar Masten, of Bloomfield.

Mr. VENIOT: To whom?

Mr. STINSON: To the district postal superintendent and passed on by him to the Civil Service Commission, with a report on the parties to be appointed. Following this applications were asked for. The office was duly advertised, and the applications were in by the 18th of October. The Civil Service Commission asked for a report from the district superintendent at Ottawa, under date of November 21, 1927:

With reference to your communication of the 13th ultimo advising that the postmastership at Picton, Ontario, has become vacant through the dismissal of Mr. S. A. Smith, the commissioners would be pleased to receive the report of the district superintendent in this connection at your earliest convenience.

That letter is addressed to the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General at Ottawa by the secretary of the Civil Service Commission. The report was supplied to the Post Office Department on the 5th of December, 1927, but it never was forwarded to the Civil Service Commission until the 23rd day of December of that year.

It seems to me that if the Civil Service Act is to be fairly administered, the Civil Service Commission should have an inspector of their own to make reports instead of depending on the inspector of the department. That would ensure an independent report. The report of District Inspector Low is dated December 5, 1927. In it he sets out that the office is a class 2B office, and he classifies the applicants. I will give the particulars regarding Purtelle and Way:

Robert J. Purtelle

Educational qualifications—Good.
Accommodation offered—Government building.
Location offered—Centrally located.
Residential qualifications—20 years.
Experience—3 months post office experience.
Character and integrity—Good.
Time willing to give to post office—Full time.

Gerald H. Way

Eucational qualifications—Good.
Accommodation offered—Government building.
Location offered—Centrally located.
Residential qualifications—40 years.
Experience—20 years post office experience.
Character and integrity—Good.
Time willing to give to Post office—Full time.

The applicants rank in order of merit, from a post office standpoint, as follows:

Gerald H. Way is a man of fine appearance forty-three years of age. He was born and brought up in Picton and has lived there practically all his life. He is well known, and bears a splendid reputation, and seems to be very popular. Mr. Way enlisted in 1918, but did not accompany a regiment overseas. He was in training at Petawawa camp, and was honourably discharged in January, 1919. He entered the post office in 1905 as a clerk where he has been employed. He became assistant postmaster in 1911, and has a thorough knowledge of post office work. He is a person of good habits, and commands the respect of all who come in contact with him. Mr. Way is single and resides with his father.

Robert J. Purtelle is widely known in the vicinity of Picton where he has resided for twenty years. He is well educated, having taught school for a number of years, thence going into the canning business, and latterly conducting a seed store. He is a clean living person and bears a good character. Mr. Purtelle was appointed acting postmaster in September, and although not yet thoroughly familiar with the workings of the office no doubt would be efficient as he is making an earnest effort to be successful.

The Civil Service Commission received that report on December 23, 1927, and issued their

certificate of appointment to Gerald H. Way, on February 13, 1928. It is the usual form of certificate issued in such cases. Accompanying Way's application was his discharge from the army, which shows that he was honourably discharged. On February 23, 1928, the Postmaster General wrote to his deputy telling him to reject the certificate. This is the letter:

With further reference to the post office vacancy at Picton, Ontario, which I authorized on February 14, to hold in abeyance, I now wish to instruct you to refuse the certificate of the commission issued in favour of Mr. Gerald H. Way.

Mr. STEVENS: Who wrote that?

Mr. STINSON: That is signed by the Postmaster General, P. J. Veniot.

Mr. STEVENS: Surely not.

Mr. STINSON: It will be observed that in his letter the Postmaster General simply instructs his deputy to reject the certificate, without assigning any cause for so doing.

Mr. RYCKMAN: A law unto himself.

Mr. STINSON: However, the Deputy Postmaster General, in writing the Civil Service Commission did attempt to assign a cause. This is his letter of February 24, to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission:

Referring to your certificate of February 13, covering appointment of Mr. Gerald H. Way to the above postmastership, permit me to inform you that this matter has received the attention of the Postmaster General, and to state that Mr. Way is hereby rejected as unsuitable under section 13 of the Civil Service Act.

Section 13 of the Civil Service Act, which will be found in volume 1 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, deals with an entirely different matter altogether. It reads as follows:

The rate of compensation of an employee upon appointment to a position in any class in the civil service shall be at the minimum rate prescribed for the class; provided, however, that when the appointee is already in the civil service in another position, the rate of compensation upon appointment to the new position either through transfer or promotion shall be the same as that received before such appointment or, if there be no such rate for the new class, then at the next higher rate, but no appointment shall in any case be made at less than the minimum or at more than the maximum rate prescribed for a class.

There is no doubt that the Deputy Postmaster General intended to refer to section 24. I presume there has been a re-numbering of the sections and that section 13 in the old act has become section 24 in the new one. Section 24 reads as follows:

The deputy head may, at any time before the expiration of six months, reject any person assigned or appointed to any position under his control or direction, or he may extend the period of probation within which such person may be rejected for another six months; and the cause of rejection, or the reason for extending the period of probation, shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission.

This explicitly provides that cause must be assigned for any rejection and reported to the Civil Service Commission. Neither in the letter from the Postmaster General to his deputy, nor in the letter from the deputy to the commission, is any cause assigned for the rejection, and that in spite of the fact that his own inspector had reported on Gerald H. Way as being a fit and proper person and had placed him in the category of merit as No. 1 for the appointment. There is nothing in the opinion of the Justice department, quoted yesterday by the Postmaster General:

If the deputy be reasonably satisfied upon preliminary examination of the person nominated that the latter is unsuitable or not qualified for the duties of the office or employment to which he is assigned, I think he may, if he thinks it advisable, reject him without entrusting him with the charge of any duties.

There is nothing in the statute that permits the exercise of any such power of rejection as the minister invoked in this case, nor is there anything in the opinion of the Justice department to justify his action, because Gerald H. Way was in charge of the office for twenty-three years, and the department's own inspector reports him as a fit and proper person to be appointed. On March 26, 1928, the commission issued a fresh certificate in favour of Robert J. Purtelle.

From the above facts it is evident that the Postmaster General has absolutely flouted the appointment of the commission notwithstanding that yesterday he stated that these appointments are altogether under the control of the Civil Service Commission, and the Whittaker file contains two or three of his letters to the same effect. That, I repeat, is the view expressed by him in his own letters. Moreover, his inspector reported strongly in favour of Way, who has had twenty-three years' experience in postal work. Although appointed by the commission he was given no opportunity to enter on the duties of the office, for the Postmaster General promptly instructed his deputy to notify the commission that the appointment had been rejected, but without assigning the slightest cause for taking such action.

Now, we have been told that the former postmaster was dismissed for partisanship. Well, the man who has been put in his place was, according to his own sworn testimony, the

secretary of the local Liberal association, and acted as Liberal organizer for Mr. Horsey and Mr. Raney in the last two campaigns. If any substantiation of this point is needed it is to be found in the letter from Mr. Masten stating that the man has been a good, staunch Liberal and that it would please the local Liberal party if he were appointed to the office. Robert J. Purtelle, the man appointed, was the man who fathered the claim of partisanship against Smith. He files an affidavit based upon opinion and not fact, as follows:

I, Robert Purtelle of the town of Picton, in the county of Prince Edward, do solemnly declare that I heard Mr. Alexander McKee tell Mr. J. H. Roberts, Inspector of Postal Service, on December the 27th, 1926, that he (Mr. McKee) was in Picton post office on an election day and he (Mr. McKee) saw Samuel Smith, the postmaster instructing an elector how and where to mark his ballot and directing him to the polling booth to register his vote.

And it is on that affidavit and one or two others that the investigation is started. Now when we turn to McKee's evidence as given before the investigator we find it is entirely different from the affidavit filed by Mr. Robert J. Purtelle. McKee simply sets out in his evidence as follows:

Alexander McKee, being duly sworn, said in substance: That he resides at Picton and knows the postmaster. That he has seen Mr. Smith during the federal campaign of the year 1925 directing a man where to vote. Witness says that the man in question asked the postmaster where the polling booth was, and the postmaster told him where it was.

This is entirely different from the affidavit as sworn to by Mr. Purtelle. Now the very fact that Purtelle was the man who started the investigation, who gathered the evidence for it, and gave evidence, was sufficient to bar him from the appointment where a man was being dismissed for political partisanship. If the administration of the department by the Postmaster General were ever so good, is not Canada paying too high a price for that service if it is developing in the country a disrespect for law and order? A minister has no more right than any other man to disregard the statutes of this country; yet the minister has openly violated the statute in this case, because the section makes it incumbent upon him to assign the reason for the rejection of an official after appointment is made by the Civil Service Commission. And there is no pretence at assigning any cause in the present case. Way was entitled to preference by reason of the fact that he had twenty-three years of experience in the post office; and he was entitled to preference on the part of the Postmaster General, if the statement made by the Postmaster General yesterday was sincere, that he was anxious to look after the welfare of soldiers, because Way was a demobilized soldier. Way was entitled in any event to come under the provision of section 24 as to probation. If you accept the cause assigned by the deputy, at least he should have been given the opportunity to take advantage of section 24 of the act, which exists for that very purpose, of trying a man, where he is appointed to office, in order that the act may be fairly and squarely administered.

Now I have read into the record the letters and documents that fairly deal with the matter and I do not think I have left out any part that really adds to the file in any way. But the whole thing is absolutely clear on its face, that Purtelle was appointed for no other reason that that he was a political partisan, and that Smith was dismissed for alleged political partisanship as to which there was absolutely no direct evidence; because the investigator says, "I suspect these things are true", but he does not give it as a finding. I submit, in view of the facts, that the minister had no right to do what he did and that there was no authority, either in the act or under the legal opinion from the law offices, giving him the right to act as he has done in this case.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. member having treated the Picton post office question, it is but right that I should tell the other side of the story. I am charged with refusing to appoint Mr. Way because, first, he was a soldier; it is said I should not have refused him. Under the Civil Service Act Mr. Way, as a soldier training at Petawawa camp, where he was, had no preference.

Mr. STINSON: That is right.

Mr. VENIOT: Then why refer to it?

Mr. STINSON: Because you said yerterday that you were very partial to soldiers.

Mr. VENIOT: The second charge is that I should not have refused the certificate in his favour because of his experience as assistant postmaster. Let me point out that, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, Mr. Way was assistant postmaster for twenty-three long years. I think that is right.

Mr. STINSON: No; he was appointed assistant postmaster in 1911.

Mr. VENIOT: But he was in the service, a regular employee in a classified post office, for twenty-three years. Will the hon. mem-

ber for Victoria (Mr. Stinson) explain to the committee how it is that in 1912, when Mr. Petit was put out for political interference, Mr. Way was not then promoted by the Conservative party. Why was he not recognized?

Mr. STINSON: He was a much younger man.

Mr. VENIOT: He had then been in the service seven years. He was appointed to the service in 1905.

Mr. STEVENS: There was no Civil Service Act then.

Mr. VENIOT: Of course not; my hon. friends hide their political guillotine behind the statement, "There was no Civil Service Act".

Mr. HANSON: Does that justify your breaking the statute?

Mr. VENIOT: I did not break the statute.

Mr. HANSON: I say you did.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not. While I do not wish to put my legal talents against the hon. gentleman who has interrupted me at least I can put up good sense and judgment. In 1911 W. V. Petit was dismissed because he acted as a political partisan, and no investigation was held.

Mr. BENNETT: Certified by the member for the constituency.

Mr. VENIOT: Exactly. And S. G. Smith was appointed in his place. This Mr. Way had then been seven years working in the office, and S. G. Smith had no post office experience whatever.

Then let us come to the last appointment. Mr. Smith was dismissed for political partisanship; affidavits were produced charging him with certain offences along that line and, I believe, with interference perhaps not on his part but by employees of the post office in the distribution of certain political circulars during the election. That investigation was held according to law, and on the report of the investigating commissioner I recommended to the executive council that Mr. Smith be dismissed, which was my right under the order in council first passed by hon. gentlemen opposite, later accepted by the present government and unanimously confirmed by the House of Commons. This position was advertised; Mr. Way was an applicant, together with Mr. Purtelle and I think one or two others. The result was that the Civil Service Commission did issue a certificate in favour of Mr. Way, but since the investigating commissioner felt satisfied, according to his report that responsibility should rest somewhere in the office for the non-distribution or mishandling of these circulars during the election, which circulars should have reached their destination at a certain time but did not, and in view of the fact that Mr. Way, the assistant postmaster, must have been a party to the non-distribution according to the evidence, I did not think I was justified in accepting the certificate of the commission, which I refused. That is the whole story.

Mr. ARTHURS: Was there an investigation?

Mr. VENIOT: There was an investigation and it was proved that these circulars had gone astray in some unaccountable manner, and either the postmaster or some of his assistants were directly responsible.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): Shall the item carry?

Mr. KENNEDY: Now that we have an open season for complaints in connection with the Post Office Department I suppose I may as well have my say also. I wish to bring up a case in connection with a postmastership within a few miles of my own home in the Peace River country, in which it appears to me discrimination has been shown against a returned soldier.

Mr. VENIOT: What is the name of the office?

Mr. KENNEDY: Waterhole and Fairview. Just about a year ago a vacancy occurred in the Waterhole post office through the resignation of the postmaster, Mr. Craig, and Mr. Henry Sigler, a merchant of the village, received the temporary appointment. Later on a permanent appointment was made by the Civil Service Commission, as this office carried a salary of about $900 a year. I believe Mr. Sigler applied for the position but the appointment was given to Mr. Smith, a returned soldier and a married man with four or five children. Technically there may be a way which the Postmaster General can justify what subsequently happened, but in actual fact I believe there is no justification for what took place.

Previously the railway had reached only to Whitelaw, but later it was extended to Fairview. Waterhole had been the centre of a farming district, and when steel was laid to within four or five miles of Waterhole the whole village was moved to Fairview, which became the new centre of the district. It was recognized by the department as well as by everyone in that district that when the rest of the village, including the bank, three or four

stores, some garages and so on, was moved to Fairview the post office at Waterhole could not very well carry on with the bulk of its business going to the new town. Mr. Smith, who had been appointed to the Waterhole office by the Civil Service Commission, applied for the new post office realizing that the Waterhole office could not continue as a salaried office but would probably become attached to a local store and would carry with it only a small remuneration. Notwithstanding the fact that all the business moved to Fairview, the Fairview office was opened as a new office altogether and Mr. Sigler, who had moved his store from Waterhole to Fairview, was appointed postmaster. According to the file Fairview was a non-accounting office promising a salary of $100 a year until such time as the revenue justified an increase, and Mr. Smith was informed that if the Waterhole office could not keep up the business, as everyone knew it could not and as the department must have known, the salary would be reduced.

My point is that, the whole village having moved to a new centre which was bound to take away 95 per cent of the business from the old office, the logical and fair thing was to move the Waterhole postmaster, who was giving his whole time to the post office, to the new office at Fairview. It is possible to crawl out of this situation by a technicality, but everyone who has known western Canada knows that when a railway comes within a mile or even five miles of an old village, the business moves to the new town at the end of steel.

I do not want to read the correspondence; I think I am giving a fair review of it. Smith made a statement to me which I am going to offer for what it is worth; I have always found him a truthful man. He told me that Mr. Reilly, from the office at Edmonton, came to Waterhole and asked him if he would be good enough to sign his resignation as postmaster at Waterhole to permit of his being moved to the new post office at Fairview. He did so and on the afternoon of that same day Mr. Sigler was sworn in by Mr. Reilly as postmaster at Fairview. This is why I also feel that politics have been played in connection with these appointments, and why I believe that in this matter there has been a discrimination against a returned soldier in favour of someone who was not a returned soldier.

Mr. BENNETT: What Mr. Reilly was that?

Mr. KENNEDY: James J. Reilly, district superintendent at Edmonton.

Mr. VENIOT: I have not before me any notes on the Waterhole and Fairview offices, but from the Postmaster General's report I find that Waterhole has a revenue of $1,630 annually. When it became necessary to open an office at Fairview we did not consider that we should transfer the postmaster from Waterhole to Fairview. It is true that the opening of the office at Fairview has reduced the revenue at Waterhole, but that is no reason, from an administrative standpoint, why this transfer should take place. We followed out the regular practice in the opening of new post offices, and we appointed a new postmaster.

Mr. BENNETT: Why not ask for the resignation of the old one?

Mr. VENIOT: We did not ask for it. I have not the record before me and I would not like to make any positive statement. I will have the record here to-morrow and we can see just how the matter stands.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will the minister also bring the record concerning the change in postmasters at the village of St. David's, in the county of Lincoln?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: There has been a great deal of interference by the Post Office Department with appointments made by the Civil Service Commission. There must be something radically wrong with the system when a person can be notified by the Civil Service Commission that he or she has received an appointment and should report for duty immediately, and then be informed by the department that he or she is not to receive the position. I ask the minister to be good enough to get the record of the case I am going to refer to. This occurred in connection with the post office at New Westminster, but it does not have any relation to the appointment of a postmaster.

Mr. VENIOT: It is not the postmaster?

Mr. McQUARRIE: No.

Mr. VENIOT: I understand it applies to the building or the surroundings.

Mr. McQUARRIE: It concerns the appointment of a stenographer. When there have been so many cases where the department has interfered with the Civil Service Commission, I do not suppose the minister can be expected to remember all of them.

Mr. VENIOT: I have a pretty good memory.

Mr. McQUARRIE: There was considerable publicity given to this case, and considerable objection made to the action of the department. Applications were called for in September of last year. A competition was duly held, after which a young lady in my constituency received a notice which I will read to the house. I will quote this in full for the benefit of the Postmaster General. It is as follows:

Notification To Report For Duty
(Permanent Appointment)
Local Competition

AT:TM P.O.-C27-130 Date: Sept. 27, 1928.
Name: Miss Margaret Isabella Moore. 18380-C1.
Address: 2405 Linden Ave., New Westminster, B.C.
Dept.: Post Office.
Branch: New Westminster, B.C.
Title of position: Stenographer Grade 2.
Salary rate: $1,080 per annum.
Vice: Harold G. Wade.
Place to report: New Westminster, B.C.
Person to whom to report: The Postmaster.
Date to report: Immediately.

W. Foran,
Secretary.

Upon receipt of that notification the young lady reported for duty on October 1. She had another position, but as this was a better one she handed in her resignation. She reported to the postmaster at New Westminster but was informed that he had not yet received any notice from the Post Office Department. She was told that probably this would come in due course, and she waited until the 29th of that month before inquiring again. She was told then that no word had yet been received, and I think she had some correspondence by wire with the Civil Service Commission. After considerable delay she was informed that the department had refused to confirm her appointment and someone else had been appointed to the vacant position. The appointee was a boy under the age limit required by the department, the son of a very strong Liberal in the town.

It seems to me that there must be something radically wrong with the system when the department steps in and countermands an appointment made by the Civil Service Commission. I would be very glad indeed if the minister would bring down the file in connection with this case.

Mr. VENIOT: The case related by the hon. member is somewhat of a surprise to me. With appointments of that kind the system has been for the Civil Service Commission to establish a waiting list. The commission would not for a moment delegate the appointment of a person whose name was not on the civil service waiting list, provided that there was on that waiting list some person prepared to take the position offered. I do not want to go any further into the matter without having the file before me, but I would be very much surprised if any file that we have would show anything of that kind.

Mr. McQUARRIE: There can be no doubt the notice was sent out and received by Miss Moore.

Mr. VENIOT: I doubt that.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I have a copy of the notice under my hand.

Mr. VENIOT: How is the notice signed?

Mr. McQUARRIE: W. Foran, secretary.

Mr. VENIOT: That is the secretary of the Civil Service Commission. He sends the notice out to the parties. I think I am safe in saying, although I will produce the file, that there was no notice from the department to that effect. Had the hon. gentleman let me know in advance, I would have had the file with me. I will get it for the hon. member.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I stated that the postmaster said that he had not yet received a notification from the Post Office Department. That is the trouble. Surely it is most unfortunate that a system like that should be in force.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. member will get the file in the morning.

Mr. CLARK: Has the minister filled the post office vacancy at Sutton, Quebec?

Mr. VENIOT: I have no record with me, of the Sutton post office, but I can get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. CLARK: Last year a return was laid on the table and at that time the vacancy had not been filled. I wonder if the minister would bring that file up to date.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. ERNST: I should like for a few minutes to direct the attention of the committee to a dismissal which took place in Lunenburg county in 1926, the papers respecting which should have been tabled in response to an order for return of last year. I have some papers which were tabled and I want to draw those to the attention of the committee as well. The order for return passed the house on the 30th April, 1928. The return was brought down on the 11th May, 1928, and it concerned the dismissal of Howard Robar at Sarty's in the county of Lunenburg, a very small post office. The facts are these: Mr.

Robar had been postmaster there for some years. He was a cripple and almost wholly dependent upon that office and the carriage of the mail for his living. I want to read to the committee the facts on which he was dismissed as disclosed in the file. The first reference to the subject is dated the 6th December, 1926, and it is headed:

Memorandum for the Deputy Postmaster General

Re Sarty's, N.S.

Please have the dismissal and appointment made as recommended and notify Mr. Duff it is being done.

(Signed) P. J. Veniot,
Postmaster General.

That is the first reference in the file. Obviously that file is not complete, and the Postmaster General has not complied with the order passed by the house. There must have been some previous communication from Mr. Duff and there was such a previous communication referred to in another letter from the department, because I find in the file this letter dated December 10, 1926:

Lunenburg, Nova Scotia.

William Duff, Esq.

Dear Mr. Duff:

Re Sarty's. In reply to your communication of the 26th November, recommending the dismissal of the postmaster at Sarty's, permit me to say that in accordance with your recommendation instructions have been given for the transfer of the Sarty's post office to the charge of Mr. Edwin Sarty as postmaster.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) L. J. Gaboury,
Deputy Postmaster General.

The remainder of the file consists of routine correspondence, but nowhere in the file does there appear a letter of November 26 or any other correspondence emanating from Mr. Duff. I ask the Postmaster General—and he is welcome to the file which I have in my hand so that he can look it over himself—whether he has complied with the order of the house and has given the house the full information asked for in the order. This is only one more instance where, for some purpose or another, information has been deliberately suppressed. Further, Mr. Robar was in no respect a political partisan. He took no part in the election, and, as I say, he was a cripple and almost wholly dependant upon the office for his living. No reason is given for his dismissal, but the man who was appointed to take his place is a violent political partisan. Will the Postmaster General complete the file at this late date?

Mr. VENIOT: Before answering the question whether I will complete the file, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that he has stated that the man in question was wholly dependant upon this office for his living. The office had a revenue of $32 per annum and the salary was $60 per annum.

Mr. ERNST: And he drove the mail.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. member is talking about the dismissal of a postmaster at a salary of $60 a year. If that gentleman has to depend for his living upon that $60 a year and he was dismissed, perhaps I have done him an injustice. As to the question about the completion of the file, all the file will be produced which is not the minister's personal file and marked "personal."

Mr. ERNST: I submit that if the minister made a dismissal upon the recommendation of any person, the reasons for that dismissal should be given to the committee. Furthermore, with reference to the minister's rather cheap statement about the small salary connected with the office, he knows or ought to know that the person who kept the post office also drove the mail and received something in addition to the ordinary postmaster's salary.

Mr. VENIOT: The Postmaster General might know by the file, but I do not think he should be expected to carry all these contracts in his head.

Mr. CLARK: I should like to ask the minister whether a post office employee or a postmaster who is dismissed is entitled, if he so requests, to the reasons for his dismissal?

Mr. VENIOT: I should say he would be. There may be cases where it is not done, but I think it should be.

Mr. CLARK: Then why, in the case to which the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg has been referring, were the reasons not given?

Mr. VENIOT: I did not understand him to say that the postmaster asked for the reasons.

Mr. CLARK: I will make it quite clear. Not only did the postmaster ask for them, but it looks as if he was a Liberal, because he indicates in the letter that he had always voted right.

Mr. VENIOT: It sounds like Satan rebuking sin to hear a Conservative stand up for a good Liberal.

Mr. CLARK: How he voted is a matter of indifference, to me at least, but the man by a letter dated December 18, 1926, addressed to the Postmaster General, makes a request

for the reasons for his dismissal, and the answer is contained in the following letter dated Ottawa, December 29, 1926, addressed to Howard Robar, Sarty's, N.S.:

Dear Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 18th December, regarding the postmastership at the above-mentioned office.

In reply, I may say that your remarks have been noted.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) E. J. Underwood,
Chief Superintendant of
Post Office Service.

There is something seriously wrong with a department that permits that sort of an answer to be written to a man who has been a postmaster anywhere; this particular man had been a postmaster for many years, and that is the sort of answer he gets. I suggest that if that letter was written on the responsibility of the civil servant who signs it, he should be taken to task. That is no sort of an answer for a civil servant to make on his own responsibility. However, I would assume that that answer was dictated under instructions of the minister because it reads, "I am directed to acknowledge." I assume that the direction was given by the minister, and this minister when he is requested to give reasons for the dismissal simply writes and says, "Your remarks have been noted." I do not think that is consistent with the dignity of the office which the minister holds. I think this house is entitled to know why this postmaster was dismissed. Apparently the only way in which the minister can give those reasons is by consulting a letter from a member of this house—he was not then a member, but a defeated candidate—whose letter is referred to in this file. If there are any reasons given in that letter for the dismissal, the minister now says that he will produce that letter if it is not private. If it is private, it should not have been referred to at all in the file, but as it is referred to in the file it should be on the file. It is no longer private; it is a matter of public business that concerns every member of this house and the electors at large. I think the minister should put the letter on the file. I think, further, that the minister should have the common decency and courtesy to answer the letter he received from the postmaster asking reasons for his dismissal.

Mr. ERNST: I have several more of these incomplete files to which I wish to direct the attention of the minister and of the house. If there was only one that was incomplete we might put it down to inadvertence, but it happens repeatedly. I have five files in my hand only one of which appears to have the appearence of completeness, all the rest being obviously incomplete in that something has been deleted or suppressed.

The second one refers to the dismissal of a woman postmistress at Conquerall Banks in the county of Lunenburg, Mrs. Albert Rafuse. The facts of the situation are that Mrs. Rafuse, who is the widow of Captain Albert Rafuse, had kept the post office at Conquerall Banks to the satisfaction of the people there. Her husband died in the early part of 1927, and she conducted a general store, which was at the most central point in the village. In June 1927, for what mysterious reason the Postmaster General alone knows, he wrote the following letter to the Deputy Postmaster General:

Ottawa, June 22nd, 1927.

Mr. L. J. Gaboury,
Deputy Postmaster General, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,

In the interest of the postal service at Conquerall Banks, N.S., I have decided to dismiss the present postmaster at that place and have him replaced by Captain Oxner. This is not a Civil Service Commission appointment.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) P. J. Veniot.

There is nothing further on the file as to the reasons for that dismissal or as to who recommended Captain Oxner. Knowing the district, I am credibly informed by the people there that when the dismissal took place a search had to be made to find a person who would take the office, because most everyone wanted Mrs. Rafuse to retain it. Finally Captain Oxner agreed to take the office if it was taken away from Mrs. Rafuse. The only local reason assigned for that dismissal is this: Mrs. Rafuse and her husband had been life-long Liberals, but her husband voted against the gentleman who controls the patronage in Lunenburg county. Mrs. Rafuse herself either did not vote at all or she voted as she had always voted in years past, but the rumour locally is that Mr. Duff was incensed at the fact that the husband had changed his politics after so many years; Mrs. Rafuse was dismissed, and the only reason given is in the Postmaster General's letter, and that is a blank so far as a reason is concerned. I want to ask the Postmaster General why that woman was dismissed, and on whose recommendation. I think, Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to an answer.

Mr. VENIOT: You have got the answer there. I instructed the deputy to make the dismissal. It was made on my recommendation.

Mr. ERNST: I certainly do not intend to accept an answer like that. That is no answer at all. There must have been someone who recommended the dismissal and suggested reasons; there must have been a departmental investigation, and so forth. There must be some reason assigned by the Postmaster General before he can dismiss a public servant and justify the dismissal before the House of Commons.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I feel that I must join with my hon. friend from Queens-Lunenburg in a protest against the discourteous attitude of the minister in this matter. It is an insult to the members of the House of Commons to refuse to give the reason for the dismissal, to refuse an answer to a courteous question on a matter of public importance. I do not think the minister is justified in simply saying that the member has the answer in his hand when that answer is merely a statement to the effect that the minister has decided to do so-and-so. This house is entitled to the fullest explanation from the minister in matters of this kind, and I feel satisfied that the house will insist on these explanations being given.

Mr. ERNST: Before this item carries, I expect an answer to a question fairly put.

Mr. VENIOT: The only answer I can give the hon. gentleman is that if I received a recommendation I acted upon it, and if that recommendation came to me marked "personal" I do not think the house would say that I should put that personal letter on file. I do not know at the moment whether it was marked "personal" or not. I will look it up. But it has not been the practice in the past to put a letter marked "personal" on the file. But if the house insists upon it, there is only one thing for me to do, and that is to obey the orders of the house and put the letter on the file. Personally I feel that I am justified in holding back a letter that is marked "personal" when I take the responsibility for carrying out whatever recommendation may be contained in it.

Mr. BENNETT: There is a very important principle involved in the observation which the minister has just made, and I think the government should give it its careful consideration. Assume a minister of the crown writes a letter to a member of the pension board marked "personal," asking that certain action be taken. Is that a public document or not if action is taken? The Postmaster General has been receiving letters from a defeated candidate in Lunenburg county marked "personal," according to his own statement.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not know about that; I said I would look it up.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the hon. member think that he did, or do I understand him to say that he has no memory of it?

Mr. VENIOT: I say I have no memory of it. I will look it up. I think if the letter was not marked "personal" I should have put it on the file.

Mr. BENNETT: That is an entirely different thing. The minister said this house would not require production of a letter marked "personal", recommending certain action in connection with the public service of this country. I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) will tell him that that is a position he cannot take in this house. I think the Minister of Justice will advise him that when a letter addressed to a minister of the crown is the cause for official and public action being taken it must be placed upon the file, or at least that portion of the letter which refers to the action taken. I may mark my letter to the minister "unofficial and not for the file," and that may be all right; but when I mark a letter "personal", and it may involve many matters, and action is taken upon any part of the letter, that part upon which action is taken is no longer a personal communication because it is addressed to a minister of the crown. I think his colleague will tell him that that principle has always been recognized by this house. The general principle is that there can be nothing personal in letters directed to a minister of the crown upon which official action is taken. There are variations from that general principle, as there always are from all general principles, but that is the rule.

A good deal will have to happen—and I say this with much regret—before we can yield to any such rule as that enunciated by the Postmaster General. The Minister of Justice in times past occupied a seat to the left of the Speaker; he may do so again; and I believe he is too fair a public servant when a great principle such as this is involved not to rise superior to his position as a member of the government and to regard himself as the legal adviser of the people of this country; and in this capacity I am confident he will tell his

colleague that any letter addressed to a minister of the crown, upon which action is taken by that minister, cannot by any possible chance be kept off the file because the correspondent has seen fit to mark it "personal". That is the principle which I think the Minister of Justice will say has always been observed in our parliament. I hope it will continue to be observed. Otherwise what becomes of our parliamentary institutions? If the defeated candidate of the government in the constituency of Queens-Lunenburg, the present member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff) was able to mark letters to the Postmaster General "personal", and so interfered with the public service in the county of Lunenburg—I say if—and thereby those letters are excluded from the departmental files and so escape inspection by the members of this house, what becomes of responsible government? There is no such thing. It would mean that if the Minister of Justice himself, desiring to deal with a matter of public business, writes a letter to the Postmaster General, and does not mark it "private" it will be put on the file as a matter of course. But if a defeated candidate writes a letter to the Postmaster General on which action is taken resulting in an unfortunate woman being deprived of a postmastership in a little village of Nova Scotia, and that letter is marked "personal", it cannot be brought down. That is not the law. I think the minister will say that when he sat to the left of the Speaker that was not the practice of the government of the day, and I do not think it would be the practice advocated by the Liberal party when they are again sitting to the left of the Speaker.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can throw a little light on this matter. It is a great pleasure to me to-night to be able to act, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has said, both as the member for Antigonish-Guysborough and as the defeated candidate for Queens-Lunenburg. It is not often that a member of this house can occupy that dual position.

Mr. ERNST: And control the patronage for two constituencies.

Mr. DUFF: What is that? Of course, Mr. Chairman, I cannot remember exactly what happened in connection with those two matters which my hon. friend from Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Ernst) brought up. It is quite possible the file is complete; it is quite possible that I wrote no letter; it is quite possible that I saw the Postmaster General personally. But I want to say right here to the hon. leader of the opposition that I am neither a coward nor a hypocrite—

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. DUFF: —and if there is a letter on file from me with regard to Sarty's post office or the Conquerall Banks post office, for God's sake produce them quick.

Mr. BENNETT: That is fair. At least we can say this, the hon. gentleman has waived the privilege, if there was any; so the minister is free in the matter.

Mr. DUFF: Quite right. Let us take the Sarty's case first. My hon. friend has said that the gentleman whom I recommended, Edward Sarty, was a very strong partisan. That is quite true. Mr. Sarty is a good Liberal. Mr. Robar is a good Tory.

Mr. Robar took the place of a Liberal in 1911, shortly after the Tory party came into power. My hon. friend speaks of this gentleman depending upon a $60 office for his livelihood. My hon. friend should be very careful how he talks about the people of Lunenburg; nobody in Lunenburg lives on $60 a year.

Mr. ERNST: I did not suggest anything of the kind, and my hon. friend will take my word for it. The Postmaster General said it.

Mr. DUFF: Very good. He said this gentleman was dependent upon the post office for his living. If my memory is correct, and I think it is, Mr. Robar at the time was a storekeeper, so he was not depending entirely upon the post office for his living. His store was situated at the extreme end of the North river district in the county of Lunenburg. I think I am safe in making the assertion that his store was at least three-quarters of a mile from any house at the very extreme end of the district, which was within a mile of the post office occupied by Mr. Meisner. I was asked by the people of the district—and I have on my file a number of letters from prominent people of the North river district—saying that the post office was in an inconvenient place, that in 1911 it had been taken from a very central place. I have no objection to the action of the Tory party at that time. When they are in power they should look after their friends, something that the Liberal party do not attend to often enough. When the complaint came that this post office was not in a central position, on the recommendation of the people in the district, I recommended, either in a letter to the Postmaster General or in a personal interview, that it was in the interests of the public

service to locate the post office in the centre of the district where it would best serve the public. Now, what about Conquerall Banks? My hon. friend from Queens-Lunenburg left the impression—I think I am fair enough in saying—that the person in charge at Conquerall Banks is a woman. That is not true. I will give my hon. friend this opportunity to say whether that is so or not. Did he say so?

Mr. ERNST: I certainly did. And the file bears me out.

Mr. DUFF: All right. He said the occupant of the office at Conquerall Banks at the time of dismissal was a woman. I have not my file at hand, but I am positive that Albert Rafuse was the postmaster when the change was made, and Captain Oxner was appointed. The woman was not postmistress. A man was appointed, but my hon. friend tried to make out that this woman was a widow at the time the change took place. That is not correct.

Mr. ERNST: It is quite correct.

Mr. JACOBS: She may have been a grass widow.

Mr. DUFF: She was not even a grass widow. I recommended the change in the post office at Conquerall Banks at the request of at least 75 per cent of the citizens of that place. In fact, while I have recommended a good many dismissals, and have succeeded in some cases, I have never made a single recommendation unless a majority of the people asked for the change. If I am asked by the people, whom I had the honour to represent for a number of years, I say it is my duty to make a recommendation in furtherance of their request. That is the reason why Albert Rafuse was dismissed—the prominent people in the district asked that the change be made.

Mr. ERNST: I want to correct the impression of the hon. member as to who was postmistress or postmaster at Conquerall Banks, Lunenburg county, and I have no doubt he will accept the authority of the file of the department. I have under my hand, in the file, a copy of a letter dated Ottawa, June 28, 1927, at which time, I may say, Mrs. Rafuse was a widow. The letter is addressed to the district superintendent of postal service, Halifax, and reads:

> The district superintendent is informed that the Postmaster General has authorized the dismissal of the postmaster at Conquerall Banks, N.S., in the interest of the postal service, and he is requested to transfer the office from Mrs Ella A. Rafuse, present postmistress, to Captain Norman Oxner, as postmaster, and report the date of this transfer as soon as effected.
>
> Letter of notification in favour of Captain Oxner is herewith.

This is signed E. J. Underwood, chief superintendent of post office service.

I do not think I need comment further on the Conquerall Banks case; and with reference to the Sarty's case I may make only this observation, that I hope the remarks of the hon. member are more dependable in this connection than the remarks he made about the post office at Conquerall Banks.

Mr. DUFF: That is smart.

Mr. BENNETT: So the electors of Lunenburg thought.

Mr. ERNST: Further, with reference to the present Sarty's post office location, it is by no means in the centre of the district; in fact it is very much the other way, being considerably to the north end of the district. My hon. friend said that he did not know whether he had written or had seen the Postmaster General. I may say that under date December 10, 1926, I have a letter as follows:

> William Duff, Esq.,
> Lunenburg, N.S.
>
> Re Sarty's
>
> Dear Mr. Duff,
>
> In reply to your communication of the 26th November, recommending the dismissal of the postmaster at Sarty's, permit me to say that in accordance with your recommendation instructions have been given for the transfer of the Sarty's post office to the charge of Mr. Edwin Sarty as postmaster.
>
> Yours sincerely,
> (Sgd.) L. J. Gaboury,
> Deputy Postmaster General.

I can only suggest that the hon. gentleman refresh his memory before referring to the matter again. Now I will ask the Postmaster General to answer the question I put to him before the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff) took part in the present discussion, namely: Upon whose recommendation, so far as his records show, was Mrs. Rafuse dismissed as postmistress, and why was not that recommendation brought down as part of the file in response to the order of the house?

Mr. VENIOT: I have answered that.

Mr. ERNST: No.

Mr. VENIOT: It is pretty hard to give an answer that will satisfy the hon. gentleman.

Mr. ERNST: Satisfy the house.

Mr. VENIOT: No, it is you I am trying to satisfy just now. The hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough says that it was on his recommendation, and that refreshes my memory to that extent. I think that is correct. Now, if he has written a letter it was, as I said before, marked personal and I felt that I should not produce it. There is precedent in this house to justify the non-production of private letters on a minister's file.

Mr. BENNETT: That is another thing altogether.

Mr. VENIOT: It may be, but I took it that it was upon the same principle that I was going, and if it worked in one case it should work in the other. However, the hon. gentleman says that he releases me from that responsibility, if he has written me a personal letter, and therefore I will produce it if it is on the file.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In regard to the Upper Branch post office in Nova Scotia, the letter has been put on the file. It was not marked personal and evidently it is from the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough, who was at that time the defeated candidate for the riding of Lunenburg. The Upper Branch post office is in the electoral district of Lunenburg, as I understand. I should like to ask the minister this question: Will he act on the request of a Liberal member of this house in the dismissal of a public servant without requiring any allegations or reasons or cause? Is the mere request of a supporter of this government sufficient justification, in the mind of the minister, for the removal of an official, or must there be cause alleged?

Mr. VENIOT: Cause is given in all cases.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, I look over the file in the case of the Upper Branch post office and I find that the following communication passed:

Lunenburg, Nova Scotia,
November 26, 1926.

Hon P. J. Venoit,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Veniot:

In the interest of the postal service of this constituency please arrange to have the post office now in charge of Brown Rhodenizer, Upper Branch, transferred to Colin Sarty of that place.

Yours sincerely,
William Duff.

No reason, no charge.

Mr. VENIOT: He gives a reason.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is the file that is produced and there is no reason given.

[Mr. Ernst.]

Mr. VENIOT: He says, in the interests of the public service.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is no reason.

Mr. VENIOT: My hon. friends made dismissals with much less reason.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is no reason at all. Then comes the direction of the minister:

Please have the dismissal and appointment made as recommended and notify Mr. Duff it is being done.

(Sgd.) P.J.V.

Now here is a case where a postmaster, a humble one it is true, was dismissed purely at the request of a defeated candidate, who makes no charges. There is no cause for the removal, but it is made, I fancy, carrying out the idea of the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough as stated in this house to-night, that he is an out and out believer in the pernicious spoils system: To the victors belong the spoils. This was the political doctrine on both sides for many years and it was condemned by both sides of this house and a law was passed, practically by the unanimous consent of all parties in the house, known as the Civil Service Act of Canada. It was passed for a particular purpose, namely, to do away with the spoils system.

Mr. DUFF: Nothing to do with dismissals.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, absolutely to do with dismissals, to prevent such dismissals as were formerly made, and which were unjustifiable, on political and partisan grounds. I have this to say, that the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough has very candidly stated that he believes in that spoils system, and I think probably he has a very active sympathizer in the present Postmaster General. But while the hon. gentleman from Antigonish-Guysborough may be a believer in that system which once prevailed in Canada, but which by universal consent was put down, my hon. friend the Postmaster General has no right to disobey the law of the country; he should act in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the Civil Service Act. But from what we have heard in the last two days in the discussion of these estimates, I say that he has persistently disregarded the provisions of that law, and we are justified in inquiring into case after case, as we propose to do, before this item passes. Action will have to be taken. The law must not be disregarded by any minister of this or of any other government, and we propose to get to the bottom of the matter.

Mr. VENIOT: If this thing keeps up much longer—

Mr. GUTHRIE: It will keep on for some time.

Mr. VENIOT: Well, I am prepared to keep it up as long as you can and am well able to do it. I was going to say that if this thing keeps on much longer this house will be imbued with the idea that our hon. friends opposite have suddenly taken the wings of political purity.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The old story.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, I will tell the old story. My hon. friends were in power in 1926 for three short months, and if I made as many dismissals in proportion to the length of time I have been in office as they made in that short time my present record would sink into insignificance. In 1927 and 1928 I laid on the table of the house reports of the department; in one such report was a telegram issued while they were in office which accounted for the dismissal of seven postmasters in the county of Antigonish, on the recommendation of a then member of the cabinet. Apparently there was no harm in their doing this sort of thing but it is a crime for the present Postmaster General to accept the recommendation of an hon. member of this house or of the man looking after the interests of the Liberal party in a certain district with regard to dismissals in small offices which do not come under the Civil Service Commission.

Let me go further; in my own county a temporary postmistress in an office which is under the Civil Service Commission was dismissed on July 4, 1926, and in the county of Bonaventure another dismissal was made and a gentleman appointed on the recommendation of the Minister of Health of the shadow government. This gentleman who was appointed was the right hand man of the Conservative party there and when he received the appointment he wired back to the department, "I cannot accept the position but please appoint my wife", and his wife was appointed. That is what happened when hon. gentlemen opposite carried on in 1926; they were in power only from July 1 to September 14, and look at their record. Even then they had no authority from the people of Canada.

Mr. CLARK: They had more than the present government has to-day.

Mr. VENIOT: They probably had more then than they will have for a very long time to come. Why, in certain sections of the maritime provinces it was broadcast that the only thing you had to do was to ask for a dismissal and the government would carry out your wishes. The shadow government dismissed Liberals who had held office; when the Liberals returned to power many of these postmasters who had been unjustly dismissed by hon. gentlemen opposite were reinstated, and because we took this action we are committing a crime and hon. gentlemen hold up their hands in holy horror to think that such things should take place in this day and age. If I use language which is too rough I may be taken to task by that paragon of perfection in the English language, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), but the political conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite is the most reprehensible ever seen in this Dominion of Canada.

I do not wish to take up the time of this committee in recriminations; I wish to give the committee the information with regard to any questions they may ask and I desire to give that information as honestly as possible, but in order to expose the political hypocrisy of some hon. gentlemen opposite it has become necessary for me to take up some time in this way.

Mr. DUFF: I am sure we all listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for South Wellington; his remarks recall to mind something I read some time ago and which runs like this: "When the devil was sick the devil a monk would be; when the devil was well the devil a monk was he." My hon. friend from South Wellington was a member of the shadow government of 1926, and I am going to give just one instance of what occurred under that government. I do not want to take up too much time; I could give many such cases but will not do so. When my hon. friend from Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Ernst) was not a member of parliament and when he was not even a defeated candidate he recommended certain dismissals of postmasters in the county of Lunenburg. My hon. friend the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Manion), who is not in his seat at present, did us the honour of visiting Lunenburg during that famous election. I do not believe he had been in the county over half an hour before telegrams were being sent to Ottawa instructing the officials of his department to dismiss certain postmasters in the county of Lunenburg.

Mr. RENNIE: Is the correspondence on the file?

Mr. DUFF: I do not know what you are talking about. If you want to make a speech after I am through get up and make it; all you do is interrupt other speakers.

This is the case, Mr. Chairman: In 1912, shortly after our Tory friends came into power, they dismissed the postmaster at Pleasantville, just four miles below Conquerall Banks. No investigation was held in his case; he was simply fired from the position and a gentleman who voted for the successful candidate was appointed postmaster. In the spring of 1926, if I remember correctly, this postmaster had the misfortune to die, and the people of Pleasantville wrote me that a vacancy existed in the post office there. I consulted my friends in that vicinity and they suggested that the old postmaster, who was dismissed in 1912 for no good reason except that he voted Liberal, should be reinstated. I recommended to the Postmaster General of that day, just before the 1926 election, that this old postmaster should be reinstated, giving as my principal reason the fact that he was fired by the Tories in 1912, and he was appointed accordingly. About a fortnight after he was appointed the shadow government came into power and a few days later the hon. member for Fort William, who was acting as Postmaster General in that government, came to Lunenburg. While I have no definite information on this point it is my belief that the hon. member who is now complaining about Conquerall Banks, was the gentleman who recommended to the acting Postmaster General that this old postmaster be fired and a lady put in his place.

An hon. MEMBER: Was he fired?

Mr. DUFF: Of course he was fired.

Mr. VENIOT: And here is the wire that fired him. On August 11, the acting Postmaster General wired his secretary from Bridgewater, Nova Scotia, as follows:

For fourteen years Miss Jean Fraelick did work of postmaster for her father at Pleasantville, N.S. Because of father's death the office given to Allen Rafuse a month ago. Great injustice appears to have been done thereby and petition signed by patrons being sent forward. Please have Miss Fraelick reappointed immediately by wire and advise me Thursday at New Glasgow.

Miss Fraelick had never been postmistress, therefore she was not dismissed. On August 12, Doctor Manion received word by wire at New Glasgow that orders were issued as requested.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member has referred to my colleague who is absent to-night on an engagement he made about a week ago.

Mr. DUFF: I apologize.

[Mr. Duff.]

Mr. STEVENS: This matter was dealt with somewhat effectively in Hansard of 1926-27 at page 2297. The following extract relates to it:

I consulted the member for the district after the hon. minister made the charge, and largely on his statement I remember the facts as he brought them back to me. These are the facts: A man named Fraelick was postmaster at Pleasantville for fifteen years. He was a cripple and his daughter did the work. He died just about the time of the smash-up here last session. He was replaced by a political henchman, and his daughter was cast aside. Practically every person in the community signed a petition requesting that the girl be given back her late father's job. That is the case which I had taken up once before on a wire from my hon. friend the present member. As apparently the case had not been considered I wired at once to Mr. Gaboury, who is sitting in front of the minister to-night, and demanded —having looked into the facts on the ground— that the petitioners should be granted their petition to have the girl reappointed.

Mr. DUFF: If she had never been appointed how could she be reappointed?

Mr. STEVENS: She had been doing the work of her crippled father.

Mr. DUFF: Her father had been crippled with rheumatism for only about a year. He was a rigger, and a rigger cannot be crippled.

Mr. STEVENS: Hansard continues:

An hon. Member: She was a Liberal.

Mr. Manion: My hon. friend interjects that she was a Liberal. I do not know about that. But the proof that her appointment was a good move is that the present Postmaster General has not dismised her and she is still postmistress.

Mr. Veniot: She is not there now because she got married, and consequently her office became vacant.

Mr. Manion: My hon. friend is a smooth politician and is an adept at getting away with a great deal of oily, slippery, political material.

Mr. DUNNING: Something like what we have been hearing to-night.

Mr. STEVENS: To continue:

Mr. Veniot: There are two of a kind.

Mr. Manion: Thank God, no. I am not in the hon. gentleman's class at all, I do not pretend to be a politician.

Mr. DUFF: He was in that class for a few days.

Mr. STEVENS: To continue again:

I repeat here to-night without fear of proof to the contrary being produced on the floor of the house that there were no wholesale dismissals during the time we were in office. I do not deny there were a few dismissals where proof had been given to me that officials had so acted as to justify their dismissal.

Mr. VENIOT: I am being blamed for the same thing.

Mr. STEVENS: Hansard continues:

But I resent the attitude of my hon. friend. I have enough sense of humour to take a joke, but I certainly resent his trying to put me in his class, because I never was and never will be in his class as a politician.

There is more here, but I will not detain the house by reading further. The point is this: A man named Fraelick had the position of postmaster at Pleasantville for fifteen years, the latter part of which he was crippled and his daughter did the work.

Mr. DUFF: Quite right.

Mr. STEVENS: And he died about midsummer and she was replaced.

Mr. DUFF: By another cripple.

Mr. STEVENS: I hope my hon. friends are laughing at the joke and not at the cripple, because, after all, it is not a joking matter. I know the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysboro (Mr. Duff), even with his partisanship, is at least a pleasant, bluff, outspoken man, and all his sympathies would be with the cripple.

Mr. DUFF: They were both crippled.

Mr. STEVENS: A moment ago the minister was giving us quite a lecture about dismissals. There is no doubt that dismissals have been made. The hon. leader of the opposition mentioned this afternoon the principle which had been adopted by this house, and particularly by the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Robert Borden and I think by the present leaders on both sides of the house. It is this: After an election, if it can be shown that a public servant went out of his or her way in a partisan manner to take part in the election, he or she was subject to dismissal from office. That is to say, it is not a part of the duty of a public official to participate in a partisan manner in an election. That is the principle.

Mr. VENIOT: The Civil Service Act distinctly states that.

Mr. STEVENS: No one is questioning the minister about dismissals of that character. I have in my hand a return made on March 9, 1927—I am presuming, Mr. Chairman, that this return which was made to parliament is correct—moved for by the way, by our late member, Mr. Edwards. The return with the questions is as follows:

Subject: The names of the postmasters dismissed from office since the last federal election for political partisanship and in what counties the offices are situated.

That the proper officer do lay before this house a return showing:

1. The names of the postmasters dismissed from office since the last federal election for political partisanship, and in what counties the offices are situated.

2. The names of the postmasters removed from office at the request of:

(a) Liberal members of parliament;

(b) Liberal candidates defeated at the last election;

(c) Conservative members or defeated Conservative candidates;

(d) Progressive members or defeated Progressive candidates;

(e) Liberal-Progressive members or defeated Liberal-Progressive candidates;

(f) Members of other parties or defeated candidates of other parties.

The general answer to that is this, and I will repeat the question so that the answer can be attached:

Postmasters removed from office at the request of

(a) Liberal members of parliament.

Answer:

List attached.

I find a list of two sheets of foolscap with about seventy names.

Mr. POWER: Is that for the whole of Canada?

Mr. STEVENS: This was in March, 1927, dismissals since the election of 1926.

Mr. DUFF: I am not the only hero then?

Mr. STEVENS: No. The trouble is they are not quite so frank as my hon. friend.

Mr. DUFF: That is the difference.

Mr. STEVENS: I wish to give my hon. friend credit for that frankness.

Mr. BENNETT: He can say: "I'm Alone."

Mr. DUFF: Yes, I'm alone.

Mr. STEVENS: The next is:

(b) Liberal candidates defeated at last election.

Under that heading I find a list of about seven.

(c) Conservative members or defeated Conservative candidates.

Answer:

None.

Mr. DUNNING: None of them ever asked for a dismissal, I suppose?

Mr. STEVENS:

(d) Progressive members or defeated Progressive candidates.

Answer:

None.

(e) Liberal-Progressive members or defeated Liberal-Progressive candidates.

Under that heading, I find a list of three.

(f) Members of other parties or defeated candidates of other parties.

Answer:

None.

That is the list. The names are given and it merely illustrates what I have said, namely, that many members taking advantage of that well known and well accepted principle, demanded that these should be dismissed for partisan purposes.

Mr. DUNNING: The seventy my hon. friend mentioned were not seventy members but seventy dismissals.

Mr. STEVENS: Seventy recommendations.

Mr. DUNNING: Is the number of members given?

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps if I mentioned the constituencies, they would be recognized. Somebody suggests that we might call the roll. The list is as follows:

Gaspe, Kent, Gaspe, Gloucester, Gloucester, Montmagny, Bonaventure, Lake St. John, Restigouche-Madawaska, Restigouche-Madawaska, Nipissing, Brome-Missisquoi, Restigouche-Madawaska, Bonaventure, Gaspe, Bonaventure, Kent, Gloucester, Gaspe, Gaspe, Gaspe.

This is one I am startled to see:

Weyburn, Dorchester, Montmagny, Northumberland, Gaspe, Gaspe, Gaspe, Gaspe, Gaspe.

It makes you gasp.

Gloucester, Timiskaming North Riding, Pontiac, Willow Bunch, Quebec-Montmorency, Nipissing, Bonaventure, Gaspe, Gaspe, Compton, Kent, Gaspe, Brome-Missisquoi, Charlevoix-Saguenay, Gaspe, Gaspe, Kent, Willow Bunch, Temiscouata, Charlevoix-Saguenay, Gaspe, Restigouche-Madawaska, L'Islet, Gaspe, Dorchester, Kent, Montmagny, Montmagny, Yamaska, Bellechasse, Kent, Restigouche-Madawaska, Gloucester, Gloucester, Gaspe, Willow Bunch, Megantic, Kent, Willow Bunch.

That is the list of seventy as I said.

Mr. DUNNING: About half a dozen constituencies in the whole of Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister last year made certain statements. This is what he said as reported on page 3231 of Hansard:

Let me give the record from 1911 to 1917 and may I say to my hon. friend that I did not take any time during the dinner hour to prepare this; I had it already prepared. What do we find? We find that from the first of October, 1911, to the 31st December, 1912, they dismissed 908 postmasters. That is not degrading the service. We find that from the first January, 1913, to the 30th September, 1917, they dismissed 696 postmasters. These are the gentlemen who now say that the Postmaster General has degraded the Post Office department because, forsooth, in the last two years there have been 421 changes.

[Mr. Stevens.]

I have in my hand another return which is rather interesting. This is a return to an order of the house dated April 4, 1929, showing when and where the first rural mail route was established, number of rural mail routes established in each of the provinces, number of post offices closed in each province in each year in consequence of the establishment of the rural mail delivery, number of new post offices opened. In that return there are some very interesting figures. The minister has been twitting this side of the house with having wiped out a number of postmasters during our term of office. These are the facts. During the period of the Conservative regime, that is from 1911 to 1921—

An hon. MEMBER: What about the Union government?

Mr. STEVENS: That is including the Union government. There were established under Conservative governments and the Union government 3,339 rural routes in this country out of a total of 4,281. Let the house grasp the significance of these figures. Rural mail delivery was first introduced in 1908, and the following shows the number of routes established in each year:

Fiscal Year	Rural mail routes established
1908	36
1909	209
1910	155
1911	214
1912	296

That is the first year of the Conservative regime.

1913	1,021
1914	780
1915	634
1916	298
1917	145

Then they dropped off during the rest of the war period and they fell right off after that. During eleven years of Liberal administration there were 952 rural routes established as against 3,339 during the ten years of Conservative administration. The number of routes established under the Liberal regime from 1922 to 1929 are as follows:

Fiscal Year	Rural mail routes established
1922	12
1923	26
1924	27
1925	26
1926	23
1927	47
1928	141
1929	36

Following the other column of figures showing the post offices closed as a result of the establishment of these routes, we have the fact that during the Conservative period 3,339

rural routes were established, and 3,237 post offices were closed because of the establishment of rural routes. That is where the heavy closing of post offices and dismissals come in. Unquestionably, I am assuming from the general record that we have, there were dismissals for political partisanship just as we have them in this return and the committee ought to face the situation frankly and admit that, where partisanship is demonstrated, where public officers go out of their way to interfere in the politics of the locality, they do so at the risk of losing their positions, and as the minister very properly says, it is part of the law. But when we bring forward bona fide case after case where there has not been political partisanship, where the minister has not observed the law, do not let the minister charge us with having at some time in the past made dismissals. Furthermore, as my hon. friend from South Wellington very properly said a moment ago, the practice of dealing with public officers of Canada strictly on the spoils system as it was known in days gone by is now a thing of the past, and I think we ought to be glad of it. The spoils system was practised in the past on all sides of politics both here and in other countries, and to the south of the line it was notorious, and in a sense still is, but in this country in 1918 we passed the Civil Service Act. I well remember it, because I happened to be one of the members elected in 1911 on a pledge that I would bend every effort to assist in bringing in a Civil Service Act. In 1918 such an act was introduced after a great deal of study and thought by both sides of the house, and it was accepted by both sides of the house. My hon. friend the senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier) has been most assiduous in his advocacy of the Civil Service Act. The only thing in recent years that has in any way impaired confidence in that act has been just such cases as we have had brought to our attention under the administration of the Post Office Department, which incite—shall I say?—among the followers of the government a desire to reintroduce political interference in these matters. We cannot blame a Liberal association, or a Conservative association, if the Conservative party were in power, in some part of the country for endeavouring to push forward their favourites. You cannot expect to stop that, but the minister has no right to give way to that pressure in violation of the Civil Service Act. That is what we are complaining about. We are not complaining that the minister has received letters or that members bother him; that is to be expected, but the minister can take refuge, as he ought to do, in the statute itself. Here is the Civil Service Act, chapter 22 of the revised statutes of 1927. It is an excellent piece of legislation, covering every conceivable matter in connection with this subject. Section 55 reads:

> No deputy head, officer, clerk or employee in the civil service shall be debarred from voting at any Dominion or provincial election if, under the laws governing the said election, he has the right to vote; but no such deputy head, officer, clerk or employee shall engage in partisan work in connection with any such election, or contribute, receive or in any way deal with any money for any party funds.
>
> 2. Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall be dismissed from the civil service.

So there is no question about it, and if my hon. friends opposite find a Conservative postmaster or any other officer who has been appointed by a Conservative government in the past who has violated that section of the act, they can bring it to the attention of the Postmaster General or the other minister concerned, and it is then his duty to institute a proper inquiry, and to dismiss the official if the charge is proved. But there is this to say: Such a civil servant, whether he is here in Ottawa or elsewhere, is entitled under this law and under the accepted principle of the civil service of Canada to a hearing; he is entitled to an opportunity to defend himself. What we are complaining of is the disregard of this law.

My hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power) yesterday intimated that this law ought to be abolished, and he invited us to join with him in abolishing it. We have no sympathy with that view at all, or at least I have not. It is not a question here whether the Civil Service Act is to be observed or not. It is the law and it must be observed until parliament takes the repeal of that act into consideration.

The minister has answered us altogether too frequently with the tu quoque argument. That is not enough.

Mr. VENIOT: You have not shown both sides of the question.

Mr. STEVENS: I will give one illustration of my point. A moment ago we were discussing the case of the Picton post office. The minister intimated that Mr. Way was appointed in 1905. He was undoubtedly a Liberal appointee because at that time the Civil Service Act was not in force at all. In 1911 the postmaster at Picton was dismissed. Mr. Way had been in that office then for about six years, and the Postmaster General

says: You should have promoted him to the postmastership. He went on to say that inasmuch as the Conservatives did not promote him to the office in 1911, that justified him in refusing to promote him in 1929.

Mr. VENIOT: I said nothing of the kind. I gave a reason why I did not consider that he should be promoted, and that was not the reason.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister argued that at some length.

Mr. VENIOT: No. I merely pointed out that the Tory government at that time should have recognized Mr. Way, but they did not recognize him for promotion.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister used it as an argument in defence of his present position. What is the present position in that case? It is this: Mr. Way has now been in that office nearly twenty-four years. The minister's own officer gave him an excellent recommendation, pointing out that he was a fine appearing officer, well liked by the public and popular in the district, efficient in his work, of excellent character, and had served twenty-three years in the office. In the interim, in 1918, we passed the Civil Service Act, the act which does away with the old system of direct appointment upon the recommendation of a member or candidate or whoever has the patronage. Under the Civil Service Act the minister proceeded to call for applications for this office. He received two applications. One of them was from an individual whom he had put into the office temporarily. I am not going to pause to question whether he got the permission of the Civil Service Commission to do that or not; I take it for granted that he did.

Mr. VENIOT: No need of it.

Mr. STEVENS: He was put in at the minister's instigation at all events, and was in there for three months as a temporary employee, while Mr. Way had been there for twenty-three years.

Mr. VENIOT: Seven years under you.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend will not surely charge me after that remark with a wrong interpretation of his previous argument.

Mr. VENIOT: That is only a statement of fact, and it does not please the hon. gentleman.

Mr. STEVENS: It pleases me immensely because if I was wrong for seven years the minister is three times wrong for twenty-one or twenty-four years. If that is the measure of the heinousness of the offence of the Conservative party, how deep is his offence? But the point I am making, and I am going to keep the minister to it, is that we are now controlled by a statute. The minister is controlled by this statute, and he defies it. He is obligated by his oath of office to observe this statute, which is a part of the statute law of Canada, but he persistently, time after time, in case after case and instance after instance defies this statute. The Civil Service Commission under this statute passed by parliament sends out notifications to the citizens of Canada on a set form—I have one in my hand—notifying applicants who have complied with the statute, made their applications, and have been examined under the statute, that they have been successful. The examiners have compared them with others and justified them for the appointment, and the Civil Service Commission has sent out certificates of appointment to these individuals. The minister steps in and says: I won't take them. We know the reason. The reason is that some political friend of the minister interferes. I do not blame the political friend. I do not blame the Liberal organization. You must expect it from them as well as from other political organizations. But I blame the minister for accepting, in defiance of the statute, the recommendation of any organization or any individual and reversing the action of the Civil Service Commission. In the Picton case it is aggravated. There is no excuse and there is no escape. In the Picton case the gentleman who was put in temporarily for three months and later appointed permanently was one of the individuals who brought charges against the postmaster. He was actively engaged in the election. I do not blame him for that. But the point is, it establishes beyond peradventure that he was appointed for his political services. In fact we have on the file a letter indicating that certain persons should be appointed, and they were appointed, because it was going to be of advantage to the Liberal party. That was the reason, and the sole reason—not the sole reason for the appointment, but the sole reason why the statutory decision of the Civil Service Commission was defied. Furthermore, the appointment of Mr. Way was strongly backed by an official report of an inspector of the post office. The minister cannot escape from these things. I think he has found some difficulty in finding in the long period I have been in parliament any recommendation from me in any way interfering with the administration of the Post Office Department.

Mr. VENIOT: I have not looked up the hon. gentleman's record.

Mr. STEVENS: I invite him to do it.

Mr. VENIOT: It might have been done verbally.

Mr. STEVENS: No, I rarely ever go there. I invite him to do that, not in any vainglorious way, but for this reason. From the moment I became a member of this house, and this is my twentieth session, I have assiduously stood by the principle of Civil Service Commission appointments. I will tell you why. I had six hundred civil servants in my riding in the earlier days when the whole of the patronage was in my hands, and I earnestly sought for civil service reform and appointment so that I could get away from the hopeless task of dealing with such a condition. As a matter of fact, we did not dismiss a soul in the Vancouver post office, with all its large staff. The minister will find recommendations from me for appointments during those years before the act was passed because in every instance they were referred to me, as such appointments were referred to every member; but not since the Civil Service Act came into force.

Now, I invite the minister, and I invite the government, seriously to consider this condition of affairs. The story is not half told. We have brought only a few cases forward. The minister has not yet faced this question seriously. He has treated it more or less as a joke. He has replied to us by saying: Oh, well, it was a disgrace to the public life of Canada the way the Conservatives acted. But the minister must remember that we are not dealing with the Conservative party of ten or twenty years ago, or with the Liberal party of ten or twenty years ago.

Mr. VENIOT: But what about the shadow government?

Mr. STEVENS: All right, I will deal with it.

Mr. VENIOT: You made dismissals then.

Mr. BENNETT: For partisanship. Reasons were given in every case.

Mr. VENIOT: You dismissed them during the election and gave them no chance to prove their innocence. What right have you to exercise political patronage and condemn me for doing so?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Because those we dismissed were partisans.

Mr. VENIOT: Oh.

Mr. STEVENS: I gave reasons in the Fraelick case.

Mr. VENIOT: In the Fraelick case the lady was not appointed at the time we had this telegram nor during the election. She remained in on the appointment made by the hon. gentleman who was then Postmaster General. She sent in her resignation because she was going to get married, but after her marriage she wished to continue. She remained in office under the name of her husband, recommended by William Duff.

Mr. STEVENS: He apparently had a sense of fairness.

Mr. BENNETT: No, conversion.

Mr. STEVENS: I am trying to point out to the minister that he certainly will not make much headway by his attitude of mind on this question. We are taking a very sound position and it will not do for the hon. minister simply to say that the Conservatives did so and so. Let me remind the minister of my little talk with him last night. He had cited seven or eight cases where soldiers were overlooked, and he asked us what we were doing. These were appointments made while he was Postmaster General.

Mr. VENIOT: Not all.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, many of them since he or Mr. Murphy, his predecessor, has been in office.

Mr. VENIOT: Some twelve.

Mr. STEVENS: He said to us: What were you doing that you did not protect the interests of those soldiers? But what was he doing? Last night I asked him very frankly: Why did you not exercise your prerogative in regard to these cases after the Civil Service Commission had made its recommendation as you had done in the cases of Whittaker and Bowyer. Oh, he intimated to me —I will quote his words in a moment—he had very little to do with it, that the statute named the deputy minister. I said, yes, the statute names the deputy minister, but we know, and he knows, that the deputy minister does not act except on the authority of the minister. He sought to evade the question, and he did it quite skilfully. I have the little dialogue here. I am quoting from page 1666 of Hansard, dealing with the discussion last night:

Mr. Stevens: I understand that, under the act referred to by the minister sometime ago, the Postmaster General or, I think, technically the Deputy Postmaster General, has the right, after an appointment has been made by the Civil Service Commission, to reject the nominee and ask for a further consideration. In

each of these cases cited by the Postmaster General in regard to returned soldiers during recent years, did the Postmaster General exercise his power under that section?

Mr. Veniot: I have no power under that section.

"I have no power under that section." The letter read to-night is a straight, unvarnished order to do it—a letter from himself to his deputy, instructing him to tell the Civil Service Commission that the appointment would not be accepted. But last night he said, "I have no power under that section." If under that section he had no power to deal with the cases of these returned soldiers, how did he get power to give instructions in the other case? The minister was not frank; he has not been frank with the house since he brought down his estimates. He is not playing the game.

Mr. VENIOT: Perhaps I am playing it too much.

Mr. STEVENS: There is a very serious principle at stake in connection with the Civil Service Act, and it is this: certain persons secure appointment through competitive examination by the Civil Service Commission. Having passed the examination they are entitled to receive appointment, but there is a reservation, which has a distinct and definite meaning and intent. It appears, I think, in section 13 of the act, if I recall rightly, wherein the minister or the deputy minister is empowered, in the event of an appointee sent over by the Civil Service Commission being incompetent or unsuitable, to call for a second appointment from the commission. And why is that in the act? For this very simple reason. The Civil Service Commission makes its examination—I am not going to go into the details—on certain grounds, allocating certain marks for certain qualifications. There is a verbal examination and a written examination; there is an examination on educational qualifications, and there is an examination on technical qualifications. There is also an examination as to health, intelligence, suitability and so forth. All these things are factors, and it is possible that the commission might choose an individual who by temperament, or by some peculiar physical disability, or for some other reason, might be more or less an irritant in a department; that is to say, an impossible person from the standpoint of temperament. I know of such people myself, who could pass examinations, probably well. It is therefore provided in the statutes that in a case of that kind, an abnormal case, the minister may reject the appointee. But he may not do so for the purpose of appointing his own choice; he may not defeat the purpose of the act. He can ask the Civil Service Commission to make a second appointment. Now why does the minister persist in the course he has followed? Take the case referred to by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) to-night. A young lady tries the examination; she seeks to enter the civil service as a life work. She passes her examination, receives notice from the commission that she is appointed, resigns her present position, and goes and reports for duty as she is instructed to do by the government of Canada. Can we expect private citizens to understand not only all the intricacies of the statutes of the land, but all the idiosyncrascies of the minister? Can we expect it? Not very well. They act on good faith, believing that when they receive a document signed by a government official the Dominion government is behind that document. So this young lady resigned her job and reported for duty. They dilly-dallied for a month, and then she was coolly told that the Post Office department had not ratified her appointment. And in her place was put a young man, a boy in fact—under the civil service age by the way—who was the son of a very prominent supporter of my hon. friend; not that he is any the worse for that, but it is a rather significant coincidence. It is the same in case after case, incident after incident. The Civil Service Commission's recommendation is repudiated by the minister and a particular friend substituted.

Now the country asks the government, the country is expecting of parliament, a vindication of the Civil Service Act. That is what the country is asking for—a vindication of the act. And we intend, so far as we are concerned, to insist that the facts be brought out. I am inviting the government, as I did this afternoon and do again to-night—not the Postmaster General, because that I conceive to be hopeless, but I do invite the government as a whole—seriously to take this matter up. They can do it in conclave if they like, but let them take it up and tell the house whether or not the Civil Service Act is to be a joke, whether it is to be defied, or whether we are going to pay at least reasonable respect to its provisions. That is what we ask, and we claim that we are on sound ground. These cases that have been brought up have not been fairly answered; they have not been frankly met. The frankest thing we have had to-night is the outspoken declaration of my hon. friend from Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff) who stated that he was for the spoils system, that he believed in it and was willing to fight for it, that he had made a recommendation—

Mr. DUNNING: I did not hear him say that.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, he did, and I admire him for his frankness. I think he is to be commended on that score even though we cannot agree with him on the principle behind the declaration. I certainly think it was a refreshing change from the attitude of the minister.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman has already spoken several times on this question and I have attempted to answer him and others. I have always thought that the hon. gentleman would at least give some proof of being fair when he is stating to the house what he calls facts. There are always two sides to the medal, two sides to every argument. When the hon. gentleman tried to excuse his friends for the very large number of dismissals they made in the first eighteen months they were in power, by saying that nearly all these were brought about by reason of the closing of post offices through the establishment of the rural route in the Dominion, he instanced the number of post offices that had been closed. On the other hand he did not tell the house—and I say that he should have been fair enough to do so—the number of new post offices that were opened each year and which in many cases, in some years, counter-balanced the closing of the old.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. VENIOT: The record is here and cannot be denied. Hon. gentlemen may say "oh, oh" as much as they like, but let me give an instance. Take for instance the opening of new post offices last year in the province of New Brunswick, from the members representing which I hear "oh, oh." Those established were 22 and those closed 21.

Mr. ERNST: What about 1912 and 1913?

Mr. VENIOT: In 1912 and 1913 the record will show around 300. The hon. member took the record from 1912 to 1921 and he gave the total. Let him give the yearly closings.

Mr. STEVENS: I will give them; I gave them once but I will give them again. These are for the fiscal year, I presume. The government return from which I am quoting says 1912, which means, I suppose, March 31, 1912. I will give first the rural routes established and secondly the post offices closed:

Year	Rural routes established	Post Offices closed
1912..	296	270

Mr. DUNNING: Those are purely closings consequent upon the establishment of rural routes. They are not all the closings.

Mr. STEVENS: That is right.

Mr. DUNNING: Those consequent on the establishment of routes.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Year	Rural routes established	Post Offices closed
1913..	1,021	872
1914..	780	820
1915..	634	522
1916..	298	310
1917..	145	134
1918..	64	189
1919..	55	67
1920..	22	37
1921..	24	16
1922..	12	19
1923..	26	26
1924..	27	24
1925..	26	35
1926..	23	33
1927..	47	70
1928..	141	99
1929..	36	..

The figure for those closed in this year is not given.

Mr. VENIOT: Thank you for the information. According to the figures my hon. friend has just given, about 1,300 offices were closed in 1912 and 1913 through the establishment of rural routes, but in the first eighteen months hon. gentlemen opposite were in power there were 1,604 dismissals.

Mr. STEVENS: If I might be permitted to interrupt the minister, will he give the exact dates? That is the only fair method of comparison.

Mr. VENIOT: It does not reach 1914.

Mr. STEVENS: If the minister will lump a few years together he will get fair comparison.

Mr. VENIOT: I am not going to argue with the hon. gentleman as to the exact month or hour these dismissals were made, but the record does show that hon. gentlemen opposite made 1,604 dismissals during the first eighteen months they were in power, and I defy the hon. gentleman to show that those dismissals occurred through the establishment of rural routes.

Mr. STEVENS: I would say about 70 per cent of them occurred in that way.

Mr. VENIOT: Not at all; the dismissals were made simply because hon. gentlemen opposite wanted to put their friends into office. That is all I wish to say; I simply

wanted to show the hon. gentleman that he did not give both sides of the story, because when he gave the number of offices closed he did not give the number of new offices opened in the same period.

Mr. ERNST: Then give them.

Mr. VENIOT: If you want the information, look for it; you are making the argument.

Mr. ERNST: The minister began by announcing that the new post offices opened exceeded the number closed in many years; apparently the figures do not suit his purpose at the moment, since he does not give them. I want to deal with one specific case to which the minister referred in order to justify his claim that patronage was practised by the so-called shadow government. He gave as an example a case which occurred in my county, the case also mentioned by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff), the only dismissal of a postmaster in either Lunenburg or Queens county during the time the shadow government was in power. The facts of the case have been given in this house by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion), who was Postmaster General at the time, but perhaps I might repeat them. Mr. Fraelick, the father of Miss Fraelick, held the office for some fifteen years; during the latter part of his life he was a cripple and his daughter looked after the office. Immediately after Mr. Fraelick's death and almost before he was buried, I am informed that the office was transferred to Mr. A. L. Rafuse, who also is described as a cripple. I am not aware of his physical condition, but I do know that he is a merchant of some considerable standing in the district and did not need the post office in order to support himself, whereas the Fraelick family were dependent upon it. Further, a petition was presented signed by practically every resident of that district with the exception of Mr. Rafuse and his immediate relatives, asking that the office be given back to Miss Fraelick; that petition is in the department, but although the Postmaster General wants the record kept straight he has never tabled it in this house.

Mr. VENIOT: Was not the office given back?

Mr. ERNST: Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: In my time?

Mr. ERNST: No.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. ERNST: No, it was transferred back by the hon. member for Fort William. That is just what my hon. friend complained about.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. member is making a mistake. The records will show that the lady in question took charge of the office on her father's death and that in June of that year, before I was Postmaster General, an appointment was made. After that appointment was made, however, the Postmaster General in what we call the shadow government dismissed that appointee and appointed the lady.

Mr. ERNST: That is what I have stated.

Mr. VENIOT: The lady then retained the position and was not dismissed afterwards.

Mr. ERNST: No; who said she was?

Mr. VENIOT: The petition referred to by my hon. friend is on file, and on that petition, which came to me after I was sworn in as Postmaster General—

Mr. ERNST: It was there before that time.

Mr. VENIOT: It may have been, but I handled it. A request was received for the dismissal of the lady in question, and I took up the matter on this petition. This lady had resigned to marry but she wanted to go back and keep the office; the resignation had not been put into effect and the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough recommended that this lady be allowed to remain in the position and no change was made.

Mr. ERNST: I have no dispute with the statement just made by the minister. I said that when the hon. member for Fort William was Postmaster General the office was taken from Mr. Rafuse and given to Miss Fraelick on the petition signed by every resident of the district except Mr. Rafuse and his immediate relatives. If the Postmaster General wants any further confirmation of the public attitude with respect to that matter, as to whether or not it was patronage in the ordinary sense of the term, he has only to look at the results of the elections of 1925 and 1926. In 1925, before the change was made, the present member for Antigonish-Guysborough received a substantial majority in that district; in 1926 the same people, indignant over the change in the post office, gave me a substantial majority. That is the most conclusive answer I can give my hon. friend as to whether the action was taken in the public interest.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. SHORT: I would like to ask the Postmaster General to be good enough to-morrow to bring the file—the complete file—in connection with the dismissal of the postmaster at Waterford, Digby county, Nova Scotia, in order that we may discuss that matter then.

Mr. VENIOT: Very well.

M. ERNST: I would like to draw to the attention of the committee another dismissal, this time in the county of Queens. A gentleman by the name of Mr. M. A. Harlow, a man of advanced years who was postmaster in the village of North Brookfield in the county of Queens for nearly forty-five years and whose son was killed serving overseas, was dismissed from office. The file relating to his dismissal, or what purports to be the file, was brought down in conformity with an order of this house in 1928. I want to read that file to the committee in order to show just what caused the Postmaster General to dismiss this old servant of the crown who had held that office for so long, who had lost his boy, overseas, and who was depending in a large measure upon this position. I desire to read a letter written by the Postmaster General under date of December 13, 1926 and addressed to Mr. L. J. Gaboury, Deputy Postmaster General, at Ottawa:

My Dear Sir,

You will please make arrangements for the removal of the postmaster at North Brookfield, Queens County, N.S., and appoint in his stead Mr. Nelson Frank of that place.

Your very truly,
(Sgd.) P. J. Veniot.

That is the only reference made in this file to the cause of dismissal; the remainder of the file contains only the ordinary routine business of dismissal. There is absolutely no cause assigned in this case for the dismissal of this old servant of the crown. There is nothing to indicate on whose recommendation he was discharged; there is nothing to indicate what the cause or the reason was, and I know that a very strong political partisan, in fact the leading worker of the party to which the Postmaster General belongs, was appointed in his place. I would like to ask the minister if he is prepared to complete this file and to give the committee the information to which it is entitled. Obviously the file is not complete, and I desire to know whether the postmaster will undertake to bring down this information.

Mr. VENIOT: I will bring down the information if it is not on a private file. I have stated that before and I will go no farther. I have a right to adhere to that practice, because it has been the practice of the house not to produce any documents on the ministers' private files, which are marked "personal". I am not going to be driven to take that action in this case.

Mr. ERNST: I assume that it was upon the recommendation of the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff) that this dismissal took place, but can a member have a public servant of this country dismissed and have his letter treated as sacred by simply marking it "personal"? If that is the practice of the Post Office Department, there is something radically wrong. If a member wanted a particular action taken by any minister of the crown, all he would have to do would be to put "personal" across his letter and the minister could say, "This is on my private file and I will not produce it." That is the stand which has been taken by the Postmaster General. I ask the members of the house: When a public servant is dismissed should not the reason be given to the house; have we not the right to know? We are here representing the people. I am here representing the constituency of Queens-Lunenburg, and the people of my constituency want to know why this action was taken.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, as I have said before this evening, if this house desires to pass supply it can not be passed on that statement. We owe a duty to the public which is of far more importance. I hope the house realizes what is involved in this, and as it is near eleven o'clock the Postmaster General will have an opportunity before supply is next moved to consider whether or not a letter, upon which a public official is dismissed, can be marked "personal", and therefore not brought down to the house. That is the question at issue. Supply has been withheld in other countries for less reason than that, and I feel perfectly certain that on mature consideration the government will not take that position. Remember that governments do not endure forever, and it is establishing a precedent.

Mr. HEPBURN: The shadow government had its day.

Mr. BENNETT: I should say that there is one member who should be very thankful for that because it enabled him to become a member of this parliament for a short time.

If it were not so serious we would not take up the time of the house discussing the matter, but, as I say, governments do not last forever and our position to-day may be

the position of my hon. friends opposite some other day. When the Postmaster General said that this principle was applied in the past, he was speaking of an entirely different matter. A personal letter written to a minister about a personal matter and placed upon his personal file is privileged, and this house has so ruled. But a letter marked "personal" which deals with the public business of Canada cannot be made personal merely by marking it so. That principle has been laid down by parliament from the first time the production of papers was called for, because parliament claims the right to redress grievances and it claims the right to know what the grievances are before supply is granted. The only time this matter can be placed before parliament is when supply is being sought. It would be an intolerable thing if all you had to do was to mark communications to a minister "personal" and know that they could not be brought down as part of the file. I do not think there is a minister in this country except the Postmaster General who would suggest that that be done. The rules to which he referred are rules which deal purely with personal communications. For instance, if I write a letter to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) and say that I hope he is enjoying better health and I very much regret that he has been laid up for so long a period, his secretary, if he keeps it at all and does not send it to the waste paper basket, puts it upon the personal file and that is the end of it. But if I say to the minister in that letter, "I strongly recommend that John Smith be appointed a judge of the county court. He has qualifications of a very peculiar character and they should not be overlooked—"

An hon. MEMBER: And the man is appointed.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think he would be appointed upon my recommendation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh, yes, he would.

Mr. BENNETT: I know one hon. gentleman in this house who would not call that a personal communication in respect to that part of it, and that is my hon. friend the Minister of Justice.

Mr. DUNNING: He might write to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) and point out that fact.

Mr. BENNETT: He would take that part of the letter which deals with public business and say, "I am not treating this as a personal matter." But when an official is actually removed from office upon the recommendation contained in a letter which may be marked "personal" and the Postmaster General says that that letter must be treated as private, he is going beyond any precedent which will be found in the records of this country. The hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough is not the only gentleman who has used such letters, and the evidence will be forthcoming when the session progresses. I think the Postmaster General might well reconsider his position, as I am sure the government would not expect supply to be granted unless that very ordinary request were granted.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, April 19, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Ninth report of select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.—Mr. Cahill.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT

On the motion of Hon. Charles Marcil, the first report of the joint committee on the printing of parliament was concurred in.

TRANSFER OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend from St. John-Albert (Mr. MacLaren) a few days ago asked for a return with respect to the return to the prairie provinces of the natural resources in so far as concerned correspondence with the province of New Brunswick in relation thereto. There were one or two letters that were written just about the time the return was brought down, and I understand that my hon. friend would like to have the return supplemented with these letters. I now table them.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 149 for the relief of Dorothy Madeline Hanson Campbell.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 150 for the relief of Frank Arthur LeNoury.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 151 for the relief of William Thomas Taylor.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 152 for the relief of Thomas Booker.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 153 for the relief of Marion Isabel Kemp.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 154 for the relief of Agnes Victoria Leader.—Mr. Edwards (Ottawa).

Bill No. 155 for the relief of Louisa Martha Weston.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 156 for the relief of Susannah Musson Savery.—Mr. Bell (Hamilton West).

Bill No. 157 for the relief of Elizabeth Crawford Copping.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 158 for the relief of Arthur Alderton. —Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 159 for the relief of Elias Abraham, otherwise known as Elie Abraham Allen.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 160 for the relief of Irene Mabel Usher.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 161 for the relief of Anna Estella DeNike.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 162 for the relief of Elizabeth Spain.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 163 for the relief of Bella Solnik. —Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 164 for the relief of Louisa Hitchman.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 165 for the relief of Florence Jane Sheppard.—Mr. Sanderson.

Motions for first readings agreed to on division.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Outside service — Salaries and allowances, $17,295,464.40.

Mr. VENIOT: I was asked yesterday for certain explanations and certain reports. I was asked by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy)—

Mr. SPENCER: If the hon. minister will allow me, the hon. member for Peace River asked me to let him know if the minister was going to bring down this information. He is engaged elsewhere at the moment, and perhaps the minister would give this information later.

Mr. VENIOT: Very well. There was also a letter written by the hon. member for Antigonish-Gusyborough (Mr. Duff) in connection with the Sarty's post office, and which was on my own personal file. I considered it personal and did not put it on the file that was brought down, but as it seems to be the desire of the committee that the letter should be on the file, I am now tabling it.

Mr. BENNETT: We required only that part of the letter which dealt with the post office.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, and I now table it. In connection with North Brookfield, it was claimed that a return tabled in 1928 was not complete, the only reference to the dismissal being a letter of instruction from the Postmaster General to the deputy. In this case also I am laying the complete file, including my own file, on the table.

In connection with the case brought up by the hon. member for New Westminster, I wish to read to the house my report on that case, and then to table the file. My report is as follows:

When Miss K. T. Mawson, the postmistress, requested that a male stenographer be appointed in her place, in response to her request for a statement of the duties of the position it was stated that stenographic work took up about one-half of the daily period, the other half being occupied in assisting the regular employees in the different departments where required. The Civil Service Commission reviewed the duties of the position and decided that it should be changed from postal clerk to stenographer grade 2, on account of the fact that his general duties were stenographic. The postmaster, however, represented that there were certain duties which he would not care to require a female to perform. Subsequent to Miss K. T. Mawson's resignation in July, 1928, Mr. Harold Wade was taken on and was appointed to the permanent staff as stenographer grade 2, as from January 29, 1926. In April, 1928, Mr. Wade was promoted to postal clerk, and the commissioners were requested to furnish the name of a male stenographer to replace him. They were unable to do so, and gave authority for a local selection. In consequence Mr. S. W. Thomas was employed temporarily from September 1, 1928. Subsequently the commission held a competition for stenographers at New Westminster, and on September 28, 1928, they submitted the name of Miss Margaret Isabella Moore, one of the successful candidates, in connection with the filling of the position permanently. In view of the postmaster's representations, however, the services of Mr. Thomas were retained and Miss Moore was not offered employment. It is understood that the Civil Service Commission advised Miss Moore, in reply to her inquiry, that the reason she had not been accepted by the department was that a male stenographer was necessary.

That is the explanation given to me by the officials of my department. It was purely a departmental matter and did not come before

the minister at all. I am now laying the file on the table so the hon. gentleman can examine it.

Yesterday the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy) asked for some information regarding Waterhole post office and Fairview post office. Here is the history of the case:

Waterhole is an old established office. It was opened on August 15, 1912. On January 29, 1928, Mr. David P. Smith, returned soldier, was appointed postmaster. Mr. Smith is still postmaster at Waterhole. Prior to Mr. Smith being appointed Mr. H. Sigler was acting postmaster. Mr. Sigler was applicant for the postmastership at Waterhole, and asked that if he were not successful in the appointment there he be considered as an applicant for the position of postmaster at Fairview.

Fairview post office. In 1920 authority was given for the opening of a new post office at Fairview, 4½ miles from Waterhole. In submitting the application for the new office the district superintendent stated that there were two applicants, namely, Mr. Sigler and Mr. Levesque. In the first instance authority was given for the opening of the office at Fairview under the postmastership of Mr. Lesveque. In September the Postmaster General suspended action as he understood that Levesque was a non-resident. In November, 1928, the office was opened in charge of Mr. Sigler, who had been the former acting postmaster at Waterhole. Mr. Smith, the postmaster at Waterhole, inquired in regard to the possibility of his getting the appointment at Fairview, presumably on account of the increase in business at Waterhole, many of the residents having left for Fairview. Both offices are in operation at the present time. Mr. Smith is postmaster at Waterhole, and Mr. Sigler is the postmaster at Fairview. Up to the present time the postmaster at Fairview, Mr. Sigler, has been paid a salary of $100 a year. The postmaster at Waterhole, Mr. Smith, is still paid at the rate of approximately $1,000 a year.

The revenue of the Fairview post office from November 1, 1928, to the end of March, 1929, is $986. The revenue of the Waterhole office for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1929, is $1,423. The salaries will be adjusted on the above revenue bases at April 1, 1929.

Now, if the hon. gentleman wishes a copy—

Mr. KENNEDY: I have a copy here. But my contention, Mr. Chairman, is that Smith was appointed to the Waterhole office by the Civil Service Commission. He is a returned soldier. All that exists at Waterhole to-day is the post office, a part of one of the three or four stores that were originally there, and a bunch of yawning cellars, the buildings having been moved to Fairview. The bank has also been transferred to Fairview. In a word, there is practically nothing left at Waterhole. The reason that Waterhole in the past was a revenue office was due to the fact of its being the centre of the district so far as general business was concerned; but for the future the Waterhole post office cannot be anything else than merely a small country office for delivering mail. There is no question about that, because all business must go to Fairview, with its two banks, the only place where it can be transacted. In the very nature of things the Waterhole office must be attached to a store or given to someone who does not have to devote his full time to it. The civil service appointee is left there where he cannot make a living as postmaster under the natural order of things, as is well known to the post office superintendent of the district and to anyone else familiar with the circumstances.

My contention is that when the town and the business was moved to Fairview, the appointed postmaster should have been moved there as well, with his office. It is purely a case of appointing a man through the minister—a political appointment, if you like—and leaving the other man, appointed by the Civil Service Commission, at Waterhole, in a job that is bound to run out as far as he is concerned.

An hon. MEMBER: He is left in the hole.

Mr. KENNEDY: Yes, he will be in the hole all right. This office at Fairview has a peculiar record. I find on the file a letter from Mr. Levesque to the Postmaster General which reads as follows:

June 19, 1928.

In view of the fact that the Alberta government is extending the Central Canada railway fifteen miles west of the present terminus at Whitelaw to a townsite, which at present appears will be called Fairview, I wish to submit my name as desirous of obtaining the post office at the new town, whatever name is selected.

As the contract for the completion of the extension calls for early fall, I trust you can see your way clear to accept this as my application for the post office.

In support of this application I am taking the liberty of referring you to the Hon. Mr. Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior.

Yours very truly,

J. D. Levesque.

On August 13 the district superintendent at Edmonton made two recommendations with regard to the appointment of a postmaster at Fairview. The first in order of merit was Henry Sigler, Fairview, the second J. D. Levesque, Peace River. He states in this report that the revenues of the office

at Waterhole will be affected adversely by the establishment of the new office. On August 25, 1928, we have this memorandum for the Deputy Postmaster General:

Re Fairview. Establish office and appoint Levesque.

In spite of the fact that he was second on the list. Now there is nothing to indicate what has happened, but I understand Mr. Levesque was a non-resident so far as Fairview was concerned. There was a general and vigorous protest against this appointment by, I believe, the Canadian Legion, and as the minister has said, we have instructions issued by himself to suspend action. Very little was done for some months with regard to the opening of the office, and while the town of Waterhole was being moved to the new site of Fairview a number of people who had become residents of Fairview and who had previously been resident in Waterhole, wrote to the Postmaster General asking for the establishment of a post office. I wired the Postmaster General, and I think I made it perfectly clear that it was necessary to establish a new office; and it was also made clear that some change would be required with regard to the revenues of the post office at Waterhole. The following telegram was despatched, dated November 14, Fairview, Alberta, addressed to P. J. Veniot, Postmaster General, Ottawa, Ontario:

Waterhole village moved during last month five miles northeast to Fairview, Alberta. New town end of steel, E.D. & B.C. railway. Fairview has six elevators, two banks, six stores, no post office as yet. Post office should be established immediately.

(Sgd.) D. M. Kennedy.

Prior to this Mr. Smith, who was Postmaster at Waterhole, realizing what would happen when the town was being moved, wrote as follows:

Waterhole, Alberta,
September 24, 1928.

Postmastar General,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir:

I wish to know if I could be transferred from Waterhole post office to the new post office at Fairview. If not, I wish to apply for the Fairview appointment. What salary would the postmaster at Fairview receive the first year? My reasons for the transfer are: There will be a school in Fairview, the nearest school to Waterhole is 1½ miles distance, also the salary for the Waterhole appointment in the near future, I have heard, will be decreased.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) D. P. Smith,
Postmaster, Waterhole.

On November 17 we have the following memorandum from the Postmaster General to the Deputy Postmaster General:

Re new post office at Fairview, Alberta

Referring to memorandum September 8, you are hereby instructed to proceed immediately with the establishment of an office at Fairview. Mr. Henry Sigler, who is given first place in the district superintendent's report, of the 13th August, is to be placed in charge as postmaster.

This is rather a peculiar statement. Mr. Henry Sigler, it is said, is to be appointed postmaster because he is given first place by the district superintendent, but he was given first place before when Mr. Levesque was appointed. The report giving Mr. Sigler first place over Mr. Levesque was in the hands of the Postmaster General before he appointed Mr. Levesque. Then we have a wire to Mr. Leger, district superintendent of postal service, Edmonton, Alberta, under date of Ottawa, November 17, as follows:

Re Fairview. Take immediate steps to open office with Henry Sigler as postmaster.

(Sgd.) E. J. Underwood.

On November 21, 1928, Mr. Smith wrote to the Postmaster General as follows:

Waterhole Post Office, Alberta.
November 21, 1928.

The Postmaster General.

Dear Sir:

In connection with the appointment for Fairview post office, I wish to know if Mr. Sigler has been appointed temporary postmaster, and if there is a chance of myself getting the appointment. If not, I would like to know how this office stands, will it be closed in the near future and salary decreased meantime.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) D. P. Smith, P.M.,
Waterhole, Alberta.

On November 29, 1928, we have the following letter from E. J. Underwood to D. P. Smith, in reply to the letter I have just read:

D. P. Smith, Esq.,
Postmaster,
Waterhole, Alberta.

Dear Sir:

In reply to your communication of the 27th November, regarding the opening of the post office at Fairview, permit me to inform you that there is no vacancy at that point as Mr. Henry Sigler was placed in charge as regular postmaster.

As regards the status of Waterhole, I may state that it will depend on the amount of patronage given it in the future. It is observed that it is over four miles from the townsite of Fairview and the question as to whether it will be maintained or not will depend on

its revenue. The same applies to the salary attached to this office, which will be revised at the end of the present fiscal year and after the Fairview post office has been in operation for some months.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) E. J. Underwood,
Chief Superintendent of
Post Office Service.

And then we have some correspondence between the Postmaster General and Mr. Reilly, who is good enough to ask Mr. Smith whether he would resign his job at Waterhole in order that he might be transferred to Fairview—just about five hours before Reilly went to Fairview and appoint Mr. Sigler as postmaster there.

Now my point is that this returned soldier, who was appointed by the Civil Service Commission to the office in that district, should have been given the new office, which is and must be an important office, the others being merely subsidiaries. There was no misunderstanding so far as the department was concerned; it was understood in Ottawa as well as in Edmonton what was happening. In the first place Mr. Levesque was appointed on the recommendation of somebody whose letter is in the Postmaster General's file but is not produced in this file. Mr. Sigler had been recommended by the district superintendent at Edmonton first in order of merit and Mr. Levesque second, and after Mr. Levesque's appointment had to be cancelled Mr. Sigler months later was appointed on the direct recommendation of the Postmaster General.

How can we expect a department the size of the Post office department to be efficiently administered and to be kept up to date if we are going to have the man at the head of the department taking charge of the details of appointments, political and otherwise, in the various small post offices throughout the Dominion? You might as well have Sir Henry Thornton going out west appointing section foremen. The Postmaster General has simply been playing politics in this instance, and anyone who is going to take up his time playing politics in this way cannot in my judgment pay proper attention to the big affairs in connection with his department. In addition to that we have a direct case of discrimination in actual fact against a returned soldier in favour of political appointees, and that is the reason why I speak on this occasion.

[Mr. Kennedy.]

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot see how it is possible that the hon. member (Mr. Kennedy) can say that there is any discrimination. In the first place, it was at an early date that the present postmaster at the first-named office, Waterhole, was appointed and accepted the position under the Civil Service Commission. For the same reason that I cancelled the appointment of Mr. Levesque at Fairview, because of his not being a resident, the Civil Service Commission would cancel the appointment of Mr. Smith to Fairview; because under the act no returned soldier nor anyone else can be considered who is not a resident of the place. That being the case—

Mr. KENNEDY: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. VENIOT: I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman when he was speaking and surely he will accord me the courtesy of listening to what I have to say. There has been a little too much of this jumping up and interrupting the minister when he is endeavouring to make explanations. Surely the hon. gentleman who stands so firmly by the Civil Service Commission would not want me to undertake to violate the law; although no doubt he feels I should have done so in this case, surely he would not encourage me to do so. I had no option in the matter; there was only one thing to do and that was to appoint a postmaster to the position at Fairview, which was done. That is the only explanation I can give; there was no question of discrimination in my mind. The hon. gentleman has quite often referred to my discriminating against returned soldiers, and I feel the time has come when perhaps he might be told that my record with regard to returned soldiers from the beginning of the war to the present day is at least equal to if not better than his own.

Mr. KENNEDY: I would like to correct the Postmaster General; I did not make a general statement with regard to returned soldiers but I did make a statement with regard to this returned soldier.

Mr. VENIOT: We know what your intentions were, anyway.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I would like to draw the attention of the minister—

Mr. VENIOT: Would my hon. friend allow me to complete the returns I am to table? I was asked for a return having to do with the Waterford, Nova Scotia, post office, which I now submit to the house. I was also asked to complete the file in connection with the Conquerall Banks post office by

adding certain letters which were on my own file. I am submitting herewith the additional letters; I think they are all from Mr. Duff and since he asked yesterday that they be submitted I have no hesitation in doing so.

Mr. GOTT: Are all the files in the department dissected?

Mr. VENIOT: I do not think I need answer that remark. Now I wish to submit another return in connection with the Uffington post office, and in doing so I wish to apologize to the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) because of certain figures I stated to the committee yesterday. This correction does not take away from the seriousness of the occurrences at that post office, but in revising the file which came from the finance branch of the department I find that instead of a shortage of $142 in 1926 the actual shortage was $24.43. However, that irregularity was continued later on and in 1928 a further irregularity was shown by an inspection on June 7, so with that explanation I am submitting the remainder of the file. Hon. members must remember that there are three different files in the department covering each of these matters, which may account for some of the files which have been submitted to the house not being complete. Then the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) requested information with regard to the postmastership at St. Davids, Ontario. When I left the department to come here that report was not ready, but they were working on it and if it comes in during the afternoon I will table it.

Mr. CLARK: The minister promised to bring a file for me, or to complete the file with reference to Sutton, Quebec.

Mr. VENIOT: When I left the office they were bringing the correspondence up to date; I may have it this afternoon.

Mr. CLARK: Would the minister state whether or not a postmaster has been appointed at Sutton?

Mr. VENIOT: I could not say from memory. I have something here with regard to St. Davids, which just came in, and which I will table. Mr. E. D. Lowry was suspended and resigned on November 18, 1927; a Civil Service Commission certificate was issued in favour of A. E. Woodruff; the certificate was accepted and he was placed in charge on March 1, 1928. As soon as the file with regard to Sutton comes in I will give it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Could the minister tell me how many postal workers there are in Canada? I see the term used freely and I understand that it includes letter carriers in the cities. How many letter carriers are there and how many postal workers?

Mr. VENIOT: I will secure the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I would like to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to page 791 of Hansard for 1928, where the following question appears:

Dismissal of Postmasters

Mr. Brady:

1. How many postmasters were dismissed throughout Canada from October 1, 1926, to February 1, 1928?

2. During above period, how many of those postmasters were dismissed in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island?

Mr. Veniot:

1. 421.

2. British Columbia	7
Alberta	9
Saskatchewan	34
Manitoba	11
Ontario	32
Quebec	122
Nova Scotia	106
New Brunswick	99
Prince Edward Island	1
	421

Mr. Chairman, that is a period of exactly sixteen months, and not two years as the Postmaster General has stated. Upon figuring that out I find there is an average of twenty-six dismissals for each month; in other words, one postmaster was dismissed for every working day during a period of sixteen months. Apparently the Postmaster General thinks that the day is lost when he does not dismiss a postmaster. I would like the Postmaster General to furnish information as to how many of these dismissed postmasters were appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

I would like to refer to a question which I asked on March 18, 1929, as follows:

Post Office Department—Civil Service Recommendations

Mr. Stewart (Leeds):

What is the total number of cases in which the present Postmaster General, his deputy or his department, or either of them, have rejected or refused to accept the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission as to appointments?

Mr. Veniot: 32.

I would ask the Postmaster General to bring down the file referring to each of those

thirty-two cases. We have only had two or three so far, and as this is a very important matter we would like to have, and I think we are entitled to have, all these files.

The Postmaster General has suggested that I am ignorant. I have endeavoured to obtain some information from the document from which he read and which he said was in the file, and upon which his remark was based. I asked the minister to table the document from which he was reading, and he did so. I now show that document to the house. The house can see that it is one sheet of foolscap paper filled in with long-hand writing, apparently copied by the Postmaster General or someone in his office. It simply contains a copy of Section 13 of the Civil Service Act, 1918, and what is said to be the ruling of the Department of Justice made on December 9th, 1919. I asked the minister yesterday if he would give the house the correspondence which resulted in the ruling referred to here. It is perfectly clear that it did not come from the Department of Justice in that form, and we would like to know from which department the request for this ruling came. If this information were furnished I could be enlightened on this ruling, and then he would not be able to reproach me in the future with being ignorant.

Mr. VENIOT: I told the hon. gentleman last evening that I would have the correspondence looked up, and I am endeavouring to find it.

Mr. GOTT: It may come in two parts like the return I got.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I want the correspondence from the Department of Justice; the letter accompanying this ruling.

Mr. VENIOT: The Department of Justice will have to provide their own correspondence; I will provide anything that is in my department.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The minister gave the house to believe that he had the correspondence from the Department of Justice.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not do anything of the kind. I read the ruling of the Department of Justice as I found it, and which ruling I know is correct. I read it to the house and I was asked to put it on the table, which I did. I did not say that it was from the Department of Justice, I simply said that it was the ruling made by that department in 1919. I read the ruling and then a point of order was raised that, having read from the paper, I should put it on the table. I placed the very paper I had in my hand upon the table of the house.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The Postmaster General left the impression that he was reading from the actual ruling of the Department of Justice.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. VENIOT: That is not fair.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The hon. minister says that is not fair, but will he dispute that that is not the ruling?

Mr. STEVENS: There is nothing to show that it is the ruling.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. members know it is.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I do not know it, and I would like the information.

Mr. BOYS: Will the Postmaster General inform the committee at whose instance the ruling was made, and to whom the ruling was sent? If it was sent to his department one would imagine that it would be on one of the files. There is a little controversy over this matter and we should have it cleared up.

Mr. VENIOT: I said I would do that, and I cannot do any more.

Mr. BOYS: Does the Postmaster General know whether or not the ruling was asked for by his department? If he does not know that, then let the information be obtained.

Mr. VENIOT: I know the Civil Service Commission published their certificate stating the ruling of the Department of Justice.

Mr. BOYS: I am not disputing that at all; that is not the issue before the committee.

Mr. VENIOT: I have promised to get the correspondence and will endeavour to find out how the ruling was asked for.

Mr. BOYS: Can the minister say at the moment whether or not—

Mr. VENIOT: No, I cannot.

Mr. BOYS: If the minister would permit me to finish he would have a better opportunity to answer it intelligently. Does the minister know whether his department asked for the ruling, and whether the ruling was addressed to his department?

Mr. VENIOT: It was made in 1919.

Mr. BOYS: That is not an answer to my question. I do not care whether it was made in 1919 or 1921; was it made at the request of the minister's department, and was the ruling given to his department?

Mr. VENIOT: I think it was, but I will find out and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. STEVENS: What we want is the ruling itself.

Mr. VENIOT: It was made in 1919.

Mr. DUNNING: As it applies to all departments, what difference does it make?

Mr. VENIOT: I really believe the Civil Service Commission asked for it.

Mr. GEARY: Is the hon. Postmaster General speaking to the house or is he just gossiping?

Mr. VENIOT: A little louder, please, so I may be able to enjoy the laugh too.

Mr. GEARY: I can tell whether the hon. minister is addressing the house by his standing up or sitting down.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member is a good sportsman and I think he will agree that the Postmaster General has been more than generous in answering all sorts of interjections from hon. members opposite. They did not show him the courtesy of always rising in their places, and as a matter of good sportsmanship I feel the hon. member does not desire to convey the impression that the minister is mumbling his answers.

Mr. GEARY: If my remark has annoyed the Postmaster General or the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning), I shall have great pleasure in setting their minds at rest. I do not intend to hurt them any more than I can help.

During the debate yesterday the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Stinson), reviewed the series of remarkable events which had occurred in connection with the Picton post office. The Postmaster General attempted to reply to the remarks of the hon. member, and I would like to quote part of that reply which appears on page 1705 of Hansard. The minister said:

> I am charged with refusing to appoint Mr. Way because, first, he was a soldier; it is said I should not have refused him.

The minister continued:

> The second charge is that I should not have refused the certificate in his favour because of his experience as assistant postmaster. Let me point out that, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, Mr. Way was assistant postmaster for twenty-three long years.

This is the argument that the Postmaster General advances against what was set up by the hon. member for Victoria:

> Will the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Stinson) explain to the committee how it is that in 1912, when Mr. Petit was put out for political interference, Mr. Way was not then promoted by the Conservative party. Why was he not recognized?
>
> Mr. Stinson: He was a much younger man.
>
> Mr. Veniot: He had then been in the service seven years.

Of course the Postmaster General had not the facts in his mind when he referred to the matter, because Mr. Way at that time had been in the office for six years. He was a young fellow of twenty-two years of age, and he was not recommended, nor does the record show that he even applied for the position. As a matter of fact, he was advanced, as far as one could expect him to be advanced at that time, to the position of assistant postmaster at Picton.

But even supposing that was not the case, I wish to draw the attention of the committee to one feature of the answer of the Postmaster General to charges of great importance that have been levelled against him in the house. His answer was to refer back ten, twelve, fifteen years to what some other party did when it was in power. Even, for the sake of argument, accepting his contention to its fullest extent, I ask hon. members: Does it put this government right that a preceding government did wrong? The Postmaster General's contention is that he is right in this case because a preceding government did the same thing. If a preceding government did something that was wrong, as I suppose most hon. members on the opposite side are prepared to accede to, then my hon. friend's contention gets him nowhere. His argument means only that the Postmaster General adopts revenge as his guiding motive in making appointments to postmasterships. As the cases that have been brought up have shown, the Postmaster General has been guided by one principle, and one only, not that of getting the best man for the position, not that of serving the public in the most efficient manner possible, but—and he glories in it—that to the victor belong the spoils and that the post office is fair game for patronage. That will have its reflection at some future date in the minds of the people of Canada. The Postmaster General smiles at that remark. The hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough very frankly admits that that

is his proposal. Let me say that from this side of the house we have watched hon. members opposite during the discussion, and while the faces of many of them, as the details were brought out, showed the shame they felt at the position in which the Postmaster General had put them, still they apparently decided to applaud his action, and hon. members opposite must assume the full burden of acquiescing in and supporting these actions of the Postmaster General and the government.

The Postmaster General may smile, but I feel that this matter is one of very serious import. I shall be very much surprised if we do not find that the fire that has been lighted here to-day will blaze throughout the whole of Canada, not only in Conservative quarters but even in those normally supporting the government. My hon. friends may well take it to heart whether they should not join in some condemnation of the way in which this department has been managed, because they will hear about it when they go back to their constituencies. The people of Canada will not stand for manipulation, for political purposes, of the offices of this country in a service on which they depend day by day. I have some sympathy with the position of the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough; he is frank; he says plainly: What are these offices for? Surely they are to be awarded to the people who support us. He can conceive of nothing else. That is his idea of politics, and he is frank enough to admit it. When I listen to the hon. member, the words of Byron come into my mind:

> He was the mildest manner'd man
> That ever scuttled ship or cut a throat.

For him I have a certain amount of grudging admiration because of his frankness, but not for members of the government who sit quietly in their places, because, unless they object actively and conscientiously, they must take some of the burden that the Postmaster General is loading on to the shoulders of the government and of his party at the present moment.

This file which I have in my hand narrates the story of the Picton post office. I shall go through it, not too tediously, I hope, but with sufficient thoroughness to impress certain points upon the minds of hon. members. Let me say in advance—and I think I can support my statement by what I shall show later—that the whole matter will develop simply and solely into a shameful plot to seek an opening with which to reward a partisan helper of the Liberal party. From beginning to end, involved as it may be, it is simple to find the thread. It had its inception in the desire to reward a party worker, and it was carried through ruthlessly and without regard to any of the amenities of life in this country. It was carried through without sportsmanship, and I thank the Minister of Railways for that word. It was carried through in a way that reflects discredit on this government and on the country. I will ask the minister if he will give me a little help in regard to the file. I do so because the information in files we have received has not been complete and I think this one is in no less a state of incompleteness than some of the others. The file begins with four affidavits upon which presumably was founded the procedure, first, to oust the postmaster, and, second, to place a friend in the position thus made vacant. The affidavits are by Edward Sprague, Robert Purtelle, Hiram Ellis and Durward Cole. The first letter that we have is from the Postmaster General to his deputy, Mr. Gaboury, under date of April 1, enclosing four affidavits. Two or three of these deal with the political activities of the postmaster himself. It reads:

> I desire to have an investigation held, first, into the political activities of this official.

That is the postmaster.

> You can leave the charge of allowing gambling in the office for a later date.

I suppose if they could not get rid of him on the ground of partisanship, they would have a second string to their bow, and bring the man once more before a committee.

> You will have the investigator call upon Mr. Robert Purtelle, John Edward Sprague and Durward Cole as witnesses and they will also provide further witnesses for the investigation.

It is quite plain, from reading that, that there was other correspondence. These four affidavits did not find their way into the possession of the Postmaster General without some correspondence, because in the affidavits there is no mention of the fact that these men headed by Mr. Purtelle would present further evidence. Therefore, on its face, the file, if it was a complete file originally, bears evidence of mutilation, and if it was not a complete file originally, it bears evidence of some negligence, almost criminal, in its preparation. I should be glad if the Postmaster General would take note of that, because I should like to see the letter Mr. Purtelle wrote. I judge it was he who came and saw the Postmaster General and put up the scheme to him, or who wrote a letter which the Postmaster General, according to his custom and practice, has put away in some personal

file. I should like to know what Purtelle said, because he is the man who ultimately got the postmastership. He is the man who put up the whole plant—I call it that deliberately—and he was the active organizer for the Liberal candidate in the last election.

I call attention to this man Purtelle, now in the dignified position of postmaster of the thriving town of Picton. Mr. Purtelle sent an affidavit to the Postmaster General, which the Postmaster General evidently thought enough of to forward to his official as part of the basis of an investigation to be held. This affidavit was read yesterday, but it is too good to leave unread again. Purtelle solemnly declared:

> I heard Mr. Alexander McKee tell Mr. J. H. Roberts, Inspector of Postal Service, on December the 27th, 1926, that he (Mr. McKee) was in Picton post office on an election day and he (Mr. McKee) saw Samuel Smith, the postmaster instructing an elector how and where to mark his ballot and directing him to the polling booth to register his vote.

Everyone in this house knows this much about the rules of evidence, that hearsay, to begin with is not supposed to be good evidence because you do not get direct to the man himself who is concerned, but hearsay of hearsay is pushing to an absurdity the taking of evidence and cannot be relied upon in any degree whatsoever. I want to compare what Purtelle swears to in that direct declaration with what was sworn to by McKee when face to face with the investigator. All he swore to in that investigation is that he resides at Picton and saw Mr. Smith during the campaign tell a man where to vote.

Mr. STEVENS: Why shouldn't he?

Mr. GEARY: Certainly, it would be the duty of any decent man to help another man out. But Purtelle stretched that simple act to look like an incrimination of the postmaster telling an elector to vote Grit or Tory, or some other ticket, for I do not know what Mr. Raney was running for then.

There are two branches to the case, as I said. First of all, they had to get rid of Smith, who had been there for years. He had given offence to nobody, and was well thought of. There was no possible way of getting him unless "a plant" were framed. Purtelle wanted the job. He had worked for the Liberal party, and this was the reward he wanted to get. He found the Postmaster General perfectly agreeable to entering into the scheme with him, and this scheme was concoted by which affidavits would be forwarded and so sent on for an investigator to look at, and something might come of it. I am not going to go through the evidence. Plouffe, a gentleman in Sudbury, a political friend of the government, was told to go down to Picton and make an investigation. But he did not do so for months. He knew well what was expected of him. Finding it difficult through Mr. Purtelle's agency to get a place to hold the investigation, finally he suggested that he go down to Picton and go around to witness after witness and get evidence from them and call that an investigation; but Purtelle was wiser. He knew there would be an awful row, and that the postmaster would say that he should have an opportunity of listening to the evidence and putting questions to the witnesses if he so desired. So Plouffe came down and made the investigation. The evidence is available for any member to read. It is of the flimsiest possible character, but if the evidence was flimsy, the finding was still more flimsy. I would not have thought that any man who has anything of the judicial in his make-up at all, who has anything in his make-up that inclines him to see fairness to the under-dog, would have bothered with the evidence for five minutes. He would have cast it aside and said, "I cannot get him on that; there is nothing in that finding; I will try and get him in some other way." But not so with the Postmaster General. I do not know whether the Postmaster General read the evidence and the finding or not. Mr. Plouffe had a great deal of trouble finding what was wanted, and that was some act of partisanship on the part of the postmaster. Everybody knew that that was what was wanted. The Postmaster General knew that that was what was wanted. Plouffe knew it, and Purtelle was urging him on.

The finding is simply this. Hiram Ellis, one of the witnesses, said that he saw a man gambling for money with dice in the post office, but that was not the ground on which action was taken later, so I do not need to take up the time of the committee with that. Cole said that a certain room in the post office to which the mail couriers had access resembled a Tory committee room. He was a pretty solid Grit, and how he knew what a Tory committee room looked like I do not know, but he probably had some conversation with somebody in the mail sorting room in which the question of politics came up. It was an isolated case, as appears from the evidence. The postmaster said that he knew nothing of this. He had heard that there was some throwing of dice in the room, which he stopped, and he had heard nothing further about it, and believed that that was the end of it. Plouffe says that if the postmaster did not know all these things, he had at least con-

structive knowledge, as it was his duty as postmaster to exercise careful supervision. I would like hon. members to bear in mind that this finding is directed purely and solely against the postmaster. There was no indication that anyone else in the post office was concerned in the slightest way as having any responsibility for these things. Later on the importance of that will be apparent, but there is nothing in that biassed finding that indicates that any other official of the post office had any knowledge of the practices that were alleged to be going on.

A very amusing part, if you can find amusement in a tragedy, is the finding of this man Plouffe. But before I touch that, let me say that certain circulars came into the post office every day during the campaign, tied together in a bundle, with a label on, for rural free delivery. On that label were stamps affixed, and what the postmaster in that office did, and it was a very good practice, I suppose, was simply to hand the bundle to the courier on the route, and the courier delivered them to the boxes along the route or took them to another post office from where they would be delivered. All that was done in the Picton post office was to take these bundles of circulars, tied together and labelled and hand them to the courier. There was no dispute about that at all. There was evidence that sometimes these circulars did not arrive when they should have arrived if posted at the hour certain men alleged they were posted. But how uncertain that is is shown by the affidavit of a man who said that he had posted them in the forenoon, and by the evidence of another man, who was a leader in that part of the conspiracy, who said he had posted them in the afternoon, and because these circulars did not get to the rural boxes next day before 3.30 the Picton postmaster is alleged to have held them up in the post office. Hon. members from the rural districts know well that these circulars may have passed through three or four different offices. In this particular case they passed through the Wellington post office, the Milford post office, the Picton post office, and then to the courier, and the Postmaster General must have known, if he had any desire to be fair, that if there was any delay—delay was not proven anyway—that delay might have occurred at the Wellington post office or at Milford or along the route. The evidence of the postmaster was that these circulars left his post office promptly on time. Plouffe says in his report:

> The mail always came regularly to the boxholders, except during the electoral campaigns aforesaid. The majority of the witnesses making complaints were known to be active partisans for the Liberal side.

If the postmaster at Picton wanted to be dishonest, why would he hold up circulars going to Liberals who had always voted Liberal and would vote Liberal anyway? What harm or what good would it do for him to hold them up? Surely he would not be ass enough to do a thing like that. Now I read the reason for the finding of partisanship:

> I infer from the evidence that the delay or non-receipt of the mail was caused by either one of the postmasters at Picton, Wellington or Milford, and I suspect that a great number of these irregularities originated at Picton.

Now, that is his finding. Mr. Chairman, you would not hang a dog on evidence like that. No man with the slightest sporting instinct or the least sense of fair play would deprive a man of his livelihood on evidence even ten times as strong as this flimsy finding. It is the flimsiest, slightest excuse for the exercise of political patronage that has ever come to my notice, and the Postmaster General should be thoroughly ashamed of himself and the government associated with him should repudiate the whole thing and reprimand the Postmaster General for his inexcusable action in the matter. It is incredible that this state of affairs should be allowed to continue in this country. Party politics? Of course. Political patronage? Of course. People believe in it to some extent. I saw my hon. friend from Yorkton (Mr. McPhee) and my hon. friend from Willow Bunch (Mr. Donnelly) and, I am sorry to say, my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Gray) applauding a statement made on this side that the Postmaster General thought it a day wasted when he did not fire a postmaster. That is their idea of "one good deed a day." They are the sort of boy scouts who are supporting the government.

I do not want to delay the committee longer than to say that to clear the way for appointing a friend this shameful deed was done and Smith, a postmaster of seventeen or eighteen years' standing, who had given entire satisfaction, was ruthlessly thrust out of the way. For what purpose? Purtelle is still unprovided for. He started this business and has done his best, a mighty small best, but still they have him there and must get him into the office. So they advertise. In the ordinary course of events the department sent out its investigator to examine the applicants. He rated them numerically, first, second and third. Number 1 was a man named Way, who had been in that post office for twenty-three years; number 2 was Purtelle, who, it was arranged, was to get the post

office; and number 3 was somebody who apparently was not considered seriously for the job. Way was appointed by the commission. The matter had to be attended to, and the Postmaster General actually wrote a letter at once to his deputy to reject Way. He could not say that Way was not fitted for the office, because his own department had said that he was eminently qualified and the best man for the job. The Postmaster General did not dare disparage Way on those grounds, but simply wrote his deputy, Mr. Gaboury, to reject the appointment. The letter is almost unbelievable. I do not know what Mr. Gaboury thought of it. It was one of those times when he had to shield his superior. This is not the first occasion on which the Postmaster General has found it necessary to shelter himself behind his deputy. I think it was the day on which this made-believe report came in that the Postmaster General wrote to his deputy:

With further reference to the post office vacancy at Picton, Ontario, which I authorized on February 14, to hold in abeyance, I now wish to instruct you to refuse the certificate of the commission issued in favour of Mr. Gerald H. Way.

Mr. Gaboury, acting under orders, had no choice but to write to the Civil Service Commission. I am confident Mr. Gaboury knew that what I might call colloquially this "rough stuff" could not be put through without giving some plausible reason, and no doubt feeling conscientiously obliged to follow the provisions of the statute, he wrote to the Civil Service Commission on February 24 as follows:

Referring to your certificate of February 13, covering appointment of Mr. Gerald H. Way—

Way had been appointed, remember.

—to the above postmastership, permit me to inform you that this matter has received the attention of the Postmaster General, and to state that Mr. Way is hereby rejected as unsuitable under section 13 of the Civil Service Act.

That was an attempt by Mr. Gaboury, without any knowledge of the circumstances —not a word had been communicated to him to put him au fait with what had been going on—to follow the instructions of his minister. He knew that under the act he had to assign a reason, so he put it in blanket form, "unsuitable." This does not meet the requirements of the statute at all, which provides:

The deputy head may, at any time before the expiration of six months, reject any person assigned or appointed to any position under his control or direction, or he may extend the period of probation within which such person may be rejected for another six months: and the cause or rejection, or the reason for extending the period of probation, shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission.

The ostensible cause of rejection is the unsuitability of Way for the postmastership, but there is not even a suggestion anywhere throughout the file that Way was unsuitable. As a matter of fact the post office inspector found that he was the most suitable of the applicants, and the commission were of the same view. Here is the sort of man he was.

Mr. RYCKMAN: A man of special qualifications.

Mr. GEARY: Yes.

Gerald H. Way—

This is from the inspector of the minister's own department.

—is a man of fine appearance, forty-three years of age. He was born and brought up in Picton—

The other fellow had not been.

—and has lived there practically all his life. He is well known, and bears a splendid reputation, and seems to be very popular. Mr. Way enlisted in 1918, but did not accompany a regiment overseas. He was in training at Petewawa camp, and was honourably discharged in January, 1919. He entered the post office in 1905 as a clerk where he has been employed. He became assistant postmaster in 1911, and has a thorough knowledge of post office work. He is a person of good habits, and commands the respect of all who come in contact with him.

And that is the man they fired as being "unsuitable," that is the man whom Mr. Gaboury represented to the commission to be "unsuitable." I am sure he did that against his own wish.

Mr. STEVENS: Under instructions.

Mr. GEARY: Yes, under instructions in order to get rid of Way. Had Purtelle been third or fourth, the other men ahead of him would have been treated exactly in the same way until Purtelle was reached, because the whole plan from beginning to end was to get Way out of the job and put Purtelle in. The government cannot evade responsibility, but they have sat as dumb as oysters. When they passed the order in council they had this wretched finding of so-called proof before them, and it was on that finding that they solemnly acted. Probably they said to their colleague: Mr. Postmaster General, this is getting a little bit thick. To which we may imagine he replied: I told them down in Simcoe that you would either have to stand for me or lose me. And so he gets through this order in council. He knew it would be put through, for fourteen days before the meeting of council he actually wrote to the

appropriate official to prepare this order because it was going to be passed at a meeting of council a fortnight later. I repeat, the government must take responsibility for this ruthless action. They cannot sit quiet under this Veniotism that is pervading all the actions of this department. It is staining any record the government ever had and holds up the government before the country as traffickers in political patronage. If I know the people of my country at all, it will be a long time before they will forget what the Postmaster General and his colleagues and the men behind them have done in connection with just such jobs as this. I do not know how they can countenance his action. But perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it is one of the "cool-headed" things that the government has set its hands to. If it were not that my hon. friends opposite have taken such a dislike to sanguinary adjectives, I would call their conduct cold-blooded. To be capable of bringing about the dismissals complained of, the minister responsible must be as ruthless as Nero and utterly callous in his disregard of the family, the reputation and the home surroundings of the men so harshly dealt with. But to the Postmaster General these men are simply pawns in the political game. That is his conception of politics, just as it is the conception of the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough. Every consideration of decency and fair play is swept aside by the Postmaster General if he thinks the good of the party in any particular section is going to be served by the dismissal of a trusted public servant. As I say, he acts as ruthlessly as Nero himself.

There is very little further that I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. GEARY: There are some points that I hope other members will emphasize to show the unfairness of the whole transaction from beginning to end. Now I come back to the alleged defence yesterday of the Postmaster General. He said:

> That investigation was held according to law, and on the report of the investigating commissioner I recommended to the executive council that Mr. Smith be dismissed, which was my right under the order in council first passed by hon. gentlemen opposite, later accepted by the present government and unanimously confirmed by the House of Commons.

Suppose I do not object to its being his right, is it his duty? Does his right mean that he is always to exercise it like Shylock wanting his pound of flesh at the expense of all considerations of mercy, decency and fair play? He goes on:

> This position was advertised; Mr. Way was an applicant, together with Mr. Purtelle and I think one or two others. The result was that the Civil Service Commission did issue a certificate in favour of Mr. Way, but since the investigating commissioner felt satisfied, according to his report—

This was what the minister said no later than yesterday.

> —that responsibility should rest somewhere in the office for the non-distribution or mishandling of these circulars during the election,—

You heard what was said about that.

> —which circulars should have reached their destination at a certain time but did not, and in view of the fact that Mr. Way, the assistant postmaster, must have been a party to the non-distribution according to the evidence,—

When there was not a word of evidence about Mr. Way.

> —I did not think I was justified in accepting the certificate of the commission, which I refused. That is the whole story.

If that is the whole story, why did not the minister do the obvious thing, and in assigning a reason for his rejection, say to the Civil Service Commission what that reason was? The fact is that it never occurred to him until yesterday; it was not in his mind. The finding of the investigation was that between Picton and Milford and Wellington, amongst the carriers on the routes, some circulars were delayed. The evidence is not at all clear that they were delayed, but admitting that they were, the postmaster at Picton swore definitely—and his statement made was accepted by Purtelle as true—that they were delivered by him in good time and that the delay must have occurred in the country, which was a natural thing.

They wanted to get Mr. Way and could not get him; they wanted to get Mr. Smith and could not get him except by a made-up report and finding. Why did they not call Way? He was there. Why did they not call the postmaster at Milford? He was there. Why did they not call the postmaster at Wellington? Why did they not call any of these carriers who deliver mail? They would have told the story. They did not wish to do so; these men might have told the truth and excused the thing or put it in such a light that Mr. Smith could not be got rid of and therefore there would be no place for Purtelle.

This is just a resumé of what appears in the report, and it will stand still further investigation. And the further you look into it, Mr. Chairman, the more you will see that the people of this country have before them now such a scandalous state of affairs in

the administration of the Post Office Department that it should be cleaned up and cleaned up properly. We should know all the details and workings of the department, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) himself or some member of his cabinet must take responsibility; or if he feels strong enough let him get up and give an expression of opinion regarding what the Postmaster General has done to the disgrace of officialdom in this country.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) asked me for certain information. I have the figures. The number of postal workers in the city post office and railway mail service—this would include all that the hon. gentleman asked for —is 10,005.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How many are letter carriers?

Mr. VENIOT: They are subdivided as follows: letter carriers, 2,710; postal clerks, 3,009; railway mail clerks, 1,364; postal helpers, postal porters, postal chauffeurs, 2,922, making that total of 10,005. I was asked yesterday by some hon. member—I have forgoten who—whether I could give a report regarding the gross earnings and expenditures for the year ended March 31, 1929, or up to the 1st of January. I have this report which I will lay on the table and the hon. member can get it.

Mr. BRADY: While this estimate is before the committee I want to say a few words, first, on the need of a revision in respect to the lower classes of civil servants. But preliminary to what I am going to say I wish to make this observation. I feel that the time has come when we should recognize the fact—I think it is recognized by parliament and by the public—that the administration of the department under the Postmaster General is in a very serious condition and reflects gravely upon the high dignity of the people themselves as well as upon the government which is in power. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that any impartial critic could listen unmoved in this house for the past few days to charges so serious and reflecting so severely upon the high dignity of this parliament and of one of the most important departments in the country. What do we find? We find charges that strike at the very root of all that is worthy and in keeping with the high morality of the people. We find that breaches have been openly committed and have been passed over as if they were of a trivial nature. What, I ask, can be so serious, what can be so deserving of public criticism as the act of a minister who sets at naught the Civil Service Commission and treats the Civil Service Act as though it were a mere piece of parchment, using his high office for the purpose of furthering political ends? Sir, I say that the government cannot now stop at this particular point; they must bring the matter to a conclusion and there must be a thorough investigation into this department. I refrain this afternoon from adding further to the list already presented to the house. To do so would not accentuate the gravity of the situation; it would be merely adding one or two or three more cases of a similar character to what we have already heard. Let me say, however, that the position of the Postmaster General to-day is such that he is bound, morally as well as in the interests of himself and of the government of which he is a member, to demand—he should demand it himself—that all these charges be entered into, and if he is not guilty then parliament will be big enough and able enough to accord to him the justice to which he is entitled. But I do not think that is possible, so I will proceed to discuss the subject which I wish to bring up.

When the estimates covering these salaries and allowances were before the committee last year the question of the salaries paid the lower grades of civil servants was discussed, particularly with reference to postal clerks, railway mail clerks, mail carriers and customs clerks, and during that discussion we found that many married men with families to support are included in the classes to which I have referred. In many cases these men are supposed to have an education more or less equivalent to high school entrance; we found that their examinations were such as to demand ability, a good intellect and physical health. The examination was both oral and written, in fact, these examinations included what are known as intelligence tests, and the work which these men are called upon to do requires hard labour, long hours and fidelity to the last degree. Anyone who has ever visited a post office employing nine or ten clerks will realize the amount of work entailed and the loyal service which is given. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not know of a body of men more loyal and devoted to their work than the civil servants included in those classes which I have mentioned. When the heavy seasons come on twice a year, these men are continually on the job, and the extension of the commercial side of the Post Office Department has placed additional burdens upon them.

In spite of the fact that from all sides we are told that we have great prosperity

in Canada we find these men in rather a pitiable condition; we find that the salaries of civil servants extend from $750 a year on up through the scale to the highest paid employees of the government, who receive from $10,000 to $12,000. There is a mighty gulf between the higher paid civil servants and the great majority of the lower classes. Recently it has been proposed that the salaries of nineteen deputy ministers should be increased, nine by $2,000 a year, nine by $1,000 a year and one by $500 a year, which would give them an average salary of $10,000 annually, and in addition to this a commission has been appointed to inquire into the question of salary revision with regard to the technical and professional men of the service. That commission consists of Mr. E. W. Beatty, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Doctor Murray, president of the university of Saskatchewan and Sir George Garneau, of Quebec city.

I wish to say that there is no more important body of men in Canada to-day than the technical and professional men who are looking after the research work of this Dominion. I believe the whole country will agree, and in fact it is an axiom, that the foundation of Canada's future must depend upon the work of these highly trained men, without whose assistance the government cannot hope to succeed and without whom industry must fail, because day after day industrial activities are changing and new developments are coming forward all the time. If we do not maintain in Canada a highly trained body of technical men engaged in research work we will be left far behind in the race for commercial supremacy. Therefore I trust that the commission will see to it that these technical men receive an adequate salary for the important work they perform.

In the past it was often thought that a university man was merely a theorist who loved to get away from the common walks of life, but I wish to say that the story of national research throughout the world redounds to the honour and the glory of university men of all countries. To-day we find men who have spent four years in college and perhaps another four years in post graduate work receiving salaries of about $3,300 annually. Is it the opinion of this committee that men possessing these high qualifications, men who are working hard and who, engrossed in their work, think nothing of time, are well paid by a salary of that kind? I say that is not so.

Now let me come to the lower classes of civil servants. Last year the Postmaster General stated that he recommended to the Civil Service Commission that increases be granted to postal clerks, mail carriers, railway mail clerks and others, and he stated that the commission had refused to accept the recommendation. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that there is hardly a member of this committee who has not propounded to himself the question which I now ask: What is the relationship between the Postmaster General and the Civil Service Commission? Is it any wonder that for three years past no progress has been made with regard to the reclassification and adjustment of the salaries of these men when on the one hand the Postmaster General recommends and on the other hand the Civil Service Commission objects? We have been told, and it has been proved by his actions and statements, that the Postmaster General has a great power with regard to the appointment of postmasters. He must have some power. Hence it is there is what may be called a deadlock, and no progress has been made. It is quite evident that no progress can be made so long as these conditions exist. The letter giving the reasons why the Postmaster General's recommendations could not be accepted is worth reading, and here are the words:

> The commission believes that the salaries paid this class of employee are equitable and comparable with other salaries paid for somewhat similar kinds of work in other government departments, and feels that if any increase is recommended for the postal classes that a corresponding increase must be recommended for customs classes and certain classes in the Department of Immigration and Colonization, as well as for a considerable number of other classes in other departments of the government service who are engaged in work of a nature not much different and carrying as great responsibility as that of employees in the Post Office Department.

Mr. Chairman, is that the reason why the commission refused the request made to parliament last year? Is that argument convincing enough when evidence has been produced here that a great number of these men, many of them married, are receiving such low salaries? The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) asked a question the other day, as follows:

> How many employees of the Customs department, Post Office department, Interior department or Public Works department in the cities of Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver receive $65 per month? How many receive between $65 and $75? And how many between $75 and $85?

The answer given shows that there are 266 employees in this salary class. What do we find? We find in that class many men who are supporting families of two, three, and

four children and they are receiving what is less than a living wage, according to the labour bureau. They are receiving just enough to pay for board, fuel and light, but what about the expenses for clothing, boots and shoes, the dentist, the doctor, and a number of other necessary expenses?

This session of parliament should not prorogue until we have a definite statement from the government regarding this class of civil service employees. I looked up the statistics regarding the wages paid in the case of industrial occupations, as compared to the salaries paid in the civil service. I obtained the former figures from the Bureau of Statistics, and the later figures from the Department of Labour. The base of 100 is assigned to the year 1913, and here is what we find: In 1913 the industrial occupations were paid 100, the base, while the civil service salaries were the same figure of 100. In 1928 the industrial wages had increased to 187.6, while the civil service salaries had increased only to 163.8. The important branches of industry showed an increase between 1913 and 1928 amounting to 87.6 per cent, while the civil service salaries lagged behind and only showed an improvement of 63.8 per cent. The figures of the Department of Labour show that the cost of living increased 58 per cent in the same period, so it can be seen that the industrial workers' wages have more than kept pace with the high cost of living while the civil servants have not had the opportunity to improve their standard of living. That situation should be convincing enough to the public, to this parliament and to this committee. The government should recognize that the time has come when steps should be taken to reclassify and adjust these salaries in order to bring these well deserving classes of civil servants into line with the industrial workers.

I would like to mention the fixing of a minimum at $100 per month. Can $1,200 per year be considered as anything else but a minimum wage for mail carriers, postal clerks, and three or four other grades? A great number included in these classes are receiving only $75 to $90 per month. A great number never reach the maximum of $1,500 per year. It takes seven or eight years to reach that maximum, and many of them find that they have to go out and obtain seasonal employment which will bring them a larger return. Is that being fair to this very deserving body of civil servants?

Another thing which interested me during the course of the debate of the last few days was the sad story which brought to our attention of what was called malversation. I think it speaks well of the probity of this great class of workers that so little pilfering or stealing has taken place. I do not know of any body which is entitled to as much respect for their honour and integrity as are these men who are engaged in such important work, and on such meagre pay. I think no apology should be offered, nor is any apology needed, for any member of parliament to advocate that these civil servants should receive due consideration and that the matter of adjustment of their salaries should be taken up immediately. The public at large are watching very interestedly the proceedings of the Civil Service Commission. The salaries of the deputy ministers are to be increased and I wish to show the house that their salaries have risen very high in the last ten years. In fact, I find that in the last ten years the salaries of deputy ministers have increased by 100 per cent. There may have been a very good reason why the deputies should have their increases first and I trust this is the right one. The government may feel that, by increasing the salaries of the deputy ministers first, it may be better able to increase the salaries of the technical and professional men and then bring up the question of the salaries of the lower classes, so that the gulf may not be too wide which separates them from the top. The people of Canada appreciate the fact that the civil service of all grades are entitled to a living wage. In the last session of parliament the arguments advanced why reclassification and adjustment could not take place were, to my mind, nothing more than "passing the buck," if I may use that term. No sound arguments were given why this problem should not be taken in hand. If the Postmaster General and the Civil Service Commission were in earnest, progress could certainly be made. Are we to have another year pass by without a readjustment being made in regard to the lower grades? I hope not.

Coming back to the position in which we are to-day, I believe that the honour of parliament is at stake. At this very moment throughout the length and breadth of Canada we are being told that the high offices which should be sacred under all conditions, have been used for lower motives than that of the public interest. It is a pitiable travesty upon the intelligence of the people of Canada to have it said in this house that because in the past things were done that were derogatory to good government, they should likewise be done to-day. That is not my view. I think the public of Canada will not take that view, but they will demand purity and integrity in every department that appertains to the

well-being and interest of the people. Why should the Civil Service Act be set aside? When people sit for an examination and pay to get it; when they receive their marks for it, they believe that merit alone will decide. That apparently is not the case. Why should men have to travel hundreds of miles, as I have known them to do, to sit for some examination and then find that, though they passed first, either they did not get the position or it was months and months afterwards before they were able to get the jobs for which they passed? Is that the case in other countries ? I do not think so. We stand for legislative purity. If there is a Civil Service commission whose duty it is to hold examinations in various parts of Canada, and if they are carrying that out rightly, there should be no danger that the right man does not secure the position. Whatever may happen in this house; whatever explanations the government may later offer; whether or not they may accuse this side of the house of using a dramatic episode to further their own interest, that will not avail, because the gravity of the situation is such that the people of Canada, realizing the importance of justice being done, will speedily come to the conclusion that the time has arrived when a full investigation should be made into the relationship that exists between the department of the Postmaster General and the Civil Service Commission. The question is this: Who is responsible? Is there a liaison between one and the other? Are they acting independently, or is one subordinate to the other? This is a very important matter which parliament should understand, and I trust, before this item passes, the government will decide upon a definite policy and let parliament and the people of Canada know what it is.

Mr. BALDWIN: Many years ago, I, like many others in the Dominion of Canada, was appointed postmaster at the splendid sum of $10 per annum. That was under the government of Sir John A. Macdonald. I cannot understand what the hon. member who has just closed his remarks means about university men, after four years preparation and an additional post graduate course of four years, being able to get a salary of only $3,000 a year. I have known many young men in the past fifty years, especially in the last ten or fifteen years, who have taken technical courses of two years—naturally they were adapted to the course or they would not have taken it—and who are being paid salaries of many times $3,000. I cannot understand why we need university men who have also undertaken post graduate work, spending eight or ten years in getting an education, for the position of rural mail driver or country postmaster. It seems strange to me. I would think that their fathers and mothers would become martyrs in furnishing the money that would be required for so much worthless education for a position of that sort.

An hon. MEMBER: Why worthless?

Mr. BALDWIN: I have had ten years of Sundays in my life, and we have all spent a few years in infancy and childhood, and then we sleep one-third of our time, and if out of the time that is left we are going to spend eight or ten years in getting an education at a university simply to become a rural mail driver or a country postmaster at the end of it all, I cannot see that it is worth it. I think people have got to come down nearer to earth. The earth gives us all we need if we use it well. We have to scratch mother earth to earn our daily bread.

Let me give my own experience as a postmaster. After being postmaster for thirty-six years I voted for reciprocity, and I was driven out of office. In my opinion too many post offices have been closed up in this country and too many rural mail routes established. My particular office was at the outlet of a lake, in quite a business centre, with two churches, a school, and a Catholic mission. I have one of the biggest stores in the country and sell all sorts of merchandise. I would not say for one minute that a young man should spend eight years at a university and do post graduate work before I could recommend him to the Postmaster General, and have the post office at Baldwin's Mills reopened. I should want a young man who was honest and intelligent. I was willing to accept the office in the old days at ten dollars a year. I was a grist miller by trade, and I was intending to build a store, and I built it and filled it. I think that a post office in a country store attracts customers. I do not see why a person of ordinary intelligence could not entertain the customers without having to spend four years at a university and four years in post graduate work, nor do I think that eight yearss' university training is necessary to become a rural mail driver. It is true that a postmastership is a sacred trust.

Mr. GOTT: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. BALDWIN: You make too many speeches and talk altogether too much. I waste very little of the time of the house

myself. I remember the first time I ran for parliament. I ran against a very brilliant man, and I promised my constituents that I would not waste the time of this house by speaking whenever the opportunity occurred, but only when duty demanded. But I am on my feet now, and I propose to explain a few matters.

I was saying that the office of postmaster is a most sacred trust. When I was put in charge of a post office, the arrangement was to furnish the postmaster with a certain quantity of stamps, and when he ran short, he would order more. I think it was a splendid arrangement. Thirty years ago the postmasters were allowed to keep on hand stamps up to fifty, seventy-five, a hundred or a thousand dollars' worth, depending upon the size of the post office, and the postmaster was charged with those stamps. I think every hon. member knows that when a postmaster runs short of stamps he must send the necessary money to Montreal or Ottawa or to the chief post office in his district to get a further supply, and send cash with order. How this man could be short, I do not understand. I always mix my business right together. I have no time to take inventories, keep cash accounts; I work fifteen hours a day. Anybody in my employ does not have to steal from me, and if the inspector had called at my office he would have found fifty dollars' worth of stamps somewhere around my establishment. I would not be short, but some of these kitchen post offices may have been short, I suppose. It is a very sacred trust, but I think any honest and intelligent person is qualified to fill the office.

The hon. member who preceded me delivered an oration, rather than saying something that applied to the practical things of life. I know, of course, that an education is good for a young man, if he has lived long enough to know what he is adapted to; he can then qualify for the vocation or profession he intends to follow, but why the hon. member delivered an oration on university and post graduate education in connection with rural mail couriers and country postmasters, I cannot understand. To get such an education you may use all your money and get into debt, and then it might be natural for you to steal if you got the chance. I do not want to mention it, but it is an absolute fact that it has been rather too common in this great Dominion for men in the larger post offices to steal. If a postmaster was allowed two or three thousand dollars' worth of stamps, he would sometimes live beyond his means, and by-and-by report a burglary. The inspector goes there and finds that not a nail has been pulled, not a screw removed, not a panel broken. In fact, some of these postmasters were so derelict in their duty that they did not lock the vault. Some of them would accuse the night watchman and say that he had robbed the mail. I have known men to try to get the night watchman imprisoned, but when I had something to say about it, I would get Mr. Coolican at Ottawa to send out a real detective, without fear or favour for anyone, one that did not care for Liberals or Tories, and get him to make a thorough investigation. Perhaps the postmaster was a man of considerable influence, and could fool the auditors that were brought in, for figures can be fooled, but figures will not lie. I would tell the detective to work on the theory that the man was guilty, and to get the money back, and the accused has sometimes broken down and said to the detective. "You have come here to arrest me?" "Yes." "Would it be an extenuating circumstance if I reimbursed the government?" "It certainly would," says the detective. "Then I will try." The detective goes back. He says, "Now, Mr. Gentleman, I want you to tell me when you commenced this theft. Write it all out." When the confession has been made the detective says: "Now, you resign from this office." The man says, "All right, but I don't want to resign." The detective retorts, "It is not for you to say. Hand your keys right over and get out." The fellow says, "But I want my hat and coat." "Get out!" says the detective, "I will throw them out to you."

But coming back to my oratorical friend who preceded me, I cannot see the necessity for a man of university training to act as a country postmaster or a mail carrier either in our urban centres or rural districts. It is so amusing to me that it prompted me to get on my feet, and, Mr. Chairman, having expressed my views thereon I will not encroach further on the time of the committee.

Mr. BRADY: Did not my hon. friend misunderstand the question about technically trained men? Is it his interpretation of "technically trained men" that they are to be found in post offices or on rural mail routes?

Mr. BALDWIN: Louder, please. My hearing may be very poor, but my hon. friend's question is wholly incoherent to me.

Mr. GOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to offer my personal congratulations on the decorum you are preserving in the house. When a member rises in a regular manner to ask a question he is generally met with an

onslaught from the opposite side of "Sit down." The members who say "sit down" in such a trenchant manner are usually sitting behind some other members. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Baldwin) referred to the fact that he had been appointed postmaster under Sir John A. Macdonald. May I ask him with what political party he was then affiliated.

Mr. BALDWIN: I will tell my hon. friend now: with whichever party I considered honourable and capable.

Mr. GOTT: My hon. friend's answer puts me in mind of the coloured boy who was charged with stealing chickens. The judge said to him, "Rastus, are you the defendant?" Rastus replied, "No sir, I'se the man who stole the chickens."

Mr. BALDWIN: I did not run the government, so had no opportunity to steal.

Mr. GOTT: Mr. Chairman, for a very few minutes I want to discuss the dismissal of the postmaster in the town of Leamington, Ontario, Mr. W. G. Gidley. I have under my hand a return that was brought down during the session of 1927, showing that a number of citizens of the town of Leamington and the township of Mersea, a political organization, petitioned the government as follows:

We the undersigned citizens of Leamington and Mersea township herewith petition for an investigation of the conduct of Postmaster W. G. Gidley of Leamington post office in refusing to distribute certain mail matter, which was properly stamped and posted during the recent provincial election campaign, and other conduct unbecoming, which will be brought forward at such investigation.

I want to put on record the names of the men who signed that petition for the edification of the people in the riding that I have the honour to represent. They are:

Robert Fairful; Thos. R. Smith; F. S. Moss; J. H. Conover; A. J. Askew; D. A. Jeffery; Newton Askew; Robt. Maxwell; A. J. Quick; John R. Hope; J. Latam; A. W. Bennie; Joseph Ainslie; George Wiper; Maxwell Latam; Gordon Laurie; R. R. Brett; R. D. Moorhouse; Edmond J. White; Frank T. Sheik; Geo. Gibson; J. D. McIntosh; Jas. E. Burgess; James Richelle; R. H. Latam; J. M. Latam; S. Settirington; Chas. Hyatt; Bert E. Wigle; Malcolm Wigle; Emerson Wigle; Carl B. Roach; A. E. Roach; J. E. Gillanders; T. J. Willan; L. J. Tofflemine; Geo. R. Fox.

Mr. BOUCHARD: All Liberals?

Mr. GOTT: Certainly. In all thirty-seven I think.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont): Is that a list of postmasters dismissed in your constituency?

[Mr. Gott.]

Mr. GOTT: Oh, no, this would not even start the list of dismissals under the present Postmaster General.

Under date of December 13, 1926, the Postmaster General's department received the following letter:

Dear Sir:

A petition as has been forwarded to you under registered mail signed by numerous citizens of the town of Leamington and the township of Mersea. We the Liberal Association of Leamington and Mersea do hereby endorse the complaint lodged in the accompanyingg petition. Mr. Thomas Rowley, the Liberal candidate in the last federal election, will be in Ottawa in the course of a few days and proposes to discuss this matter with you.

The matter was duly discussed, and needless to say, although the charges did not warrant dismissal, the postmaster was dismissed. Now I want to read another petition that came to the Postmaster General, signed by eighty-two residents, all business men and reputable citizens of the town of Leamington:

To the Honourable Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

The petition of the undersigned residents of Leamington and vicinity humbly sheweth:—

Whereas W. G. Gidley has been postmaster for the town of Leamington for the past seven years and during all that period he has efficiently and obligingly filled that office, and in the opinion of the undersigned has improved and systematized the working of said office.

And whereas it has come to the knowledge of the undersigned that your department is contemplating the dismissal of the said W. G. Gidley and we believe without sufficient cause for such removal and, as we have been informed, without a proper investigation and without an opportunity being given to the said postmaster to rebut and refute any of the accusations made against him, which is not consistent with the principles of British fair play.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

Mr. GOTT: I might say to the hon. gentleman who "oh, oh-ed" that this man whom I am speaking of is a returned soldier with an excellent record.

Mr. DENIS: I do not dispute that.

Mr. GOTT: I do not like to see a returned soldier "oh oh-ed."

Mr. DENIS: I did not do so.

Mr. GOTT: You were either "oh ohing" the returned soldier or me.

Mr. DENIS: No objection.

Mr. GOTT: The petition proceeds:

Therefore your petitioners pray that you may be pleased to withhold any contemplated action toward the dismissal of W. G. Gidley as postmaster for the town of Leamington until at least a proper investigation be made of the

charges preferred against him and a fair opportunity be given to the said W. G. Gidley to face his accusers and an opportunity to present his evidence as against the said charges.

There is a petition that the Postmaster General should have acted on forthwith. It is signed by eighty-two reputable citizens of the town of Leamington. In the file as brought down during April, 1927, there was nothing to show that the postmaster at Leamington should have been dismissed, but after the house rose another section was brought down. Last session I desired to discuss this subject when the Postmaster General's estimates were before the house, but I would not have been able to do it in an intelligent manner because the return came down in two sections, one section which was misleading, and the other section in such form that the Postmaster General could have refuted any arguments that I might have put forward on behalf of the dismissed postmaster. Now I do not propose to go into the details in connection with the appointment of his predecessor, in which the decision of the Civil Service Commission was overridden for some time. Indeed, not only in the Postmaster General's department but in almost every department of state to-day the decision of the Civil Service Commission is overridden when it is to the advantage of the party to put in their own people.

Mr. FORKE: No.

Mr. GOTT: I can take almost any department of state to-day and show you where, in the town in which I live, the Civil Service Commission has been overridden not once but time and time again.

Mr. FORKE: I dispute that statement.

Mr. GOTT: You refute it?

Mr. FORKE: I dispute it.

Mr. GOTT: Then I want to say to the Minister of Immigration that in the town of Amherstburg there were three appointments in the last two years in which the Civil Service was overridden.

Mr. FORKE: The Department of Immigration?

Mr. GOTT: No, not in the town of Amherstburg. One was under the Postmaster General, I think, although I am not sure; but one was under the Minister of Public Works. Now, as I say, I have not the time to go into the full details and read them all into the record, but I should like to have this put on record for the edification of the people I represent.

Mr. McGIBBON: I want to refer again to the case I mentioned yesterday. The Postmaster General was good enough in his opening remarks this afternoon to make an apology to me. None was either requested or desired or needed. I do think though that in justice to the postmaster of Uffington, who has been dismissed, the Postmaster General should tender an apology to that gentleman. Whether he intends to or not—and I am rather inclined to be generous enough to think that he does—that man's reputation has been tarnished. He is seventy-one years of age and unable to walk, being a cripple. It was bad enough for him to have to give up his job without a cent to live on and to-day he is dependent upon the kindness of others; but it is much worse that the reputation of himself and of his family should be tarnished.

I have here the further returns which the minister was good enough to bring down to-day, and I find that on one occasion last summer when the inspector walked into the postmaster's office he found this man short eleven dollars and some cents; that amount should have been in the till and was not there. I am taking the inspector's figures, although the Postmaster General says it was only seven dollars and some cents. But the money was almost immediately put up and, according to the information I have, his accounts were certified to by the inspector as being correct. I appeal to any member of this house: How many men who are handling public funds can have an inspector walk in on them any hour of the day, not knowing that he is coming, and always have every last cent in the till? I ask any reasonable man this question: If there are a few dollars missing at the moment, not in the proper place, when an inspection is made, is that any indication of dishonesty? According to the inspector's report there was, as I say, some eleven dollars odd not in the till, but the postmaster put up the amount and his accounts were certified to as correct. I am not going to repeat what I said yesterday in regard to the dismissal, but I should like the Postmaster General to clear the matter up so far as the honour and reputation of this man are concerned. He is an old man, is unable to walk, and has not a cent in the world.

An hon. MEMBER: Old age pension?

Mr. McGIBBON: That has not yet been adopted in Ontario, and it would be his only salvation. I am going to ask the Postmaster

General to make a statement to the effect that there has been no dishonesty on the part of this man, because I do not believe that the Postmaster General is of that opinion.

Mr. VENIOT: Referring once more to the matter, I think that if the hon. member will read what I said yesterday he will find that it does not convey the impression that I thought this gentleman really dishonest, because I said there were irregularities that could not be classed as dishonesty.

Mr. McGIBBON: Just one.

Mr. VENIOT: But in cases where attention is frequently called to these irregularities and no heed is paid by the parties to whom such attention is directed, it becomes a matter for action. In this case, when the first irregularity took place—and I regret, as I have said before, that last night in the heat of debate I could not put my hand on the precise figures when I mentioned the sum of $142, because I have no intention to represent it as greater than it was—this postmaster was severely reprimanded and was told that if such a thing occurred again severe action would be taken. But notwithstanding that, in June, 1928—I believe it was around that date, because it was some time around October or December, 1926, that he was reprimanded, although I am not sure of the dates—the report of the inspector shows that there was a similar occurrence. Now I do not wish to hurt anyone's character; far be it from me; and if my remarks left the impression that it was because of dishonesty I wish to say that it was because of these irregularities in his accounts. I do not believe that the gentleman is fitted for the office, because of his age, and in addition there were these irregularities. That is what I believed at the time and what I believe now.

Mr. McGIBBON: I am glad to have that much from the minister. I am within the judgment of the house when I say that he was not quite so moderate yesterday, and even to-day he has overstated the case. I have in my hand the latest file which the minister was good enough to give us, and there are really only two cases, one several years ago involving $24 and one in 1928 in which the amount, as the Postmaster General says, was $7 or, according to the inspector, $11 odd. I submit in all seriousness that when a man is handling public funds as a postmaster in a store, or in any other place you like, if an inspector walks in upon him at any moment and happens to find a few dollars not in the till, that is not a very serious reflection on the man. I am not excusing him, but surely there are degrees in dishonesty; and, as I said, I rather think that the Postmaster General yesterday gave the impression to the house, which impression got out to the country, that that was the reason for this man's dismissal. I do not believe it was, and I do not believe the minister will say so to-day.

Mr. VENIOT: I know the hon. member wants to be fair. I said it was one of the reasons.

Mr. McGIBBON: Well, I will compromise so far as to say that the minister gave it as the major reason. But I want to correct the impression that has gone abroad through the press that there had been gross irregularities on the part of this postmaster. As a matter of fact, only on two occasions was his cash found to be a little short, and he made it up on each occasion. The minister gave the impression yesterday that he was a long time making it up, but on the last occasion it was made up while the inspector was there. I leave it to the honesty and good judgment of any hon. member whether I am asking too much of the minister.

Mr. VENIOT: I think I have said enough.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have an opportunity to speak on these estimates in order to bring up some of the delinquencies of the Post Office department with regard to Victoria, British Columbia. It seems to me that the Postmaster General expects Victoria to finance some of the other post offices throughout Canada. I have been looking up the records and find that in the estimates this year he is giving us the very munificent increase of $340 over last year. Further, I find that the earnings of the Victoria post office for the year ending March 31, 1928, were $24,321.03 more than they were in the year ended March 31, 1927. Does the Postmaster General think it fair to give us an increase of only $340 when the earnings of that office were so greatly increased, or does he intend to make the officials work harder, as has been the case during the last year or two, and take the profit out of them?

I have here a letter, a copy of which I have sent to the Postmaster General, which I desire to read. This letter was forwarded

to me by a citizen of Victoria, and I was asked to present it to the Postmaster General. The letter is as follows:

Victoria, B.C.,
April 5, 1929.

To the Assistant Postmaster General,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:

Upon behalf of the residents of this section of Victoria I would bring to your notice the lack of service at present given to the public in the matter of letter delivery.

At the present time our first delivery is more often than not after the noon hour and has been as late as 1.45 p.m. this in spite of the fact that we reside seven blocks from the general post office.

The matter has been taken up with Postmaster Gardiner who has done the best he can with the staff he has and it would appear that there is too much work for the men to get through with. I understand (and this information did not come from the post office) that the slowing up and clogging of the delivery system is mostly caused by the large amount of Vancouver newspapers now delivered here in a.m. delivery which at present post office rates is likely handled at a loss to the government.

Now sir we most respectfully suggest that these papers be not delivered until p.m. delivery or that Mr. Gardiner be supplied with the number of men needed to handle the business as we are sure that it cannot be known to you that such a service, as outlined, is in effect here.

Trusting that you will give this matter your kind attention.

Yours respectfully,

I have mailed a copy of that letter to the Postmaster General's department and I want to impress upon him the need for this service.

Mr. VENIOT: We will go right into it the moment I receive that copy. I do not know of any official report as to this condition, but we will go into the matter as soon as I receive a copy of that letter.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I want an investigation into the Victoria post office; for the last two or three years the business of the office has so increased that the men have been overworked. I want it distinctly understood that there is no question as to the fidelity and earnestness of the whole staff from the postmaster down, but we do claim that too much work has been put upon them, particularly since the government have not seen fit to arrange for any increase in salary. The technical men are being looked after, but the mail men who walk the streets of our cities cannot get an increase. In my own district of Victoria when the mail bag is full they must pick up two or three bundles of papers which they relay, leaving them on a veranda or in a house and going back for them after they have delivered some of their other mail. I am sure two or three additional men would relieve that situation; some better system could be put into effect in Victoria without a great deal of trouble. Is it right that a city whose post office revenue increased more than $24,000 in one year should have an increase of only $340 in the estimates? I ask the Postmaster General to go into that question also.

The technical men practically have had their increase granted; perhaps they are entitled to it. I like to see everyone well paid, but if the Postmaster General would see that the salaries of these men were increased he would be doing a great service. I would like him to correct me if this statement is wrong: I understand that the men who walk the street carrying mail from house to house have no chance to get into the inside service. Is that so?

Mr. VENIOT: No, that is not so; they can be promoted.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I just asked that question for my own information, because I did not want to be misinformed. The outside men must endure the vicissitudes of the weather, and most of them are broken in health; that must be the case even more in the east than in the city from which I come, but at all events I think the department should take that into consideration and advance the salaries of these lower salaried men.

Then I want to ask if it is to be the policy of the government in the future to appoint a commission whenever a branch of the service requests an increase. That is the precedent which has been set by this government, and in future any branch of the service asking for an increase no doubt will ask the government to appoint a similar commission.

Now let us see if the government is playing fair. I notice in the estimates an item of $800,000 increase for air mail services. Is it not a fact that, at best, for some years to come the air mail service will be uncertain or just an experiment? Does it seem fair to the post office employees that this amount should be placed in the estimates for such a service when the regular service employees cannot secure a slight increase? I would not care so much about the increase if they were not worked to death. In conclusion I ask the Postmaster General to look into these matters and do justice to Victoria. I could bring him half a dozen letters similar to the one I read a few minutes ago. I promised my constituents that I would bring up this matter in the house and I believe we are entitled to more consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): I wish to offer a few observations with regard to what I consider a glaring flouting of the Civil Service Act; I refer to the post office at Billings Bridge. That post office became vacant early in December, 1927, as a result of the improper conduct of the postmaster, a man named Dowler. There was a shortage of funds and after an investigation it was proved beyond doubt that Dowler was responsible and he was dismissed, which was the proper thing to do. The Deputy Postmaster General got in touch by letter with the hon. member for the county of Russell (Mr. Goulet) pointing out the reason for the change and asking the member to nominate some reliable person who could be temporarily placed in charge of that office. The shortage in the accounts was in connection with the issuing of money orders and the Deputy Postmaster General asked that the temporary appointee should be a person who could be trusted to issue money orders. He also stated that steps would be taken to fill the position permanently in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act. The member for Russell replied on November 30, 1927, to a letter from the Deputy Postmaster General dated November 22, 1927. The hon. member nominated a prominent business man of the village named Campbell, and that gentleman was appointed. Ordinarily one would ask why the Civil Service Commission was not notified and asked to take immediate steps to fill the position permanently. Campbell continued in this temporary position and we find that the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, whose apparent duty was to notify the Civil Service Commission as to this vacancy, did not notify the commission until March 19, 1928. The following letter was written on that date by Mr. Coolican, Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission:

> I beg to inform you that the postmastership at Billings Bridge, electoral district of Russell, Ontario, is vacant owing to the dismissal of Mr. George M. Dowler, O.A.S., in connection with shortage in his accounts.
>
> You will find herewith copies of poster notices issued by the district superintendent of postal service at Ottawa.

Poster notices in French and English were enclosed with the letter. The notice reads:

> Applications are invited from residents of Billings Bridge and locality possessing the necessary qualifications for the position of postmaster at Billings Bridge.
>
> Salary and allowances $1,000, based upon the revenue of the post office; rent allowance $150; forward allowance, $9; allowance of one cent on each postal note issued (in the event of money order business being reestablished, allowance of four cents on each money order issued and one cent on each money order paid).
>
> Qualifications required: ability and education to efficiently perform the duties of office.

The notice stated that the applications should be received by the district superintendent of postal service, Ottawa, not later than March 27, 1928. That notice was sent to the Civil Service Commission on March 19, 1928, and the applications were to be received not later than March 27, eight days later.

There may be some reason for this delay, but I do not think it is a clear one in this case. I looked for an explanation in the correspondence which took place between the Deputy Postmaster General and the member for the riding, and I found a letter from the Deputy Postmaster General to the hon. member, but it is in French and I cannot read it.

An hon. MEMBER: That is too bad.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): That is too bad, but I will give the house the substance of it. The Deputy Postmaster General, in the correspondence to which I have referred, informed the hon. member of the vacancy and the necessity of filling it, having regard to the public inconvenience occasioned thereby. He said it was necessary that a permanent appointment be made at once; that it would be necessary to make a new appointment and replace Mr. Dowler. The hon. member for Russell replied to that letter, and on December 16, the assistant deputy minister wrote him a letter apprising him of the temporary apointment of Campbell. The hon. member wrote to the Deputy Postmaster General on December 20, asking that the matter be allowed to stand until they could have a conversation with reference to it. The Deputy Postmaster General replied to that letter on December 22, stating that the matter would be held up until they could discuss it. In other words, the delay from December to March was due to the desire of the officials of the departments to confer with the local member regarding this matter, a matter which under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, should have been attended to immediately. The position should have been advertised and applications received by the district superintendent, which applications should have been reported upon to the Civil Service Commission so that the matter could have been dealt with. But that was not done.

The time expired on March 27, and within that period applications were received from J. L. Brule, a resident civilian; D. T. Campbell, a resident civilian—the temporary appointee; John Sinclair, a resident civilian; and C. W. Cummings, a non-resident civilian. It seems to me that the district superintendent could have proceeded and made his report, and we find that he did make a very extensive report which covers three pages of this return. This is return No. 185, dated March 9, 1929, made on the motion of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Spence) acting for the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart). In this report Mr. Low, district superintendent, refers to the four applicants. He gives the detailed answers in respect to the oral examination and the written examination made by each of these men, Brule, Campbell, Sinclair and Cummings, and he also makes lengthy comments. But that report was not sent to the Civil Service Commission. I do not understand why it should not have been sent on, because the very object of getting a report is to advise the Civil Service Commission. It was, however, not sent to them.

On April 2, the district superintendent received an application from another man, Phillips. That was in his hands just about the time he made this report. That was not sent on, but the department took time to make an investigation of the application. I find from the file that the district superintendent makes two lengthy reports in regard to Phillips, although the application was received on April 2, which was too late. Phillips was a returned soldier, a man who had not been wounded, and who had no disability. He had served overseas, and he had lived in the district for some time. April 16 is the date of the district superintendent's first report in which he reported favourably in regard to this man. On April 19 the chief superintendent of the postal service writes back to the district superintendent, asking him to state where Mr. Phillips' name should appear in the order of merit of the applicants. In other words, although the time had gone by within which applications might be received, the officers of the department were quite willing to consider this application and ask where it should be placed in the order of merit.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS OF CANADA

The house in committee on Bill No. 84, to incorporate the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada—Mr. Young (Saskatoon)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Interpretation.

Mr. BOURASSA: I would like to hear any amendments, Mr. Chairman, that have been made in committee.

The CHAIRMAN: There were no amendments to this section.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Provisional council.

Mr. BOURASSA: I would ask the promoter of this bill what communications have passed between this organization and the various medical organizations of the provinces.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): All the medical organizations in Canada have been notified of this legislation. It has been discussed for several years, and so far as I know there has been no objection from any medical organization in Canada.

Section agreed to.

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5—Fellows.

The CHAIRMAN: This section has been amended by adding after the word "persons" in the thirteenth line of page 2, the words "domiciled in Canada."

Mr. BOURASSA: Whether they are Canadiians or not? Can you admit members who are not Canadian citizens?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Admittance of physicians and surgeons as fellows.

Mr. BOURASSA: I think this is the important section. I well remember in the old days in the House of Commons when Doctor Roddick, of Montreal, introduced a bill in some respects similar to this, and one of the matters under discussion then was with

regard to the clash there might be between this federally incorporated body and the various provincial medical organizations, and as to whether a physician belonging to one of the provincial organizations could practise in another province under the privileges which he acquired from the central body. Is the object of this legislation the same?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Perhaps I had better give a short explanation to the house. This bill is asked for by the Canadian Medical Association, which, as its name implies, includes in its membership medical men from every province in Canada. This has nothing whatever to do with education; it has nothing to do with the licensing of medical men. The Canada Medical Act has to do with the licensing of medical men in the provinces. The whole object of this bill is to encourage post graduate education. When a man has been graduated for three years and is licensed to practise medicine in one of the provinces of Canada, he is eligible to be admitted to fellowship in this organization. The idea is to encourage post graduate education, the fellowship being a recognition that the post graduate studies have been taken. This body has nothing to do with education.

Mr. BOURASSA: Nor with practice?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): No.

Mr. MacLAREN: There is a marked distinction between this bill and what is called the Roddick bill, under which the medical council has to arrange for examinations and award some recognition to anyone passing their examination. That was and still is subject to the approval of each province. At the present time any province can separate itself from the Dominion council. As the hon. member for Saskatoon says, the purpose of this bill is to encourage a higher standard of education. Anyone who wishes to submit himself for examination may do so; it is entirely a voluntary matter. It is not in connection with qualifications for practice. It is somewhat similar to the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons in London, in Edinburgh and in Dublin. It is intended as an incentive to medical men, both physicians and surgeons, to aspire to higher qualifications and, therefore, higher standards.

Section agreed to.

Section 7 agreed to.

[Mr. Bourassa.]

On section 8—Admittance to fellowship.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Mr. Chairman, there is a typographical error in the first line of subsection (c); the word "be" should be "by". The line should read: "The council may by by-law," and so on.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Diplomas.—Register.

Mr. BOURASSA: What would be the effect upon the profession of these diplomas?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): This refers simply to the form of diploma on admittance; it has nothing to do with anybody else.

Mr. BOURASSA: Quite so. But what are the diplomas for?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): They are merely certificates granted to members when they pass the special examination.

Section agreed to.

Sections 10 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

On section 13—No personal liability.

Mr. SPENCER: Who is to be responsible for the liabilities of the institution?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): The institution itself.

Mr. SPENCER: Each member must be liable to a certain extent.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): There is no personal liability. That is all.

Section agreed to.

On the preamble.

Mr. STEVENS: Might I ask the hon. member who, I think, is directing the bill, regarding the word "royal"? If I recall rightly, under the rules of parliament a company or an association is not permitted to use the word without permission of the sovereign. I wonder whether that formality has been observed in this case.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): It was inquired into, and we were advised that if the bill passed this house it would be sufficient warrant for the use of the word "royal".

Mr. STEVENS: I want it clearly understood that I am not in any way objecting to the bill. But I recall several instances within the last ten or fifteen years in connection with other associations and companies where an attempt to use the word "royal" was in no case permitted by the committees of the house that had the matter under consideration,

except, I think, in one or two instances where it was shown that permission of the sovereign had been secured. While it has been argued that we find the use of the word in such titles as The Royal Bank, The Royal Trust Company, and one or two others—

An hon. MEMBER: Royal baking powder.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, and royal yeast; but that is a little levity on the side. As I say, we have the word in use in those cases, but the institutions received their charters very much in the same way as we are passing this bill, and the formality of securing the necessary permission of the sovereign was not given proper consideration; but, as I say, during the past ten or fifteen years it has been recognized as necessary that such permission should be secured.

Mr. GERSHAW: May I suggest that in this case the word "royal" is not used for advertising effect. Its purpose is to bring the college into harmony with similar colleges which exist in England, in Scotland and in Ireland, and to give the institution a standing.

Mr. BOURASSA: My hon. friend says that this has nothing to do with education, and of course I take his word for it. There is evidently nothing in the clauses as far as I have been able to read them through hurriedly—they were not read by the Chair—but at the same time the title conveys the idea of an educational institution. Why not call it an association?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): We are simply adopting the same title as that of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons in London, in Edinburgh and in Dublin. It is really not intended to have any control of education, nor, as I said before, has it anything to do with the licensing of medical men. It is simply an organization of medical men formed to promote a higher standard of professional education in the Dominion. It will be observed that every medical man must be a graduate of three year's standing of a medical school or university and must also be licensed to practise medicine in one of the provinces of Canada before he is permitted to take the examination. Having passed the examination and become a member, he in effect tells the world that he has taken this post graduate course. The idea is to encourage a larger number of medical men to continue their studies in the interests of the general health of this country.

Mr. BOURASSA: But could not this be broad enough to enable the college to establish a post graduate course, and therefore become an educational institution? Did not the old historical institutions of Great Britain and Ireland at some time or other provide for the training of their members, and is it not therefrom that they derived their titles?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): That is not my opinion, Mr. Chairman, and certainly it is not the intention in this case. There is no possibility either now or in the future of setting up any curriculum or any teaching body or faculty, there being no provision in the bill for this purpose.

Mr. MANION: May I say a word, Mr. Chairman, in support of my hon. friend's remarks? As has been pointed out, there is a Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons in England, in Scotland and in Ireland, and there are members of this house who have taken degrees at one or other of those institutions. But they are not colleges in the sense understood by my hon. friend from Labelle. They simply hold examinations. But more recently there was formed in the United States an American college of surgeons. I may be wrong, but while we say this proposed royal college is modelled on the British institutions to which I have referred, really its purpose is to put us on a par with the American college.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Yes; but not to put us on a par; it will be vastly superior.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend is ultra patriotic in that regard. The American College of Surgeons was established some years ago and a number of prominent Canadian physicians and surgeons obtained their degree there. Now, with the establishment of this institution, Canadians will doubtless be quite satisfied to take their degrees in this country. I have said a word in support of the bill because I consider its object a worthy one. I share the view of the hon. member who has introduced it.

Mr. BOURASSA: This college is really what its Latin equivalent signifies—a "collegium"—and not a school.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Subsection (b) of section 8 provides that candidates wishing to be examined for fellowship in the college shall be graduates of not less than three years' standing of a medical school or university approved by the council, and shall hold license to practise medicine in at least one of the provinces of Canada. They are graduates from some recognized school. I do not think that "college" here means school.

Mr. BOURASSA: Would not this institution be enabled under the charter to establish a kind of post graduate course of its own?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not that I can see in the bill.

Mr. KAISER: The great majority of medical men, whether or not qualified by virtue of their status to become fellows of his college, are quite in favour of the bill, and we expect that the institution to be founded will perform a very useful service to the public as well as to the medical profession. I might refer however to section 12 which provides that the college may acquire property by gift and so forth:

> Provided, however, that the annual value of the real estate held by the college shall not exceed the sum of $50,000.

I presume that "the annual value of the real estate" means the assessed value. This college will likely have its home in one of the great cities of Canada, probably Toronto, and it will be necessary to construct a substantial building to house the college. It seems to me that this sum should be at least doubled.

Mr. McGIBBON: I want to join with the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Young) and the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) in advocating the passage of this bill. I think it is time that Canadians had an institution of this kind of their own. In the past we have been too prone to pride ourselves upon the degrees we have won in colleges either within the British Empire or in some of the American states, and I hope the time has come when Canadian academicians will stand on their own feet. Surveying the field of industrial and scientific research, I think we may safely say that no universities in the world to-day, of all those that loom up on the intellectual horizon, are greater than the universities of Canada. There is no country in the world where the medical profession has attained greater achievements than in Canada. This legislation therefore is only, so to speak, to put the final seal of accomplishment and of recognition upon the profession. It is no secret in the medical profession that every member of that profession prizes most the degree obtained from the Royal College of Surgeons of London. It is true we get degrees from Edinburgh and Ireland as well. But speaking as one whose pleasure and honour it has been to have graduated from the Royal College of Surgeons in England, I recognize this as one of the greatest achievements of my life; I believe it is recognized in academic and medical circles as one of the most coverted honours to have graduated from that college. I am not prepared, however, to admit that we in this country should not establish an institution of our own, whose degrees it will be equally the ambition of every Canadian to secure. I have much pleasure in supporting the bill; it is, I think, a measure which is long overdue. We Canadians have too great a tendency to hide our light under a bushel. We are not good enough advertisers; we do not make the accomplishments of our people known to the world in the way we should. All we need do is to scan the achievements of our universities and to take the standing of our professors, and I say without fear of contradiction that the Canadian is the peer of any not only in the British Empire but in the world. I join with others who have spoken in urging the favourable consideration of this bill, for I know that this legislation will be of benefit to scientific education in Canada.

Mr. KING (Koctenay): I do not desire to delay the passage of the bill, but as a medical man and a graduate of a Canadian medical school I feel I ought at least to say a word in support of it. As my hon. friend across the way (Mr. McGibbon) has observed, Canadian medical institutions are outstanding not only on this continent but throughout the world, as institutions that give a broad medical education. This is proved by the fact that Canadian graduates have been able to go to various countries where medical science has attained a high standard and there compete with those who have had the best training in the world's universities. The bill does not affect in any way the institutions now engaged in the education of medical men in Canada, but it will give to Canadian graduates or graduates from other universities an opportunity to secure what I am sure will be a coveted degree in the profession of which I am glad to have been and to be now a member. I thoroughly endorse the bill and the proposal it contains. Our medical profession has so advanced in Canada, and has attained such a standing in the medical world, that I believe we can now very well proceed to found an institution to be known as the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada.

Mr. MARCIL: I took part in the debate in this house at the time the Canadian Medical Association was created, and the conclusion arrived at then was that that legislation could not become effective until the various provinces had endorsed it. In con-

nection with that legislation the question arose whether a university in Quebec or in Ontario could grant a diploma which would be recognized in any other province.

Mr. McGIBBON: That was a licensing body.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand that this bill does not touch that question at all. I believe that the Canadian Medical Association has since granted diplomas enabling medical men to practise in any part of the Dominion. I understand that that is the system.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Without examination.

Mr. McGIBBON: Only in adjoining provinces.

Mr. MARCIL: That does not affect in any way the powers held at present in the provinces. The only other point to which I wish to draw attention is the use of the word "royal." I think it would be wise to not pass the title until the Secretary of State can communicate with the imperial authorities with regard to the use of that word. This question has been discussed in this house several times, and each time this communication from the British government was requested.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): In that regard I took the trouble to communicate with the Solicitor General, and his opinion is as follows:

In reply to your letter of the 15th instant regarding the use of the word "royal", I may say that the usual practice is to obtain the consent of His Majesty to the use of the word. I observe, however, that in the case you have in mind the intention is to have the name including the word "royal" conferred by act of the Dominion parliament, and, while you will appreciate that it is not my function to advise you, I think the passage of such a bill, to which His Majesty is a party, would render it unnecesary to apply to His Majesty for consent.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PREMIER GUARANTEE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY

The house in committe on Bill No. 74, respecting the Premier Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Lawson.—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Extension of time.

Mr. BOURASSA: Why is this extension of time requested?

Mr. STEVENS: This bill passed the banking and commerce committee without amendment and unfortunately the hon. gentleman who is sponsoring it is absent to-night. I do not know of any objection to the bill, but of course if the hon. gentleman desires special information the hon. gentleman who has the bill in charge must give it. The chairman of the banking and commerce committee is not here either.

Mr. BOURASSA: It sometimes happens that companies—in the old days this was done by railway companies—ask for a charter under which something is to be done within a certain length of time; then they come back to parliament from time to time to extend their powers before making use of the powers already granted. I have heard this practice spoken of frequently as an abuse of the powers granted by parliament. Why fill up the statute books of the country with bills granting powers which are not exercised?

Mr. STEVENS: I speak subject to correction, but I think the facts are these: I understand there are certain obligations resting upon a company under the general act and it is not unusual for something to come up which prevents the company from complying with some technical portion of that act. However, I can assure my hon. friend that none of these bills ever passed the banking and commerce committee without the consent and approval of the Superintendent of Insurance, who does very good work in watching matters of this kind. I cannot assure my hon. friend that that was done in this case, but that has been my experience.

Mr. SPENCER: I was in the banking and commerce committee when this bill was presented and the Superintendent of Insurance was asked if he thought the bill should pass. He said he thought the bill was perfectly in order and that the committee should pass it.

Mr. RYCKMAN: According to section 1 the effect of this bill is simply to extend until April 15, 1930, the time for applying for the license and the going into operation of the company. Section 1 shows that the company had to make application for the license

before April 14, which was last Sunday; they were not in a position to do so and this bill simply provides that the time be extended until April 15, 1930.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Preamble and title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WAPITI INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. J. T. THORSON (Winnipeg South Centre) moved the second reading of and concurrence in an amendment made by the senate to Bill No. 32, to incorporate the Wapiti Insurance Company.

Mr. BOURASSA: What is the effect of the amendment?

Mr. THORSON: The amendment may be found on page 255 of No. 42 of the votes and proceedings, and is to this effect:

This act shall come into force on a date to be specified by the superintendent of insurance in a notice in the Canada Gazette, and such notice shall not be given until this act has been approved by a resolution adopted by at least two-thirds of the votes of the members of the company present or represented by proxy at a meeting duly called for that purpose, nor until the superintendent of insurance has been satisfied by such evidence as he may require that such approval has been given and that the provincial company has ceased to do business, or will cease to do business forthwith upon a license being issued to the company.

I understand that this amendment was inserted by the senate committee at the request of the Superintendent of Insurance.

Mr. SPENCER: Is this the case of a company with a provincial charter now securing a federal charter in order to do business in other parts of the Dominion?

Mr. THORSON: I did not know there was a provincial company in existence, but it would so appear from the amendment.

Motion agreed to; amendment read the second time and concurred in.

PROCEDURE RESPECTING APPLICATIONS FOR DIVORCE

Mr. N. M. YOUNG (Toronto Northeast) moved the seconding reading of Bill No. 88, for the relief of Minerva Elliott.

Mr. SPENCER: Will the hon. member kindly explain ?

[Mr. Ryckman.]

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto): I have the bill before me as well as the printed copy of the evidence upon which the bill is based. I do not think the hon. member desires me to read the evidence, as he probably has received a copy of it, but if he has not this evidence before him I will send my copy down. The ground upon which the divorce was granted is with one exception the only ground for divorce in Canada. The case was properly proved before the senate committee, and comes to this house for approval.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): We appear to be in the same position this evening as has been the case on previous occasions. Three bills have been called and allowed to stand. I have not the evidence relating to this particular case and I do not know if it has yet been proven; we are being asked to ratify the action which has been taken. I have not read this evidence because, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) said the other day, if one attempted to read all this evidence his brain would be turned into a garbage can, and I do not propose to submit myself to that danger.

Mr. CLARK: Would the hon. member vote for the bill if the case had been proven?

Mr. BOURASSA: I do not think the question is quite fair. I told the house that I would vote on principle against every one of these bills.

Mr. CLARK: Why worry the house?

Mr. BOURASSA: I will say quite seriously that it is a question of principle with me. I think we have the right to declare ourselves against any such bill. If the house overcomes that objection, every member has the right to know whether in passing judgment he is ratifying something which is right or something which is wrong. Apart from the question of principle which applies to all divorces, there is the question of equity which applies to each individual case. If this house is ratifying something which it does not know anything about, how can it pretend that it is acting either as a parliament or as a judicial body?

An objection was made the other day by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Geary) which was quite fair. His objection was that it might not be proper on second readings to examine the evidence in each case; that this might well be done when the house was in committee of the whole and considering the report made by the private bills

committee. I think it would be our duty to examine each case at that time because, after all, this house has to pass judgment upon the findings of its own committees. The house has to ratify, amend, or differ from the findings of its committees. If this were not the case the house would cease to exist the moment it referred any matter to any committee; it would mean that the gentlemen composing each committee would be substituted for the house, either as a legislating body or as a judicial body. As has been stated very properly by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) and the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan), this parliament is acting in a judicial capacity. As far as that is concerned, I am prepared to admit that we ought not perhaps to review the evidence of each case on the second reading, but we should know enough about the case to know whether we were warranted in sending it to the private bills committee.

I had to go to Montreal and arrived in the house only at half-past seven, and I could not take up all these records and pick out the one connected with the bill which is now called.

Mr. McGIBBON: Does the hon. member read all the evidence which comes from the agriculture committee, the railway committee, the private bills committee, and all the other committees?

Mr. BOURASSA: If the hon. member will allow me I would point out that there is a difference.

Mr. McGIBBON: There is no difference.

Mr. BOURASSA: The evidence heard before the various committees is taken either to enlighten the house upon some general measures of legislation—

Mr. McGIBBON: It never gets to the house.

Mr. BOURASSA: Or it is giving to the house new legislation or new matters affecting administration or government. Until last year there were very few people in Canada who realized that parliament was not acting only as a parliament, but was acting also as a court of justice. I am quite sure that many members of the house had never realized that this was not ordinary private legislation which was going through; that we were acting as a court of justice, and, therefore, that we should take all precautions in law and equity which any court of justice has to take. With the volume of this work growing from year to year it is intellectually and physically impossible for the committee charged with the examination of these cases to carry on with their work, and I do not say that in any spirit of disparagement of the committee of the senate or the private bills committee. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre pointed out last week, it has been necessary at times to look through the halls and corridors in order to find a quorum for the private bills committee to vote upon a batch of twenty or thirty of these bills. No tribunal would ever attempt to deal in such a manner with twenty or thirty cases of law; the most trivial cases are always considered on their merits. Is the annulment of a marriage a less important thing than the most trivial cases that come before police courts or criminal courts or civil tribunals every day? We have let the system grow without realizing the seriousness of our responsibilities. I say in all earnestness it is not a matter of pleasure for me, any more than it has been for any other member who has taken the same position, to delay the business of the house. I would not feel insulted at all if anybody accused me of blocking this legislation in order to give the house time to reflect over it. I am doing this in a sincere desire to do something good for my country. I think the government should examine the situation and come to some decision with regard to all these bills and the principle and basis of them. It is for the purpose of emphasizing upon the minds of the members of the government, the members of the house and the people generally, the seriousness of the situation that has grown upon us, that I for my part have taken this view, and I think it was also the view taken by other hon. members who have approached the question from another angle.

Mr. BOYS: Supposing the charges dealing with practically the only ground upon which divorce is granted were proved to the hilt in the senate committee, would my hon. friend still oppose the bill?

Mr. BOURASSA: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: I have not read the evidence in this case, but I have in a number of them and in every single one in which I have read the evidence, the charges have been proved to the hilt. If my hon. friend says that it is not on the question of proof he is opposed to the bill, he would simply vote against it no matter what the evidence was, and he would still let people come to parliament, this being the only course they can take in Ontario, and spend $500 to $1,000 and yet, although

they conform with the law, produce the evidence which is reported and presented to the house—and my hon. friend has a copy of it in his room; as far as I know every hon. member gets it—he will deny to those people a right which is held out to them as citizens of Canada. Surely that is unfair.

Mr. BOURASSA: What I have been trying to emphasize in these various debates, not only this year but last year, is the necessity of amending the constitution and, short of that, of amending the procedure. In years past the question has been discussed only academically; nothing has been done. The same procedure has been going on from year to year and the senate is complaining about it.

Mr. BOYS: So far as I know, the only complaint the senate make is that they want a different forum; they want a judge, who is trained to this sort of thing, to do it, and not have the time of the senate and of this house wasted as it is from year to year.

Mr. BOURASSA: Quite so, but at the same time that raises the bigger issue which I am not going to discuss to-night, because some other occasion will be found to discuss it—that is, the question of provincial as well as federal jurisdiction.

Mr. McGIBBON: Which does the hon. member stand for?

Mr. BOURASSA: Unhesitatingly for the exclusive and absolute jurisdiction of the provinces in all these matters.

Mr. McGIBBON: Then why is the hon. member opposing the wishes of the province of Ontario?

Mr. BOURASSA: I beg the hon. member's pardon; I myself suggested an addition to the proposal made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre on the second reading of a public bill—that it should be left to the province of Ontario, and objections came from Ontario representatives.

Mr. McGIBBON: And voted differently.

Mr. BOURASSA: I do not know, but many of them voted against it also. I voted against it precisely because the house refused to define and limit the scope of the bill by leaving it in the hands of the Ontario legislature to have it put into force or not. On the one hand I consider that parliament morally and constitutionally cannot force a court upon either Ontario or Quebec; and on the other hand I do not think parliament should assume the responsibility of establishing a court of that nature without the province interested exercising its power of expression of opinion.

Mr. BOYS: Has my hon. friend not on many occasions by his silence supported the first, second and third readings of many divorce bills in the House of Commons?

Mr. BOURASSA: As I explained to the house the other day, I have let those bills pass on division. It was the custom to call each one and say "carried on division", and I explained to the house, and I repeat to my hon. friend, who is very fairminded and who seems to be exercised over my conscience in this matter, that I have come to the conclusion it is not the proper way to act. Because I think I have done something wrong in the past, I am endeavouring to do right in the future.

Mr. McGIBBON: When did the hon. member become a Saul of Tarsus?

Mr. BOURASSA: I am not speaking for any other member; I am speaking simply for myself, and I think this method of saying "carried on division" is not sufficient; it does not carry the meaning which the hon. member for North Simcoe wants to attach to it—that we agreed to these bills. But I consider it does not sufficiently emphasize the objection we have on principle to divorce.

The only reason I have taken this attitude is to try to have the government think over the situation and come to a decision. The other day the leader of the opposition said something which is absolutely true. Even in private matters the government has the responsibility of the business of the house. The government has the responsibility of the general direction given to legislation, whether it be private or public. The proof of that is that if any piece of legislation appears to the government to be contrary to the interest of the country, or even, from a narrow point of view, to the interest of the government, it has the right and duty to appeal to the house to oppose it. That is one reason why I am trying—call it obstruction if you like; it does not matter to me—to emphasize the importance of this question. I do not want to do it any further on the second reading with regard to the evidence, but there is one more point made by the hon. member for—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour for private bills having expired, the house will resume in committee of supply.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Outside Service — Salaries and allowances, $17,295,464.40.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): When the house rose at six o'clock I was discussing the application of Mr. Phillips for the position of postmaster at Billings Bridge. On page 85 of the return to which I referred this afternoon, I find a report from the district superintendent to the postal service branch at Ottawa in regard to Mr. Phillips. It is too long to put the whole report on record, but I will read part of it. It says:

In conversation with Mr. Phillips it was ascertained that he is a garage owner at Billings Bridge and conducts a taxi service. If he were given the postmastership his wife would look after the office. He stated that she had the better education, as she had been a school teacher for nine years.

Mr. Phillips was one year in England and three years in France, as a chauffeur and mechanic, but suffered no disability.

The chief superintendent then asked for information as to the order of merit of Mr. Phillips, and a further report was sent by the district superintendent to the postal service branch dated April 20, 1928. It reads:

With reference to departmental memorandum of yesterday's date, concerning an application from Mr. W. T. Phillips, for the postmastership of Billings Bridge, which was received after a report was forwarded regarding the various applicants for the postmastership, and in connection with which the district superintendent was requested to state where Mr. Phillips' name should appear in the order of merit of the applicants, it is desired to say that Mr. Phillips should precede Mr. D. T. Campbell.

In conversation with Mr. Phillips and his wife, it was ascertained that Phillips, in the event of being appointed postmaster, would continue the operation of his taxi service. It appears he has two cars on the road; the one manned by a driver during the day time, and the bulk of Phillips' work is performed after 6 o'clock. He states he would be in attendance at the office at mail hours and during the greater portion of the day, but that if post office business were slack he might absent himself. It is clearly to be seen that Mrs. Phillips would be the one who would be in constant attendance at the post office and the district superintendent was very favourably impressed with the woman's appearance and intelligence. She has been in this country fifteen years and previous to moving here was nine years a school teacher in England. Unquestionably she has the requisite qualifications to discharge the duties of the office when money order business will have been restored there.

As stated in the previous memorandum, it is the intention of Mr. Phillips, if he is appointed postmaster, to remove the office to the former site, but instead of a grocery and meat business being run in conjunction with it, he would subdivide the front portion of the building where passengers for the Hunt Club could be sheltered.

That report goes to show that Phillips and his wife between them are quite capable of taking charge of the office. That report was sent to the postal service branch, Ottawa, but no action was taken to send it on to the Civil Service Commission.

Then on the 17th day of April an application was received from one Henry Lemoine, which was forwarded by the district superintendent to the postal service branch on the 25th of April. Attached to the application were recommendations from P. C. Lemoine, of Sorel, Quebec, and one by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. No report was asked in regard to Mr. Lemoine, and no report was sent on to the Civil Service Commission.

On June 20 the chief superintendent of the post office service requested his district superintendent to ascertain what arrangements the present acting postmaster at Billings Bridge would make for the proper discharge of the money order business. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that it was in connection with the money order business that the defaulting took place. A report was made by the district superintendent on June 23rd in regard to arrangements for the money order business, and while I shall not quote the report in full, it shows that the work was very unsatisfactory, that the office was left in charge of a boy of eighteen with a limited high school education, that Mr. Campbell, the temporary appointee, was working for the International Paper Company up the Gatineau and was home only every two weeks, that while the superintendent was there he found that the mail courier desired to obtain stamps from the office and could not get them, that a patron of the office wanted a money order for nineteen dollars and the boy could not give it because they were all locked up by Campbell when he went to the market. That was the condition of the post office, and yet Campbell was retained as temporary postmaster until March 14, I think, of this year. The position had not been advertised. They did not send a report to the Civil Service Commission in order that something might be done to relieve the situation, and that is the kind of service that the people of this community were getting. Dowler was put out of office in December, 1927, on account of a shortage in his accounts and here was the work of the office being attended to in a very unsatisfactory manner.

On the 25th of June the deputy postmaster general found it necessary to communicate with the hon. member for Russell, acquainting him with the conditions and stating that it was necessary that something should be done. On July 3 the district superintendent made another full report to the postal service branch in regard to the conditions at Billings Bridge post office, reiterating what had previously been said as to the unsatisfactory conditions at that office, and yet nothing was done. But they were still open to receive applications, because I find in the file another application dated August 29 from a man named Edward Sutherland, a returned soldier. This application was received by the district superintendent and sent on to the postal service branch on September 4, but still no action was taken. I also find in the file a memorandum dated October 18 signed by Mr. Coolican, and why this was not sent to the Civil Service Commission I do not know. I will put it on record:

Memorandum for the Deputy Postmaster General

Re Billings Bridge

Electoral district, Russell.

Revenue, $2,600.

The deputy postmaster general is informed that the Billings Bridge post office is vacant since December, 1927. The office is in the temporary charge of Mr. David Campbell.

The vacancy was advertised from the 18th to the 27th March last and applications were received from the following (order of merit):

Joseph L. Brule, resident civilian.
D. T. Campbell, resident civilian.
John Sinclair, resident civilian.
C. W. Cummings, non-resident civilian.

Applications were later received from the following:

Applicant—Date of Application

W. T. Phillips, O.A.S., 2nd April, 1928.

J. H. Lemoine, resident civilian, 18th April, 1928.

Ed. Sutherland, resident returned soldier, 29th August, 1928.

I would ask hon. gentlemen to note the next clause:

It will be noted from the above that Mr. Hector Doresa mentioned is not an applicant to that office, at least in so far as the department or the district superintendent's office are aware.

The application of Hector Doresa, the man who got the appointment, had been before Mr. Coolican, the assistant deputy postmaster general, and yet he states innocently or otherwise that his application was not before him. The memorandum proceeds.

As regards the applicants who submitted their applications before the closing date of the competition—27th March—it may be stated that—

(1) Mr. Brule is still an American citizen.

(2) Mr. D. T. Campbell, the acting postmaster. has not proved very satisfactory since he took charge of the office.

(3) Mr. John Sinclair is stated by the district superintendent not to have the necessary qualifications, whereas—

(4) Mr. Cummings is a non-resident.

In his report covering Mr. Phillip's application the district superintendent stated that he should be placed second in the list.

Mr. VENIOT: What is the date of that?

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): October 18, 1928. It is rather interesting to note that in this same file I find an application signed by H. Doresa, dated August 3, 1929—it must mean 1928—on a form supplied by the Civil Service Commission, which is properly filled up. Hon. gentlemen will notice that Mr. Coolican's letter is dated October 18, and he says in that letter that no application was received from Mr. Doresa. It would be interesting to know where that application had been all that time.

Mr. VENIOT: May I call the attention of the hon. gentleman, in order to have the record correct, that the applications at that date went to the Civil Service Commission, they never came to my department at all.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): How did this application go direct to them?

Mr. VENIOT: That was very often the case. Why attempt to make an argument out of it?

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): Let us follow this a little further. That application was accompanied by a petition and a report by D. F. Rowe, superintendent of employment. According to the poster notice applications were to be sent to the district superintendent. There is nothing here to show it came from the commission. I do not wish to say that the minister's statement is not correct, but there is nothing in the file to show that.

Mr. VENIOT: There is no need to explain it.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): Then in October why did not the department, following the report to the Civil Service Commission, have the position further advertised? This was not done until some time in December. It will be remembered that they advertised first in March, 1928, and then again in December. But in the meantime the man who apparently they wanted to appoint, Mr. Doresa, had filed another application, that is, he had filed it while the advertising was going on. Then the matter was taken into

consideration by the department and the report was made on February 12, 1929, and all the applications were sent forward, Hector Doresa, class A, standing at the top of the list. It is only fair to say of Mr. Doresa that he is a returned soldier, that he had been disabled and was in receipt of a 100 per cent pension, and that in every respect, apparently, he was well recommended. But I would point out that it was only after Doresa's application was received, all those months of delay having intervened, that the advertising was attended to. The Civil Service Commission acted on the recommendation and appointed Mr. Doresa.

It may be interesting also to note that from December, 1927, until March, 1929, the Civil Service Commission had written eleven times asking for a report in regard to this man. The letters are dated April 27, May 22, June 21, July 10, August 1—this was the first occasion on which the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General replied and said they were not yet ready to send on the report. Then there were other requests by the commission on October 4, October 30—and again the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, by letter dated November 22, 1928, stated that they were not yet in a position to send on the report. Yet he had the report in his possession covering the four men who had applied before March 27, 1928. He had a report in regard to Mr. Phillips and in regard to Campbell. I may say that Campbell's application was accompanied by a petition signed by 218 persons served by the post office. I do not contend that Campbell as a matter of fact was entitled to the position in view of the investigation, but I say the delay was inexcusable, and it seems to me its purpose was to prevent the Civil Service Commission from functioning. Then we find the Civil Service Commission writing again on December 18, 1928, and on January 19, 1929. All applications were in at that time, yet the commission's letters were not answered. Finally on February 20, 1929, the commission sent a further request for the report and the Deputy Postmaster General sent it forward. That is the report to which I have referred.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the whole matter from beginning to end indicates that the applications that had been received were for some reason or other not suitable, but this is not disclosed in this file. The department were continually in communication with the member for the riding. He was informed of the course of events, and his advice or information was requested, and he invariably gave it. The delay in the first instance was wholly due to a request by the member that the vacancy should not be advertised. When the department found that Campbell, who was a temporary employe, was not carrying on the office satisfactorily, and had in their hands at that time seven applications for the position, there was no excuse under the sun for withholding the report from the Civil Service Commission, and so enabling the commission to act. I submit that the action of the department savours very much of a desire on their part to act independently of the commission, and that the exercise of patronage was uppermost in the mind of the minister, who apparently was determined to act on the maxim "To the victor belong the spoils."

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. VENIOT: No, Mr. Chairman. I certainly would not consent to having it carried without replying to the hon. gentleman. If one were to believe the hon. member who has just taken his seat, one would conclude that in connection with the Billings Bridge vacancy nothing but politics was played. Now, as I have said before, there are two sides to every story. There are two sides to this case, but the hon. gentleman, although he has the full record before him, has presented only one side. The first advertisement for this vacancy was, as he stated, issued on March 27, 1927. In due time four applications were received. The inspector reported on those applications. If the hon. gentleman had read that report he would have seen why the applications were not forwarded to the Civil Service Commission. The applicants were (1) Joseph L. Brule, resident civilian, an American citizen—no need of sending his application to the Civil Service Commission; he could not be considered under the act; (2) D. T. Campbell, resident civilian, acting postmaster, according to the qualifying officer proved unsatisfactory; (3) John Sinclair, resident civilian, eliminated under qualifications by investigating officer, as he was not capable of filling the position; (4) C. W. Cummings, non-resident civilian, and his application could not be considered under the act because he must be a resident of the district. Everyone of the four is eliminated except D. T. Campbell, who had some post office experience, and was then acting postmaster. Under those conditions it was seen immediately that it was no use sending this report to the Civil Service Commission, and that it would be better to re-advertise the vacancy. And one reason why that position was taken was that from the second day of April on—and especially on

the 2nd day of April—the department received applications. The department received an application from W. T. Phillips. This application could not be considered because it had been received after the date fixed for the receipt of applications under the first advertisement. But having gone over the reports, and seeing that it might be necessary to advertise again, we held W. T. Phillips's application on file; and immediately, within a very short time after that—and Phillips is a returned soldier—there came in another application from Edward Sutherland, a returned soldier, on August 29. That was followed by applications from other returned soldiers. The Doresa application was not received through the department, and according to the wording of the report which the hon. member read to the house on the blank form on which it was set out, it must have gone to the Civil Service Commission, who would send the application to the postal district superintendent, who in turn when the proper time came, when the second advertisement would be published, would send it in to the department, so that the inspecting officer qualified under the act might examine this applicant. That was the procedure, and all along, while it appears that there has been a good deal of delay between the first advertisement and the second, it was not due to anything political because, if it was, Campbell, so far as I know, was the man who could play the political game or call upon the Liberal party to assist him in getting this position. But Campbell was not considered at all. After that report he was eliminated; and when finally we decided, I think in December, to advertise a second time, we received a number of applications, Hector Doresa's application being in in the meantime. He was a returned soldier, a disability case.

Let me pause here to direct the attention of the committee to a very vicious personal attack made upon the Postmaster General in the London Free Press because the Postmaster General was not giving any opportunity to Doresa to be an applicant. I am blamed by the Tory press for not giving him an opportunity, and I am blamed by Tory members for having given him one, because it was politics to do so. That is the position, and I know the house will excuse the expression if I say, "You are damned if you do and you are damned if you don't." That is what happened in this case. Doresa finally got it, and the Tory press was asking for him to get it. But he did not get it from me but through the commission. This went along, and the second advertising took

[Mr. Veniot.]

place. Doresa, a returned soldier and a disability case, was an applicant. William T. Phillips, a resident returned soldier, was an applicant. And other applicants were:

Mrs. K. Campbell, resident civilian.
Edward Sutherland, resident returned soldier.
Mrs. V. E. Dowler, resident civilian.
Jos. Henri Lemoine, resident civilian.
Jas. Henry McCullough, resident returned soldier.
John Sinclair, resident civilian.
Andrew Amos Brulé, resident returned soldier.

There was the situation when the second advertisement was issued, and there are the applications we received. Upon the receipt of these applications there was no delay. There were five returned soldiers, and just as soon as it was possible to do so the report of the qualifying officer was forwarded to the Civil Service Commission. On March 16, last the commission issued a certificate in favour of Doresa and that certificate was approved of by the department over which I have the honour to preside.

Now there are the facts. The hon. member states that Doresa got the job because I wanted to play politics. I may say for the benefit of all that I got about the heaviest going over that a man ever got for the appointment of Doresa—although I was not responsible for it—from political friends who desired someone else to get the position and whose wishes were not complied with. I got a trouncing for it, and I get the same lashing to-night because this disabled returned soldier got the position.

That is the case as it stands, and I hope the house will understand that in this matter at least there was not the shadow of playing politics. No matter what I may have done in other cases, this is a case in which I can in all conscience say that there was absolutely no shadow of politics in it. I did not know a single applicant; I did not know their politics until, the appointment having been made, political friends came to me and opposed the action which, as they thought, I had taken in appointing Doresa.

Mr. MANION: How did my hon. friend happen to make a mistake in this case?

Mr. VENIOT: Just like all good fellows, one is apt to make a mistake occasionally. I know some you made when you were Postmaster General.

Mr. MANION: And the hon. gentleman is inventing mistakes I did not make.

Mr. VENIOT: If I make a mistake I am honest enough to admit it, but I am afraid my hon. friend will not consent to the admission on his part.

Mr. MANION: I certainly will not admit any mistakes that the minister says I made.

Mr. VENIOT: I never knew a Tory yet who would admit that he had made a mistake. Now, that is my explanation in connection with this matter. Before going further, Mr. Chairman, I may say that some files were said to be missing in connection with the Sutton post office. I wish now to complete that file and lay the information on the table.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It would seem as though hon. gentlemen opposite had decided not to allow the Postmaster General to make much progress with his estimates, at least this week. I see in the votes and proceedings among the notices of motion, a motion in the name of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart):

That the debate on the amendment of Mr. Stewart (Leeds), to the motion that Mr. Speaker leave the chair for the house to go again into committee of supply, be revived.

As hon. members well know, the rules of the house provide that a motion which is taken up on Wednesday on going into supply drops if that motion is not disposed of at the end of that day. When the house made that rule I think it was intended that in the event of a motion being so dropped it should not be revived. However, I have no doubt that in the present instance hon. members opposite would assume that the government had some special reason for not wishing to revive this particular motion on Monday next if it were strictly to follow the rules. And if the Postmaster General desires, as I believe he does, to have the motion revived so that it may be disposed of by vote of the house, the government will support him in that regard. I think it should be understood hereafter, however, that when an amendment is made on going into supply on Wednesday and is not disposed of, but is dropped according to the rules, the government should not be expected to permit that motion to be revived at a subsequent time.

Mr. STEVENS: The Prime Minister will pardon me for interrupting him, but I think on a previous occasion last year or the year before we had a similar experience and the motion was allowed to be revived, not by the government but by the interpretation of the rules by the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it was done by consent.

Mr. STEVENS: We could not consent to the government interpreting the rules for us.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps my hon. friend will admit that the rules speak for themselves, and a rule which provides that a motion shall be dropped if not disposed of by a certain time is intended to prevent that particular motion being revived on a subsequent occasion. At any rate, such is the view of the government with regard to this particular matter. I am mentioning this only that hon. gentlemen opposite may know hereafter that if they decide to introduce an amendment on a Wednesday to a motion for the house to go into supply, either that amendment must be disposed of on that day or it will be considered as dropped.

Mr. McGIBBON: Surely the Prime Minister is not going to override parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not at all; I am just stating a rule of the house, and that the government intends to stand by the rules.

Mr. McGIBBON: As interpreted by the Prime Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am giving the view taken by the government on this particular rule of the house and the interpretation which will be given the house in debating the rules. I have been given to understand, possibly without foundation, that until this particular motion of the hon. member for Leeds is disposed of, hon. gentlemen opposite do not intend, if they are able so to do, to permit the passage of any of the estimates of the Postmaster General, and in the circumstances I think we are simply consuming the time of parliament to little or no advantage in continuing further at this time with these estimates. Therefore I would suggest to the Postmaster General that at this stage he move that the committee rise and report progress, that we may proceed with some of the non-contentious legislation on the order paper and make a little progress. We would then propose that some of the railway measures be taken up and advanced a stage before the week is ended.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have no objection to the committee taking up something else if it meets the convenience of my right hon. friend, but I must not be understood as assenting to his proposition that under the rules the present motion will lapse. It would be very nice for him if it did lapse, but that was not the case last session under similar cir-

cumstances. This is my point: The motion can be moved again as a new motion if it is not disposed of. I agree that anything which has been disposed of by the house cannot be renewed during the same session, but in a conversation which I had with Mr. Speaker last session, I am not sure whether it was in the house or privately, he told me the motion could be moved again on the appropriate day.

There is no necessity for moving the motion a second time or for moving a similar motion on another question such as the Picton post office, for example, which is a very similar case. I think the motion had better be proceeded with on Tuesday. I do not agree with the interpretation given the rule by the Prime Minister, but at the same time, if all parties are willing, there is no use discussing it further at present. Let the matter proceed on Tuesday, and in the meantime let us go into the railway bills.

Mr. VENIOT: No matter what the interpretation of the rule may be I am anxious to have the Simcoe matter fully debated. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Before the motion is put I would like to ask the minister to look up the file he was kind enough to produce to-day in connection with the St. David's post office. Several letters are missing from that file; certain letters are referred to in communications which are on the file, and those letters so referred to are not included. They cannot be private in any sense, because they are from officials of the department.

Mr. VENIOT: Certainly they will be produced.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I want to have them in order to see what part the department took in this business.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Before the motion is put I want to take exception to the statement of the Prime Minister that if we continue this evening we will be wasting time. The Postmaster General made a statement to-day with regard to the appointment of a stenographer—

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think the motion is debatable, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is not debatable.

Mr. McQUARRIE: —at the New Westminster post office. I want an opportunity to reply to that statement.

Progress reported.

[Mr Guthrie.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS BRANCH LINES

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): The last time we were in committee on these bills it was agreed that we might go into committee on all the bills, which are identical except for the schedules.

Mr. STEVENS: Are these all going to the committee?

Mr. DUNNING: They are all back from the committee.

MURRAY HARBOUR—GEORGETOWN

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 43, respecting the construction of a Canadian National line from a point on the Murray Harbour branch to a point on the Georgetown subdivision of the Canadian government railways in the province of Prince Edward Island. —Hon. Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. DUNNING: This bill was discussed the other night and I do not think I have anything to add to what I then said.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I do not want to appear unduly critical in this matter, but in all sincerity I want to offer some suggestions which I believe are better than those presented by the minister. I am inclined to agree with the remark he made the other evening that it would have been better to discuss this question in the railway committee, but the minister will remember that this was the first bill to come up when the committee first met and while I was there I had not had an opportunity to consider it at the time.

The minister made another remark on Friday evening with which I wish to disagree; he stated that he did not care to take the opinions either of myself or of the hon. members for Queens.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is hardly fair; I said I would not care to take those opinions with respect to technical matters of railway construction and so on.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): The minister remarked that he would prefer to take the technical advice of his own officials.

Mr. DUNNING: No, the advice of the railway officials.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): That is quite right, and I agree with that statement to a certain point, but familiarity with these con-

ditions should lead to the application of common sense, and I think those who live along the proposed extension are well able to give good advice to the minister or the head of the railways and of course the technical officers of the railway should be responsible for carrying out the work.

The Murray Harbour railway is about forty-eight miles in length; there is a point about twenty-three miles out on the road, or practically in the centre, from which a six-mile section could be built. I refer to the proposal to make a connection from a point at or near Uigg station to Montague. To my mind, this would give the best connection possible and would mean the building of about four miles less railway. As far as the freight haul is concerned there would be a considerable saving in operation because Georgetown is equipped with terminal facilities which were put in by the government a couple of years ago and which are specially equipped to handle the principal commodity from that point—potatoes. From Murray Harbour, the distance via Uigg and Montague is about forty-two miles, while the distance via Peake Station would be about fifty-five miles, and when you consider the route proposed in this bill you will find the mileage of the connection is increased to sixty-five miles. There would be a little advantage gained on the Charlottetown end of the line via the proposed route which would apply to shipments via the car ferry, but there would be a shorter operating mileage on the Georgetown end. The proposed route would mean a mileage of twelve miles on the old line and ten miles on the new in order to connect with the main line, or twenty-two miles in all, while the Hermitage and Peake Station route would mean fifteen miles by the old line and only six by the new, or only twenty-one miles in all on shipments from the Charlottetown end.

There is another matter about which I presume the minister knows something, namely, the agitation which has been carried on for the past twenty years by certain residents of the island in the vicinity of Fort Augustus and Johnston's River, who are asking for a railway connection which I think would be better than the proposed line. There would be this added advantage which should appeal to the Canadian National officials; it would go through the territory of Johnston's River and Fort Augustus and the railway would pick up from 250 to 300 additional carloads of freight in the course of a year. The people are situated too far from the railway and they are using the river for transportation purposes. A little steamer calls once a week, but that service is very inconvenient, and they are forced to use motor boats, schooners, and every form of water transportation. Building an addition five miles to connect Mount Herbert or Mount Albion Station with Pisquid would give a better connection with the main line and pick up this additional business.

Then there is another very important question to be considered, which would eliminate all other proposals, namely, the immediate rebuilding of the bridge. There is no doubt that the bridge will have to be rebuilt sometime, and the government is proposing to spend $370,000 on this branch line and will probably spend $400,000 by the time they complete the "Y" at Southport. The cost of the bridge is estimated at $760,000, and I think it would be good policy on the part of the government to consider immediately this bridge proposition and make a complete job of the whole matter.

That is all I have to say with regard to the matter. I am making this appeal in all sincerity and I feel that any one of the suggestions I have offered would be better than the one which is being adopted by the railway.

Mr. DUNNING: Did the hon. member make to the railway authorities the suggestions he is now making? As he knows, they have been investigating this matter for some time past and I am surprised that the hon. member, with the knowledge of the locality he has displayed, did not in the railway committee ask these questions regarding the economics of that particular proposal, when the men responsible for making the decision were present. I may say that no one else has anything to do with it; the railway officials undoubtedly heard the views of the people in the locality, and I know enough of the people of Prince Edward Island to appreciate the keen interest they take in all matters affecting their welfare, particularly with regard to the island railways. Personally, I am in no position to tell the hon. member that a line a mile this way or a mile that way would or would not be the best line. Under the system we have of operating the Canadian National Railway system, all matters of that kind are determined by those responsible for managing the property. They come to me to try to convince me that economically the proposal is a sound one, but the people in the district make their representations to the railway officials who are immediately concerned with planning the road. I do not pretend to be able to debate with the hon. member the question whether one or

another line would be right or wrong, but I submit that the hon. member had his opportunity when the railway officials were before the committee. He was present at the meetings of the committee and it seems strange that he did not take that opportunity of cross-examining those who were immediately and in the first instance responsible.

Does the hon. member suggest that this bill should stand until we have the opportunity of obtaining the views of the railway officials upon the suggestions he makes? I am not disposed to press the matter against his serious objection, but the railway officials have advised me that the proposals they are making for the solution of this problem met with the general approval of the people affected. It is quite true that people desire a railroad to be as close as possible to their own particular piece of property, that those who are a little distance away would like to have the road a little closer. As they have said in the west. "I do not want it on my farm, but I would like it to be on the farm next to me." These problems always arise in connection with the location of railway lines. I always take the attitude that the railway officials who are responsible for looking into the economics of these matters have listened to all local representations.

If the hon. member cares to suggest that this bill be held up, I am not disposed to press it unduly.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I would not like to take the responsibility of holding up the bill. As I explained before, the very first intimation we had in regard to this matter was when the bill was placed in our hands in the railway committee room. The minister knows it was the first bill presented the first morning the committee met.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member is wrong, because each of these bills was preceded by a financial resolution and was on the order paper for some days before it was moved.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): That may be so, but I was not here the first ten days of the session, and I may have missed it on that account. That was the first knowledge I had of any kind with regard to it. I think the minister will admit it would be practically impossible for me to discuss it intelligently at first glance. I am sorry I was not in a better position to take it up at the time. I do not feel like going so far as to ask the minister to hold up the bill unless he thinks my representations give him sufficient reason for doing so.

[Mr. Dunning.]

While we are on the question, there is only one other matter I should like to ask the minister about. It has been suggested that, regardless of the additional haul, there will be no increase in freight rates. Is that official?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. JENKINS: In regard to this bill I may say that a number of sections of the country in this particular locality are desirous of having the route changed. My colleague (Mr. Sinclair) and I have had representations from different parts of the country along the line of those suggested by the hon. member for Kings; that is to say, not only from the district which has evidently been selected by the authorities, namely, Lake Verde to Pisquid, but also from Kinross to Montague, from Hermitage to Peake's; and from Mount Albion, Hazelbrook and Mount Herbert to one point on the eastern line. We have made all these representations to the department and I presume they were thoroughly gone into by the officials. We presented all these different matters as they came in. All the representations made to us were fully discussed with the department, and this is the result as brought in by the railway authorities. As the minister has clearly pointed out, we do not select the portions of the country through which the railways are to run. That is done by Sir Henry Thornton and his board of directors, on the advice, I presume, of their engineers. I am sorry we cannot oblige all the people who are asking for these different routes, but the case is out of our hands, and entirely in the hands of the railway authorities. I just want to make it clear that representations have already been made to the proper authorities in every one of these particular cases.

The CHAIRMAN: All sections of this bill were carried the last time it was before the committee.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUNNYBRAE—GUYSBOROUGH

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 44, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from Sunnybrae to Guysborough in the province of Nova Scotia.—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

DUNDAS—DUNNVILLE—CAINSVILLE

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 45, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from a point on the Dundas subdivision near Brantford to a point on the Dunnville subdivision near Cainsville in the province of Ontario.—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. RYERSON: When this bill first came before the house there was very little information available in reference to the plans of the Canadian National Railways, who are asking for this line. This is for a cut-iff around the northern part of the city of Brantford, just a little outside the city limits. The municipalities interested, namely, the county of Brant, the city of Brantford and the township of Brantford, had no information whatever in reference to this road. When the matter was brought to the attention of the railway company, they arranged that their engineers should go to Brantford and take the matter up with the municipalities. This was done and at that conference satisfactory arrangements were made or the plans were disclosed in such a manner as to satisfy those resident in the county. They were deeply concerned at first because the original plans showed the crossing of a number of highways in and out of the city of Brantford, and they were interested in knowing whether they were grade or separated-grade crossings. Assurances were given to the county residents in reference to this. The city of Brantford was concerned with an old agreement made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company whereby all passenger trains on this division would go through and stop at Brantford. The matter was brought to the attention of the railway officials, and a conference was arranged in the city of Ottawa between representatives of the city of Brantford, the city council headed by Mayor Beckett, and officials of the Canadian National Railways. At that meeting satisfactory assurances were given that the intention of the railway company was to facilitate the handling of through freight, and that no passenger service would be interfered with. In view of these conferences there is now no opposition to the bill from my constituency, that of Brantford city.

Mr. DUNNING: There is none from anybody.

Mr. RYERSON: I am therefore supporting the bill.

Mr. DUNNING: This is one of the unanimous proposals.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

GARSON—FALCONBRIDGE MINE

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 46, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from a point on the Garson branch to the Falconbridge mine in the province of Ontario—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUDBURY—FAIRBANK

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 47, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from a point on the Sudbury branch to a point in the township of Fairbank in the province of Ontario—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MELFORT—ABERDEEN

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 48, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from a point near Melfort to a point near Aberdeen in the province of Saskatchewan—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CENTRAL BUTTE—MAWER

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 49, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from a point near Central Butte or Mawer to a point in township 18 or 19, range 10 or 11, west of the third meridian in the province of Saskatchewan—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The title of this bill was changed in the railway committee to read "An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from a point near Central Butte or Mawer to a point in township 18 or 19, range 10, 11 or 12, west of the third meridian in the province of Saskatchewan".

Mr. BOTHWELL: The schedule is also amended, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN: It is amended to correspond with the title, by inserting "eleven or twelve" after "'ten" in the second line thereof.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

NEIDPATH—SWIFT CURRENT

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 50, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from Neidpath to a point on the Canadian Pacific railway near Swift Current, in the province of Saskatchewan—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RIDGEDALE—THE PAS

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 51, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from Ridgedale, in the province of Saskatchewan, thirty miles toward The Pas, in the province of Manitoba—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

UNITY BRANCH LINE

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 52, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from a point near Unity to a point near the provincial boundary in township 36 or 37, in the province of Saskatchewan—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

HAMLIN—GLENBUSH

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 53, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from a point near Hamlin to a point near Glenbush, Medstead or Robin Hood, in the province of Saskatchewan —Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BULWARK BRANCH LINE

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 56, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from a point at or near Bulwark to a point in township 38 or 39, range 8, west of the fourth meridian, in the province of Alberta—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

HEMARUKA—SCAPA

The house resumed from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 57, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from Hemaruka to Scapa, in the province of Alberta.—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SWIFT CREEK—TETE JAUNE

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 58, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from a point near Swift Creek to a point near Tete Jaune, in the province of British Columbia.—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

NEW WESTMINSTER—LULU ISLAND

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 59, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from New Westminster to a point on Lulu Island; in the province of British Columbia, with branches therefrom.—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ST. WALBURG—BONNYVILLE

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 54, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from St. Walburg, in the province of Saskatchewan, to Bonnyville, in the province of Alberta.—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: A new section 10 has been added, reading as follows:

10. The provisions of section 14 of chapter 11 of the statutes of 1928, relating to the making, with the approval of the governor in council, of agreements between the companies therein mentioned (comprised in the Canadian

National railways and others) for amalgamation, purchase, sale or leasing of the undertakings of the companies so mentioned, or parts thereof, shall also apply—

(a) to the making of half-interest agreements, or agreements giving joint and equal rights to other companies;

(b) to the making of running rights agreements of any description, whether for a fixed period or in perpetuity;

(c) to the making of any such agreements (except for amalgamation) between any of the companies mentioned and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Section agreed to.

On the schedule.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the note to this schedule? Are we legislating in respect to the schedule, or is this note merely for guidance? It is something entirely new. Is this a proper way to pass an act of parliament, with a note on the bottom of it saying that an agreement has been entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? Should not that be struck out?

Mr. DUNNING: The note is there only to express the conditions under which there would be a reduction in the amount of money to be voted and mentioned in the schedule.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That should not be a part of an act of parliament.

Mr. DUNNING: The note was intended as a qualification to the schedule, restricting the amount which would be received by the company under the authority of this act provided the agreement referred to in the note to the schedule was carried into effect.

Mr. BENNETT: That should be covered in a section of the act.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, I think so.

Mr. BENNETT: Better let that stand.

Mr. DUNNING: I am in the hands of my draftsman, of course, but I am inclined to agree that it had better be redrafted. The law officers have advised me that those words are a part of the schedule, that they qualify the rest of the schedule. Perhaps my hon. friend would give a little attention to that.

Mr. BENNETT: It is doubtful whether a note made by a draftsman to the schedule of a bill could be considered operative as part of the statute law. I think it would be much better to cover it in a section that would express, in terms somewhat similar to those of this note, the meaning which the minister has in mind, or say, as my hon. friend from South Wellington suggests, subject to an agreement that may be entered into.

78594—112½

Mr. DUNNING: If it is part of the schedule it is bona fide a part of the act, because the schedule is by the terms of the bill itself made a part of the act. However, I will let bills containing that particular feature in the schedule stand because I am anxious to have the matter absolutely right from a legal point of view.

Mr. BENNETT: The schedule could not be considered to comprise what is actually only an explanatory note thereto. The word "schedule" is not properly used with respect to that. If you said, "subject to an agreement," it would be different, but this is simply an explanatory note made by a draftsman. I would say that a new section should be drafted to carry out the purpose which the minister has in mind.

Mr. DUNNING: The intent of the qualification is not to make the schedule subject to the agreement, but to provide that if the agreement is carried out, the amount of money to be voted will be that much less.

Mr. BENNETT: It is subject to a condition that if the agreement is entered into, the vote will be that much less.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. I will let this bill stand and every other bill containing this particular feature in the schedule. I think there is only one other bill with that feature, and that is Bill No. 55, respecting the Youngstown or Dobson branch line.

Schedule stands.

Progress reported.

ALLIANCE—YOUNGSTOWN—DOBSON

The house resumed, from April 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 55, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from Alliance to a point near Youngstown or Dobson in the province of Alberta—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. DUNNING: I would ask that this bill be allowed to stand for the reason which I have just mentioned.

Progress reported.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. C. A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 60, to amend the Railway Act.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. BENNETT: Has this bill been to the railway committee?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, where it was the subject of thorough discussion during two sittings of the committee.

On section 1—Jurisdiction of board over tolls on international bridges, etc.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the minister think this parliament has power to deal with the tolls of international bridges except by convention?

Mr. DUNNING: Of course, up to date every international bridge has been brought about by the incorporation of two companies, one American the other Canadian. The intention is to control the tolls, in so far as the jurisdiction of Canada extends, which in these cases is to the middle of the river. I presume that American legislation or some convention would have to be arranged with respect to the matter. It has not been difficult in actual operation, but my hon. friend will remember the discussion of a year ago as to the desirability of having one authority instead of the various authorities which now exist, and we thought it well to make that authority the Board of Railway Commissioners rather than the governor in council, as is the case in some of the acts dealing with international bridges. In this way we make the ordinary toll authority look after these tolls.

Mr. BENNETT: I think we suggested that last session, and the minister was agreeable at the time and promised to look into it.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: A case went to the privy council with respect to the tolls charged by the old Grand Trunk express company, and one of the matters that gave me some thought after we dealt with the subject last year was the extent to which we could legislate. All we could do, I suppose, would be to see that no person should pass off the bridge without paying a toll, regardless of whether he paid when he got on. Presumably the American authorities would deal with the other side of it.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Issue, sale or other dispositions of capital stock.

Mr. DUNNING: Struck out.

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. BENNETT: Is it intended that this measure should apply retroactively, so to speak? Because there are outstanding securities in connection with some of the tunnels based upon the tolls which are to be paid under agreement. Perhaps the minister will realize that the St. Clair tunnel was a separate company promoted by the old Grand Trunk, in which interest on the securities was provided for by a charge against the tolls payable by the Grand Trunk under contract with the tunnel company. Would it be intended that this legislation should in any sense affect that agreement? It might be important to consider it from that standpoint. I am speaking from memory, not having looked into the matter for several years.

Mr. DUNNING: Of course, while the first section does give the board its general powers notwithstanding anything contained in any special act heretofore passed, with respect to any agreements which may exist by prior legislation the board would have authority naturally under its general powers to take into account any considerations of that kind in determining what were fair tolls. I admit the particular application in that special case.

Mr. BENNETT: I just happened to think of it.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. I am not sure of the status of it at the moment, but it was considered when the officers were going into the matter, and we are assured that while the board has power, it is not necessary for it completely to ignore a situation such as the one outlined by my hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT: I was thinking also of the Michigan Central tunnel.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Sections 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

On section 6—Leases and contracts.

Mr. BENNETT: Was that amended in committee?

Mr. DUNNING: No, that passed the committee.

Sections 7 and 8 agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT: The sections have been renumbered?

Mr. DUNNING: They will be.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

GRAND MERE—EAST BURRILLS
PILKINGTON—NIAGARA JUNCTION
ROSEDALE SOUTHEASTERLY

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in measures to provide:—

1. That the time for completion of the Canadian National railway line between Grand Mere and East Burrills, in the province of Quebec (1927, c. 13), be extended from 31st August, 1930, to 31st August, 1931, with the same location and mileage, an increased estimate of average expenditure per mile from $213,038 to $294,430, and an increase in the estimated cost of from $1,683,000 to $2,326,000.

2. That the time for the construction or completion of the Canadian National railway line between Pilkington and Niagara Junction, in the province of Ontario (1927, c. 14), be extended from the 31st August, 1930, to the 31st August, 1932, with a change of location to a point near Montrose Junction, at a decreased mileage of from 16·7 to 7·0, an increased average expenditure per mile of from $69,700 to $107,143, and at a decreased estimated cost of from $1,164,000 to $750,000.

3. That the estimated mileage for the construction of a Canadian National railway line, being a joint section from Rosedale southeasterly in the province of Alberta (1924, c. 30), be decreased from 39 to 26·19; the average expenditure per mile (one-half) be increased from $23,642 to $34,936; the estimated cost (one-half of total by company) to remain at $915,000, and the location changed to run from Rosedale to a point in section 4, township 26, range 16.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. DUNNING: This resolution has for its object making necessary adjustments in connection with the last three year program of branch line construction for the Canadian National Railways. When the resolution is adopted three separate bills will be required to give effect to the terms of it. The first line affected is the line from Grand Mere and East Burrills which was provided for in the legislation of two years ago. It will be remembered that on one occasion there was some discussion as to the very heavy expense per mile involved in this proposal.

Mr. BENNETT: There was.

Mr. DUNNING: And in the committee considerable inquiry was made of the officers responsible as to the reason for such heavy expense. In actual practice the work has cost even more than that provided for in the original act. I am advised that as the work was opened up, in the majority of the larger cuttings a soft material was encountered at varying depths, from eight to eighteen feet, to ths bottom of the cuts, which in places were up to sixty feet in depth; and as the work progressed slides and slippings began to occur and continued to grow worse, in both the sloughing in of the cutting and slipping or sliding out of the embankments as the heavier parts of both the cuts and the embankments were reached. This condition has necessitated already the handling of much more material than originally figured upon, and before the work is complete it now appears that the quantities also required to be moved may be double the original figure in the estimate. The right of way had been estimated to cost $110,000 whereas $218,000 has been paid, and there remains considerable right of way yet to be settled for.

Mr. BENNETT: It is only about six miles.

Mr. DUNNING: A very short cut-off.

Mr. BENNETT: That is a terrific cost for right of way.

Mr. DUNNING: I may tell my hon. friend that I intend to ask that this bill be referred to the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines in order that all technical and detail questions may be answered by the officers themselves, which is of course a much more convenient place to go into details in a matter of this sort than in committee of the whole house. The extra amount involved in this case is $643,000 over the amount provided for in the existing legislation.

Mr. GEARY: Seven miles.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. The second item in the resolution relates to the Pilkington-Niagara Junction proposal of two years ago. Before this act was asked for, one of the proposals, to answer the same purpose, was to build a line from Pilkington to Montrose Junction, there join the Michigan Central railroad and obtain running rights over their line to Niagara Junction near Bridgeburg. This is the same as the present proposal by the requested amendment. At that time negotiations with the Michigan Central made it appear there was no hope of their assenting to such an arrangement.

The Pilkington-Niagara Junction line would make two crossings of the Michigan Central, the original proposals for which were protected diamonds; this, however, was objected to by the Michigan Central. An estimate was then made for grade separations of these tracks, which indicated an increased cost over the total amount voted of about one million

dollars. This led to further studies and interviews. The present position is that arrangements have been made with the Michigan Central that will give the Canadian National Railways joint and equal running rights over their line Montrose Junction to Niagara Junction, the terms for which are to be worked out. In order to make use of these running rights, the Canadian National would build from near Pilkington to Montrose Junction, and to effect this the present amendment of the act is being asked for, which changes the terminating point to Montrose Junction, decreases the length of the line to build about ten miles, reduces the amount voted by $414,000, and extends the time to complete by two years. This new proposal gives a route a fraction of a mile shorter and accomplishes all the purposes of the other. It requires less capital outlay, would give an opportunity to put the outskirts of Niagara Falls on this route for passenger business, and would share in the handling of the products of industries established, and that would be established, on the line Montrose to Bridgeburg. In this case there is a reduction of $414,000 in the amount asked for.

Mr. STEVENS: And an increase in the mileage cost.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. That is another point which should be gone into in detail before the railway committee when the law officers are there. It is a slightly different road and slightly heavier work.

Mr. GEARY: An increase in mileage.

Mr. DUNNING: It is a fraction of a mile shorter. The third proposal has reference to Rosedale southeasterly, a line in the province of Alberta. It will be remembered that the authority given in this case was for a joint undertaking of the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railways in order to obviate duplication of track down the Red Deer valley from Rosedale.

Mr. BENNETT: It is practically completed now.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. The original intention for the joint section was for 39 miles, Rosedale to Bullpound creek. At that time the Canadian Pacific Railway intended to build easterly from near Bullpound Creek as also was the intention of the Canadian National Railways, the former taking a more southerly route than the Canadian National going easterly. Since the act was passed, the Canadian Pacific Railway decided to build southerly and join their Empress-Bassano line at Rosemary. This necessitated their staying in the bottom of the Red Deer river valley for the last twelve miles of the original proposed joint section in order to be able to cross the river to the south, and not start to climb out of it on an easy gradient which was the first proposal and what will be the proposal of the Canadian National Railways line. This change now means that only 26.19 miles instead of 39 miles will constitute the joint section. The Canadian Pacific undertook the construction of this line, the Canadian National undertaking to pay half the cost.

The amount provided in the act was half of the Canadian National's estimate of the cost of the 39 miles. Under the conditions of the act the shortening of the line reduces the amount to be expended, and that now proves less than sufficient to pay half the cost expended, by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BENNETT: Less than half the amount expended by the Canadian Pacific Railway, you mean.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, that is right. The amendment asks to shorten the mileage to 26.19 miles, to provide the same amount of money but to increase the estimated expenditure per mile from $23,462 to $34,936. As I said at the outset, after these bills are introduced and read the first and second times I intend to ask that they be referred to the railway committee where all questions of detail regarding them may be dealt with.

In regard to the general program authorized two years ago, I might say that while these three lines show an aggregate deficiency of $229,000 as compared with the original estimate, it is only fair to the management to point out that the twenty lines authorized under the 1924-27 program were completed for $2,340,000 less than the maximum amount authorized and within $44,000 of the minimum allowed under the various acts. Including the two lines in question it is anticipated that the 1927-30 program, covering fifteen lines, will be completed well within the amount allowed. In other words, of the thirty-five lines undertaken in the two programs to which I am referring only two have proved to overrun the estimated expenditure, and taking the thirty-five lines together it is estimated that they will be construced at a cost considerably less than the aggregate amount originally authorized. These two lines which involve increases, therefore, are the only two out of the thirty-five lines in connection with which it is necessary for me to come back to parliament and ask

for more than the original amount voted, with the qualification that taking all the thirty-five lines together they will be built for less than the aggregate amount voted by parliament.

Mr. BENNETT: While it is true that these resolutions, when reported, will result in the introduction of bills which may be considered by the standing committee on railways and canals, it does appear to me with respect to the Grand Mere line, about which we had considerable discussion two years ago, that it leaves open the question as to whether or not any such line in this country can secure traffic which will result in paying at least $115,000 per annum for interest on the money involved in the construction. It amounts to about $2,400,000 in round figures, and the net earnings of railways in Canada in the most successful sections heretofore have not been sufficient to assure a return upon that amount of money at 5 per cent. If my memory serves me aright the mileage is between seven and nine.

Mr. DUNNING: I am informed that it is 7.97 miles.

Mr. BENNETT: I wanted to be sure, because there is nothing here to indicate the exact mileage and my memory was about eight miles. My hon. friend will see that this means practically $300,000 per mile. There is not a mile of track in Canada which cost $300,000 to build which ever has been able to produce traffic sufficient to pay interest on that amount.

Mr. DUNNING: There is no question of the production of traffic involved.

Mr. BENNETT: Then why is the line being built?

Mr. DUNNING: It is entirely a matter of the controlling grade.

Mr. BENNETT: But there must be some traffic in sight which will warrant this expenditure for a reduction of grade to that extent. The minister will recall that when the grade viaduct was built at Lethbridge it was a long time before the railway company which owned that property concluded that they could produce enough traffic to warrant the substitution of the viaduct for the long haul with heavy grades which was to be abandoned. In connection with this Grand Mere undertaking I have been always worried about spending $300,000 a mile; that is a tremedous sum of money and it means that someone must earn $15,000 a mile, somewhere, in order to pay the fixed charges on that construction regardless of upkeep, wear and tear and everything else connected with the administration of railways. It is a very heavy charge upon a railway, and as yet I have not been satisfied that the resultant advantages are quite apparent.

Then there is another question I desire to ask the minister: Was this work done by contract or was it done by the company?

Mr. DUNNING: I am advised partly one and partly the other.

Mr. BENNETT: Then my hon. friend will perhaps recall the discussion we had with respect to right of way. If my memory serves me aright, this road is being cut out of the side of a hill, is it not?

Mr. DUNNING: In part it is being cut through a hill.

Mr. BENNETT: And the result has been that the lateral pressure has been so great that slides have occurred.

Mr. DUNNING: It has pushed in at the bottom.

Mr. BENNETT: The cost of the right of way seems to be enormous; it is hard to believe that a right of way in any part of Canada except in a town or city should cost nearly $300,000.

Mr. DUNNING: Not that much.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister gave the figure of $290,000, as I caught it.

Mr. DUNNING: We have paid $218,000 already, and some remains to be paid.

Mr. BENNETT: I believe it involves about $294,000, and the line is less than eight miles in length. That means the payment of $35,000 a mile for the right of way, and assuming it is of standard width the minister will realize what that means.

Mr. DUNNING: Of course it could not possibly be standard width. For the sixty foot cut there would have to be a sufficient right of way—

Mr. BENNETT: If there is a sixty foot cut of course it would not be the standard width, but think what land could be acquired for $35,000 a mile in almost any part of Canada with the exception of cities and towns. These are questions which merely suggested themselves to me during the observations of the minister, because I know nothing of the matter beyond the explanation given a couple of years ago, and my memory is not very clear about that. However, it does occur to me that this matter raises questions of sufficient importance to warrant its being carefully looked into, because it means just that much

less money available for construction in sections of Canada where profitable traffic may be expected. I think the minister will agree that $2,500,000 goes a very considerable distance in some parts of Canada in providing railways, and it is not difficult to provide traffic which will produce at least some return upon that amount of money. I find it very difficult to see just how that is to be done in this instance.

Mr. DUNNING: From the point of view of the management this never was a traffic-producing proposal; it was advanced entirely for the purpose of reducing operating costs in connection with the present volume of traffic between Garneau Junction and Montreal, and was designed to overcome the controlling grade on that section. As my hon. friend will appreciate, I did look with some concern on the proposal when it was first put before me two years ago; it semed a large amount of money for such a small mileage of railway, but I do not remember a proposal coming to me from the management of the Canadian National Railways at any time on which the operating department, from the point of view of operating economics, were more insistent than with regard to this proposal. I am sure they will be pleased to come before the railway committee and give the reasons for the faith which is in them with respect to this particular matter. I am glad my hon. friend mentioned the viaduct, because in every case where operating economics are given as the reason for an expensive proposal of this kind I ask the management to supply me with a complete analysis of the situation; I endeavour to have them show me, so far as my understanding will permit me to go in the matter, the reasons for the faith which is in them that as a result of spending this amount, money will be saved in spite of the large capital expenditure involved. When the original proposals passed the government and were subsequently passed by the house, I have no hesitation in saying that at that time I was convinced that the cost would be justified by the operating economics produced in such a congested traffic district and over such a high operating grade.

My hon. friend referred to the cost of the right of way, and I think that should be inquired into when the matter comes before the railway committee. A very large area of land will have to be acquired in order to accommodate sixty-foot cuts in the class of material to which I referred a few moments ago as existing at this point. The slope will have to extend a long distance back and it will involve the acquisition of a considerable amount of property. It will be quite within the competence of the committee to inquire, and in fact I will see to it that the officers of the railway come to that committee prepared to give full information, as to the point of view advanced by my hon. friend. In fairness to him I must say that it is a constructive point of view, and I believe we should look at these Canadian National proposals from that angle. I agree with him that this is hardly the place to get to the bottom of it, but it is the proper place to initiate inquiries of that character. I apprehend that his inquiry is in no sense intended as a reflection upon those who are responsible, but is rather an inquiry as to a matter which involves the voting by this parliament of a large sum of money.

Mr. GOTT: What is the main and alluring feature in this matter?

Mr. DUNNING: The main and alluring feature is the fact that we are hauling our trains from Garneau Junction to Montreal over a very high hill; our heaviest motive power can only haul less than half what the same motive power can haul upon a reasonable grade and by making this improvement we can double the amount of freight which can be hauled by one engine over the section. I cannot give my hon. friend the actual figures as to the saving, but that is a rough idea of the improvement which will be brought about. Of course, I might have answered that we are now into this thing so far that we shall have to finish it, but I do not urge that because it is a proper matter to be considered before the committee. I like the officers of the Canadian National Railways who are responsible for the spending of money—I am not speaking so much of the president as of the officers responsible for the operation and construction of the road—to feel that when they are spending money they are spending the money of the people of Canada and they must be prepared to come before a committee of the house and there state the reasons for the faith that is in them with respect to any such technical proposal. I think that is a sound principle and I am sure the officers and management of the Canadian National Railways welcome that attitude.

Mr. BENNETT: It has nothing to do with politics.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not know in what county this is, but it sounds like a good Liberal county.

Mr. BENNETT: What about the purchase of the right of way?

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is touching a very sore spot so far as hon. members behind me are concerned, because I know that many of their constituents have complained of being robbed with respect to the purchase of the right of way.

Mr. BENNETT: That is all the more reason for suggesting that the observation of the minister is correct. As I apprehend the position of the house in connection with a matter of this kind, it is exactly the same as a board of directors to whom the general manager of a road makes a report that there should be a reduction in grade to enable the road effectively and efficiently to discharge its function as a common carrier. In the first instance the representations are made to the management by the district and general engineers; thence they go to the minister, and the minister has to be satisfied. That is the reason I asked the minister why the past expectations had not been realized, and he has given an explanation as to the increased cost. Then the minister refers it to the House of Commons by way of a resolution in order that we, for the shareholders, may be satisfied that the judgment exercised is such as to warrant so large an expenditure. As the minister has been good enough to say, the criticisms which we have offered are not criticisms of this particular proposal at this particular point, but they are based upon a desire to ascertain whether or not the expenditure is warranted at this time, having regard to the traffic which may originate at one end and be carried to the main line. The minister now says that the officials of the company will be able to satisfy us upon that point.

Mr. DUNNING: It is their responsibility to satisfy us.

Mr. BENNETT: They have satisfied the hon. minister.

Mr. DUNNING: I did not have to be satisfied with respect to this particular $643,000, because I saw no point in worrying very much about it. I have had a long experience with engineers; some of them say I am rather hard on them because I sometimes use the phrase, "What is your estimate? Let us double it and add twenty per cent," and then I start to provide for the expenditure. That is an exaggeration, of course, but it reflects credit on the Canadian National engineering organization when we consider that they have succeeded in building thirty-five lines for less than the amount authorized. That is rather a new thing for engineers to do.

Mr. GEARY: The work is done largely by tender?

Mr. DUNNING: By tender so far as the grading is concerned; by the company's forces with respect to track laying, ballasting, and so on.

Mr. GEARY: By how much do you soften the grade by means of this particular construction?

Mr. DUNNING: It cuts the existing gradient in half. I cannot give my hon. friend the exact proportion but that information will be before the railway committee.

Mr. GEARY: What is the governing grade on the existing line?

Mr. DUNNING: One and one-quarter per cent.

Mr. GEARY: Anything over one per cent is considered a heavy grade, is it not?

Mr. DUNNING: With respect to branch line construction we endeavour to obtain a standard grade of five-tenths of one per cent.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Dunning thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 166, to amend an act respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line between Grand-Mere and East Burrills, in the province of Quebec.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall this bill be read a second time?

Mr. BENNETT: Stand.

Mr. DUNNING: Might I suggest the second reading?

Mr. BENNETT: The only point was that it is not printed. I was not interposing an objection.

Mr. DUNNING: We might read these bills a second time by unanimous consent in order to send them, when printed, to the committee.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the house, Mr. Dunning moves, seconded by Mr. Marcil, that this bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

PILKINGTON-NIAGARA

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 167, to amend an act respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line between Pilkington and Niagara junction in the province of Ontario.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and referred to the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

ROSEDALE SOUTHEASTERLY

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 168, to amend an act for the construction of a Canadian National railway line, being a joint section from Rosedale southeasterly in the province of Alberta.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and referred to the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Monday, April 22, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

RESTORATION OF DIVORCE BILL

Mr. W. F. GARLAND (Carleton) moved:

That Bill No. 91 (letter K of the senate) for the relief of Frances Gwendolyn Snow Lott be restored to the order paper for second reading at the next sitting of the house.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

*CIVIL SERVICE—SALARY INCREASE OF LOWER GRADES

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. Is it the intention of the government to increase the salaries of the lower grades of the civil service who did not receive the $120 flat increase in 1926?
2. If so, will provision for such increase be made during the present session?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I might mention to my hon. friend (Mr. Garland) that it is customary for the government to make known in the estimates, its intention with respect to civil service salaries and that with reference to the question he has asked this is the course which will be followed.

VANCOUVER HARBOUR—NEW PIER

Mr. STEVENS:

1. What is the cost of dredging for the new pier in Vancouver harbour west of the Ballantyne pier, and what amount of material is to be moved?
2. What amount of material will be required to make the gravel fill for the said pier, and what is the cost: (a) total, and (b) per yard?
3. What company has the contract for said work, and when was the contract let?
4. Were tenders called for the said contract? If so, when were the said tenders received, what notice was given and how many firms tendered?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. The cost of dredging is included in the price per yard for placing gravel fill. 85,000 yards. See answer to No. 4.
2. 700,000 cu. yds,, of material will be required to make the gravel fill for the pier; (a) Total cost $168,000; (b) Cost per cu. yd., 24 cents in place.
3. The contract was let to North Western Dredging Company, Limited, 28th December, 1928.
4. Tenders were not called but the commissioners were offered an opportunity to obtain the necessary 700,000 cu. yds. of gravel fill required at a rate below competitive prices, the price for the fill to include the cost of dredging 85,000 cu. yds. of mud from the pier site before the gravel fill was placed. The commissioners represent that the cost of gravel fill for this new pier is 21 cents less per cu. yd. of fill in place than the cost of similar fill required in the construction of the Ballantyne pier.

CANADIAN NATIONAL STEAMSHIPS—PACIFIC SERVICE

Mr. PLUNKETT:

1. How many of the Canadian National Steamship Company's ships or vessels have been operating in the mercantile or passenger service on the Pacific ocean, out of British Columbia ports, during the years 1928 and 1929?
2. What are the names of such steamships and their tonnage?
3. What was the original cost of each vessel?
4. Have any of these ships been sold during the years 1928 and 1929?
5. If so, what was the name of and value received for each vessel sold?

Mr. DUNNING:

1. Canadian National Steamship Company, 4 each year; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, 8 each year.

2. Canadian National Steamships:

	1928	1929
Prince Rupert, deadweight tonnage	1100	No change
Prince George, deadweight tonnage	1100	No change
Prince John, deadweight tonnage	882	No change
Prince Charles, deadweight tonnage	473	No change

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited:

	1928	1929
Canadian Coaster, deadweight tonnage	3750	3750
Canadian Farmer, deadweight tonnage	3750	3750
Canadian Observer, deadweight tonnage	3750	3750
Canadian Rover, deadweight tonnage	3750	3750
Canadian Importer, deadweight tonnage	8100	8100
Canadian Miller, deadweight tonnage	8100	8100
Canadian Ranger, deadweight tonnage	——	8100
Canadian Winner, deadweight tonnage	8100	——
Canadian Seigneur, deadweight tonnage	8100	8100

3. Prince Rupert, $518,658; Prince George, $539,104; Prince John, $138,574; Prince Charles, $282,667; Canadian Coaster, $719,365; Canadian Farmer, $755,528; Canadian Observer, $758,723; Canadian Rover, $715,995; Canadian Importer, $1,671,502; Canadian Miller, $1,594,782; Canadian Seigneur, $1,593,505; Canadian Ranger, $1,580,995; Canadian Winner, $1,686,443.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT—PART H-8

Mr. FRASER:

What are the details of the payment on Part H-8 Auditor General's report, 1927-8, bond insurance, $157.30; live storage minister's automobile, 12M, $144?

Mr. FORKE:

(a) Bond insurance: The sum of $157.30 was paid the Fidelity Insurance Company of Canada for bonds on the following officers of the department for the amount mentioned in each case, the rate for the insurance being 25 cents per $100 per annum.

Position—Location	Amount
Agent, Halifax	$ 2,000
Accountant, Halifax	1,000
Assistant Agent, Halifax	1,000
Clerk, Halifax	1,000
Agent, St. John	2,000
Accountant, St. John	2,000
Clerk, St. John	1,000
Agent, Quebec	3,000
Clerk, Quebec	2,000
Agent, Montreal	3,000
Clerk, Montreal	2,000
Accountant, Montreal	2,000
Clerk, Montreal	2,000
Agent, Toronto	2,000
Asst. Agent, Toronto	1,000
Div. Commr. of Imm., Winnipeg	2,000
Asst. Div. Commr., Winnipeg	2,000
Act'g Accountant, Winnipeg	2,000
Clerk, Winnipeg	1,000
Clerk, Winnipeg	2,000
Director of European Emigration, London, Eng.	5,000
Asst. Supt., London, Eng.	5,000
Clerk, London, Eng.	5,000
Clerk, London, Eng.	5,000
Cashier, Ottawa	1,000
Clerk, Ottawa	1,000
Messenger, Ottawa	1,000
Div. Commr. of Imm., Vancouver	1,000
Accountant, Vancouver	1,000
Clerk (from Aug. 11, 1927), Vancouver	3,000
Total amount of bonds	$64,000

(b) Storage of minister's automobile, Ottawa Car Manufacturing Co. Limited.

Live storage

Date	Month	Amount
March 16, 1928	April	$ 12
April 17, 1928	May	12
May 21, 1928	June	12
July 26, 1928	July	12
July 26, 1928	Aug.	12
Aug. 21,1928	Sept.	12
Aug. 21,1928	Oct.	12
Oct. 31, 1928	Nov.	12
Dec. 15, 1928	Dec.	12
Jan. 15, 1929	Jan.	12
Feb. 15, 1929	Feb.	12
March 15, 1929	March	12
Total		$144

MUTTON AND LAMB MONTHLY EXPORTS, 1928-29

Mr. KENNEDY:

1. What are the monthly export figures from Canada in each of the months of the years 1928 and 1929 of (a) mutton; (b) lamb?

2. To what countries were the exports made?

3. What was the price per pound in each case of all such exports?

Mr. MALCOLM:
1, 2 and 3:—

Canada's Domestic Exports of Mutton and Lamb, Fresh, Chilled or Frozen with Average Export Price per Pound

(By Months—January 1, 1928, to March 31, 1929)

		Total Exports	Exportations to—									
			United Kingdom	United States	Alaska	Bermuda	British Guiana	Japan	Newfoundland	Philippine Islands	St. Pierre and Miquelon	Trinidad and Tobago
1928												
January	lb.	18,000	.....	600	.....	14,200	.....	1,300	1,900	.....	.....	.....
	$	3,852	.....	151	.....	2,883	.....	504	314	.....	.....	.....
Average export price per lb		21·4¢	.....	25·2¢	.....	20·3¢	.....	38·8¢	16·5¢	.....	.....	.....
February	lb.	33,600	.....	100	.....	25,800	.....	1,300	4,300	.....	.....	2,100
	$	6,714	.....	28	25	5,200	.....	461	649	.....	13	338
Average export price per lb		20·0¢	.....	28·0¢	.....	20·1¢	.....	35·5¢	15·0¢	.....	.....	16·1¢
March	lb.	41,000	9,700	.....	.....	20,200	.....	1,700	8,300	.....	100	1,000
	$	8,274	1,915	.....	.....	4,217	.....	635	1,316	.....	20	171
Average export price per lb		20·2¢	19·7¢	.....	.....	20·9¢	.....	37·3¢	15·8¢	.....	20·0¢	17·1¢
April	lb.	66,200	.....	44,400	.....	18,800	.....	900	2,100	.....	.....	.....
	$	10,499	.....	6,046	.....	3,765	.....	297	391	.....	.....	.....
Average export price per lb		15·8¢	.....	13·6¢	.....	20·0¢	.....	33·0¢	18·6¢	.....	.....	.....
May	lb.	34,000	.....	4,500	.....	24,500	800	1,300	2,900	.....	.....	.....
	$	6,899	.....	981	.....	4,755	140	432	591	.....	.....	.....
Average export price per lb		20·3¢	.....	21·8¢	.....	19·4¢	17·5¢	33·2¢	20·4¢	.....	.....	.....
June	lb.	22,800	.....	4,700	.....	16,500	100	700	800	.....	.....	.....
	$	5,150	.....	1,180	.....	3,594	30	237	109	.....	.....	.....
Average export price per lb		22·6¢	.....	25·1¢	.....	21·8¢	30·0¢	33·8¢	13·6¢	.....	.....	.....
July	lb.	21,500	.....	2,000	.....	12,300	800	1,200	5,000	200	.....	.....
	$	4,979	.....	419	.....	3,164	125	389	826	56	.....	.....
Average export price per lb		23·1¢	.....	20·9¢	.....	25·7¢	15·6¢	32·4¢	16·5¢	28·0¢	.....	.....
August	lb.	40,100	.....	21,200	100	14,800	1,300	1,000	1,700	.....	.....	.....
	$	8,035	.....	3,136	35	3,895	217	306	446	.....	.....	.....
Average export price per lb		20·0¢	.....	14·8¢	35·0¢	26·3¢	16·7¢	30·6¢	26·2¢	.....	.....	.....
September	lb.	171,200	.....	161,700	.....	9,300	.....	200	.....	.....	.....	.....
	$	47,269	.....	44,820	.....	2,377	.....	72	.....	.....	.....	.....
Average export price per lb		27·6¢	.....	27·7¢	.....	25·5¢	.....	36·0¢	.....	.....	.....	.....

October	lb.	125,100	.....	97,000	300	19,500	1,100	1,100	6,100	.....	.....	.....
	$	28,835	.....	23,284	50	4,005	248	341	907	.....	.....	.....
Average export price per lb		23·0¢	.....	24·0¢	16·7¢	20·5¢	22·5¢	31·0¢	14·9¢	.....	.....	.....
November	lb.	408,500	.....	384,000	.....	22,100	.....	1,700	600	.....	100	.....
	$	88,711	.....	84,001	.....	4,135	.....	456	105	.....	14	.....
Average export price per lb		21·7¢	.....	21·9¢	.....	18·7¢	.....	26·8¢	17·5¢	.....	14·0¢	.....
December	lb.	145,800	.....	117,200	100	23,700	1,800	1,300	1,700	.....	.....	.....
	$	30,808	.....	25,322	36	4,458	327	414	251	.....	.....	.....
Average export price per lb		21·1¢	.....	21·6¢	36·0¢	18·8¢	18·2¢	31·8¢	35·8¢	.....	.....	.....
1929												
January	lb.	62,300	.....	32,000	.....	25,700	800	1,300	2,500	.....	.....	.....
	$	15,087	.....	8,958	.....	5,098	183	418	430	.....	.....	.....
Average export price per lb		24·2¢	.....	28·0¢	.....	19·8¢	22·9¢	32·1¢	17·2¢	.....	.....	.....
February	lb.	30,000	.....	4,800	.....	20,300	700	500	3,700	.....	.....	.....
	$	6,774	.....	1,381	.....	4,405	112	188	688	.....	.....	.....
Average export price per lb		22·6¢	.....	28·8¢	.....	21·7¢	16·0¢	37·6¢	18·6¢	.....	.....	.....
March	lb.	36,900	.....	4,600	.....	23,700	900	800	6,900	.....	.....	.....
	$	7,803	.....	1,328	11	4,708	192	297	1,267	.....	.....	.....
Average export price per lb		21·1¢	.....	28·9¢	.....	19·9¢	21·3¢	37·1¢	18·4¢	.....	.....	.....

NOTE.—Impossible to segregate exports of mutton and lamb from Canada.

ST. GEORGE'S CHAPEL WHARF, P.E.I.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings):

1. What amount was expended on repairs to Chapel wharf at St. Georges, Prince Edward Island, during the year 1928?

2. To whom was such amount paid and for what service?

3. What are the names of all parties who supplied material or performed labour in connection with this work, the rate per day for labour, and the rate per unit for material, and what amounts were paid to each respectively?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. $2,916.76.

2 and 3. Wages $1,241.25, as follows:—

W. A. McKinnon, foreman, at $3.50 per day..		$325 50
John F. Morrison, carpenter at $3 per day..		228 00
James Farrell, asst. carpenter at $3 per day..		90 00
James A. E. McPhee, labourer, at $2.50 per day..		27 50
Joseph McPhee, labourer, at $2.50 per day..		68 75
Marcel Campbell, labourer, at $2.50 per day..		23 75
Neil McCormac, labourer, at $3 per day.. ..	$153 00	
Neil McCormac, team, at $4 per day..	8 00	
		$161 00
John D. Johnston, labourer, at $3 per day ..		102 00
William Farrell, labourer, at $2.50 per day ..	$23 75	
William Farrell, team, at $3.50 per day	17 50	
		$41 25
Harold Robertson, team, at $3.50 per day ..	$14 00	
Harold Robertson, labourer, at $2.50 per day..	2 50	
		$16 50
Daniel McDonald, labourer, at $2.50 per day.		5 00
Dolphus Johnston, labourer, at $2.50 per day.	$7 50	
Dolphus Johnston, team, at $3.50 per day ..	7 00	
		$14 50
Joseph Christian, team re pile driver at $4 per day..		8 00
Alex Morrison, labourer, at $2.50 per day ..		17 50
John Farrell, team re pile driver at $4 per day..	$20 00	
John Farrell, labourer, at $2.50 per day	12 50	
		$32 50
Donald McLean, team, at $4 per day..	$12 00	
Donald McLean, team, at $3.50 per day ..	28 00	
		$40 00
Joseph Johnston, team, at $3.50 per day		24 50
Solphus McPhee, labourer, at $2.50 per day..		15 00

Accounts: $1,675.51, as follows:—

Fennell & Chandler:		
3,000 lbs. $\frac{7}{8}$" drift bolts, at $3.89..	$116 70	
4 kegs 7" wire nails, at $3.39..	13 56	
		$130 26
Joseph A. Morrison:		
2,500 ft. B. M. curbing, at $40 per M.. ..		$100 00
McDonald-Rowe Woodworking Co. Ltd:		
14,532 ft. B. M. 12" by 12", at $44 per M..		$639 40
Joseph Christian:		
Truckage, 2 loads, at $2.50..	$5 00	
5 cu. yds. stone, at $1..	5 00	
		$10 00

Questions

James H. McDonald:		
5 pieces spruce lumber, at $3	$15 00	
Truckage, 2 loads, at $2.50	5 00	
5 cu. yds. stone, at $1	5 00	
		$25 00
Alex McDonald:		
5 pieces spruce lumber, at $3	$15 00	
Truckage, 1 load, at $2.50	2 50	
		$17 50
Peter Morrison:		
48 pieces spruce timber, at $3	$144 00	
Truckage, 2 loads, at $2.50	5 00	
		$149 00
Roderick Morrison:		
10 pieces spruce lumber at $3	$30 00	
20 pieces spruce lumber, at $1.50	30 00	
30 pieces spruce lumber at $1.25	37 50	
		$97 50
J. L. McPherson:		
10 pieces spruce timber, at $3		$30 00
Felix McDonald:		
7 pieces spruce timber, at $3		$21 00
W. J. McKinnon:		
5 pieces spruce timber, at $3	$15 00	
12 cu. yds. stone, at $1	12 00	
		$27 00
Joseph Morrison:		
Truckage, 1 load, at $2.50		$2 50
Joseph McPhee:		
Truckage, 1 load, at $2.50		$2 50
Andrew McLean:		
Truckage, 2 loads, at $2.50		$5 00
Peter McPhee:		
Truckage, 1 load, at $2.50		$2 50
Donald McLean:		
Truckage, 1 load, at $2.50	$2 50	
10 pieces of lumber, at $3	30 00	
		$32 50
John Farrell:		
95 cu. yds. stone, at $1	$95 00	
Truckage, 2 loads, at $2.50	5 00	
		$100 00
Allie Campbell:		
Truckage, 2 loads, at $2.50	$5 00	
6 cu. yds. stone, at $1	6 00	
		$11 00
John McDonald:		
Truckage, 1 load, at $2.50		$2 50
Adolphus Johnston:		
Truckage, 2 loads, at $2.50	$5 00	
9 cu. yds. stone, at $1	9 00	
		$14 00
Joseph McCormac:		
10 pieces spruce timber, at $3	$30 00	
Truckage, 5 loads, at $2.50	12 50	
		$42 50
Harold Robertson:		
25 cu. yds. stone, at $1		$25 00

J. Fitzpatrick:		
3,000 ft. plank, at $35 per M	$105 00	
Sawing	2 00	
		$107 00
Bruce Stewart & Co.:		
Tools		$10 60
John F. Morrison:		
6 pieces lumber, at $4		$24 00
Alex Morrison:		
9 pieces lumber, at $1.25	$11 25	
900 ft. B. M. curbing, at $4	36 00	
		$47 25

SCHOONER I'M ALONE

Mr. SENN:

Who are the registered owners of the schooner I'm Alone?

Mr. CARDIN:

Eugene Creaser Shipping Co., Limited, Lunenburg, N.S.

RAW MATERIAL IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES 1928

Mr. PREVOST:

1. What were the principal raw materials imported to Canada from the United States, in 1928?

2. What was the total value of each of the said raw materials imported in 1928?

Mr. MALCOLM:

1 and 2. See attached table.

Canada's Imports of Principal Raw Materials from the United States
(Calendar Year, 1928)

Commodity	Unit of Quantity	Calendar Year, 1928 Quantity	Value
Coal	Ton	16,515,149	$50,209,281
Raw cotton	Pound	145,279,833	28,012,471
Fresh fruits	.....	.....	25,137,599
Crude petroleum	Gallon	585,356,951	23,765,422
Raw rubber	Pound	64,047,190	16,863,179
Raw furs	.....	.....	11,503,805
Grains (chiefly corn)	.....	.....	11,236,309
Raw hides	Pound	44,521,300	11,164,668
Fresh vegetables	.....	.....	5,701,837
Raw tobacco	Pound	16,513,117	5,399,505
Manila and sisal grass	Pound	58,961,900	4,590,240
Raw silk	Pound	836,427	4,304,456
Alumina and cryolite	Pound	220,519,300	4,236,564
Iron ore	Ton	1,563,984	3,419,168
Sulphur	Pound	365,521,600	2,962,808
Animals, living	.....	.....	2,852,531
Raw wool	Pound	4,333,578	1,487,431
Seeds	.....	.....	1,060,819
Asphalt, solid	Pound	95,965,500	821,637
Ores of metal, n.o.p.	Pound	73,902,900	804,986
Fresh fish	.....	.....	695,623
Logs	M ft.	31,883	685,746
Plants, trees and shrubs	.....	.....	496,000
Nuts, not shelled	Pound	3,267,172	491,962
Hemp	Pound	4,705,500	469,013
Fresh meats	.....	.....	456,298
Broom corn	.....	.....	451,774
Raw cocoa	Pound	2,999,300	427,029
Eggs in the shell	Dozen	902,452	403,740
Bristles	Pound	220,112	309,289

Commodity	Unit of Quantity	Calendar Year, 1928 Quantity	Value
Sand and gravel, n.o.p...	Ton	585,885	269,838
Sand, silica	Ton	121,578	268,458
Fire clay	Pound	119,671,900	258,797
Eggs, n.o.p	Pound	548,700	138,735
China clay	Pound	18,991,900	123,755
Antimony or regulus of	Pound	1,331,250	122,713
Hay	Ton	6,905	106,482
Manganese, oxide of	Pound	2,451,700	61,009

FRUIT IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES, 1928

Mr. PREVOST:

What was the total value of fruit, not grown in Canada, imported from the United States in 1928?

Mr. MALCOLM:

Canada's Imports of Fruit, Not Grown in Canada, from the United States
(Calendar Year, 1928)

Commodity	Unit of Quantity	Calendar Year, 1928 Quantity	Value
Fresh			
Bananas	Bunch	3,531,580	$ 5,212,395
Grape fruit or shaddocks	Pound	18,158,745	941,071
Guavas, mangoes, plantains and pomegranates	.....	.....	14,707
Lemons	Box	256,513	1,255,566
Limes	Box	294	1,208
Oranges	Box	2,073,083	10,308,274
Pineapples	.....	.....	466,613
Dried—			
Bananas	Pound	.....	.....
Currants	Pound	18,069	2,301
Dates	Pound	3,843,525	362,291
Figs	Pound	1,647,807	141,940
Raisins	Pound	40,739,174	2,058,606
Other dried fruit	Pound	541,103	71,991
Canned—			
Pineapples	Pound	5,581,042	482,755
Fruit Juices—			
Lime Juice, crude	Gallon	105	31
Lime Juice containing—			
Not more than 25% of proof spirits	Gallon	2,146	17,311
More than 25% of proof spirits	Gallon	232	4,948
Lime Juice, fruit syrups and fruit juices, n.o.p	Gallon	67,169	126,474
Total above commodities	.....	.....	$21,468,482

TRADE WITH UNITED STATES, 1925-1928

Mr. PREVOST:

What was the total tonnage of goods imported from and exported to the United States, during the years 1925, 1926, 1927 and 1928?

Mr. MALCOLM: No data available as to total tonnage of goods imported from or exported to the United States.

INVERNESS COUNTY—POSTMASTERS DISMISSED

Mr. MACDOUGALL:

1. How many postmasters have been dismissed in the county of Inverness since the present Postmaster General assumed office?
2. What are their names?
3. Why were they dismissed?
4. Upon whose recommendation were said dismissals made?

Mr. VENIOT:

1. 33.

2, 3 and 4. See attached statement.

Post Office	Postmaster	Why Dismissed	Recommended by
Alba	John N. Matheson	Change of site and in public interest.	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Askilton	Alex. Gillis	Change of site to give more central location.	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Belle Cote	K. F. Phillips	Interest of service	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Big Brook	W. L. A. Kennedy	Unsatisfactory management	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Big Intervale	R. McKay	Public interest	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Brook Village	Mrs. C. Jamieson	Change in site	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Chimney Corner	George Evans	Inconvenient site and unsatisfactory conduct.	Action based on report of District Superintendent.
Emerald	J. P. Tompkins	Public interest	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Frizzelton	Donald Carmichael	Non-performance of duties by postmaster.	Action based on report of District Superintendent.
Gillis Cove	Robert Gillis	Public interest	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Glencoe	W. S. McDonald	More convenient location and in public interest.	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Glendale	Alex. H. Boyd	Absence of postmaster and in public interest.	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Hay's River	H. R. Beaton	More convenient location	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Kingross	R. Y. McKenzie	Public interest	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Lake Ainslie (West Side)	Angus McInnis	Unsatisfactory management and shortage in credit supplies.	Action based on report of District Superintendent.
Lime Hill	P. R. McIntyre	Change in site in public interest.	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Little Judique Ponds	R. McDonald	More convenient site and advanced age of postmaster.	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Mabou Mines	Arch. D. Beaton	Unsatisfactory service	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Mackdale	Thos. McQuarrie	Public interest	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Marshes (West Bay)	John Ross	More convenient location in public interest.	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Melford	J. A. McDonald	Carelessness and failure to carry out regulations.	Action based on report of district superintendent.
Melrose Hill	Geo. A. Smith	Public interest	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
North East Mabou	Alex. D. Campbell	More central location	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
North East Margaree	Miss I. Ross Smith	Political partisanship and interest of service.	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Orangedale East	Murdoch McRitchie	Public interest	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Queensville	Allan McInnis	More convenient location in public interest.	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
South West Port Hood	Alex. McDonnell	Public interest	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Strathlorne	A. McLean	Neglect of duty and failure to make remittances.	Action based on report of district superintendent.
Valley Mills	Malcolm Blue	Public interest	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
West Bay Road	Dan N. McLeod	Political partisanship	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
West Mabou Harbour	Alex. McEachern	Shortages—failure to remit C.O.D. collections.	Action based on report of district superintendent.
Whycocomagh Portage	A. Matheson	Public interest	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.
Wilburn	Alex. MacDonald	Public interest	Donald MacLennan, K.C., Inverness.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

LICENSED DISTILLERIES

Mr. STEVENS:

For a return showing the name and location of each licensed distillery in Canada, and showing the amount of duty, excise, sales tax and other charges (each separately) paid during the last fiscal year.

BRANTFORD DOG INQUIRY

Mr. RYERSON:

For a copy of all correspondence, evidence taken, police reports, accounts, and all other information, in connection with the dog inquiry at Brantford.

PORT ARTHUR ARMOURY

Mr. COWAN:

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, tenders, contracts, vouchers and payments made by the government or any member thereof, and any person, firm or corporation, in connection with repairs or improvements to the armoury in Port Arthur since January 1, 1928.

PEAT FUELS LIMITED

Mr. CANTLEY (Pictou) moved:

For a copy of all agreements, contracts or releases thereof, entered into between the Minister of Mines or any department or officer of the government and Peat Fuels Limited; also a copy of all correspondence between the right honourable the Prime Minister, the honourable the Minister of Mines or any department of the government and Peat Fuels Limited, or any officer or employee of that corporation.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I have intimated to the hon. gentleman that we are quite willing to bring down the correspondence between the Prime Minister or the Minister of the Interior with Peat Fuels Limited, but it includes a great deal that is not relevant to the question. Subject to that understanding, I will bring down the correspondence.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE—EMPLOYEES WITHOUT CERTIFICATES

On the motion:

For a return showing the names, positions occupied and salaries received of all persons employed in the several departments of the public service without certificates from the Civil Service Commission during each of the past five years.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I wish this motion to be dropped from the order paper. I propose to amend it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Dropped.

78594—113½

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

PAPERS RELATING TO DISMISSALS OF POSTMASTERS

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, may I at this time lay on the table some papers asked for on Friday?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart) asked for correspondence in connection with the ruling of the Department of Justice. I may say that no communication was had between the Department of Justice and my own department. I am now submitting the ruling which was given in 1919 at the request of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, and in 1922 at the instance of the Civil Service Commission. I am laying the paper on the table as I got it from them.

Then the hon. gentleman referred to the number of postmasters dismissed from October 1, 1926 to February 1, 1928, and asked how many of these were appointees of the Civil Service Commission. I lay this information on the table for the hon. member's use. The hon. member for Toronto South (Mr. Geary) has stated in regard to the return on the Picton case that the file is not complete and referred to four affidavits by Edward Sprague, Robert Purtelle, Hiram Ellis and Durward Cole, and intimated that there was correspondence transmitting these affidavits which had been omitted from the return. In this connection I wish to inform the hon. gentleman that there was no correspondence accompanying those affidavits. They were personally handed to my secretary by Mr. Charles Hanna of Belleville.

PRIVATE BILLS

PROCEDURE RESPECTING APPLICATIONS FOR DIVORCE

On motion of Mr. Clark, Bill No. 93, for the relief of Elsie Alice Hervey, was referred to the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

CALVERT MITCHELL CARRUTHERS

Mr. F. G. SANDERSON (South Perth) moved the second reading of Bill No. 96, for the relief of Calvert Mitchell Carruthers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Sanderson moves, seconded by Mr. McMillan, that Bill No. 96 be read the second time. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): May we have an explanation from the mover and seconder of this motion?

Mr. SANDERSON: This bill appears in my name and the case is a very simple one.

The evidence can be read in about five minutes by any hon. member. One of my hon. friends opposite asks me to explain the bill. He has before him the evidence taken before the senate committee and I think he will agree with me that this is a bill which should get its second reading and be referred to the committee on miscellaneous private bills.

Briefly, I may say for the information of my hon. friend, the petitioner is a well known physician and surgeon in a city in the province of Ontario. The respondent did not appear before the senate committee. The petitioner and the respondent were married in the city of Kingston on January 1, 1923 and the respondent was married in Lima, Ohio on October 8, 1928. As I say, the respondent did not appear before the senate committee, but the man whom she married in Lima, Ohio, was present and gave evidence. The case is not complicated; it is very simple. I am not a lawyer, but I see no room for argument over this bill. Let me say that the fact that I sponsor this bill is no indication of my attitude towards the principle of divorce. I do not consider that the principle of divorce is in question at all at the moment. As for that principle I yield to no hon. member in this house my sincere conviction, although I will not now state what it is—but will do so if the opportunity ever warrants it; I voted against the bill from the senate for a divorce court in Ontario because I thought that public sentiment in the province of Ontario did not demand the establishment of such a court. The only method which we have of granting divorces is therefore the procedure which we are following this afternoon. Whether divorce is right or wrong is apart from the question. I deplore the fact that there are so many applications in Ontario, but at the same time we are bound to deal with them and this is the only machinery we have for the purpose. I would therefore ask the house to give the bill its second reading.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I note that the senate committee on divorce, in making their report, say that the requirements of the rules of the senate have been complied with in all material respects. Will the mover of the resolution give the house some idea of the requirements of the rules of the senate?

Mr. SANDERSON: No hon. gentleman knows the requirements better than does my hon. friend, and I do not propose to enter into any argument with him.

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston City): This is the bill in regard to which it was my purpose

[Mr. Sanderson.]

to say something but I understand that the evidence given will not be considered until the bill is in committee. My point is this. I believe that the house should now consider whether the requirements at present demanded for the obtaining of divorce are satisfactory. I have nothing to say on the question of divorce, but this country recognizes divorce as does the country across the line. We pay mutual respect to marriages in the two countries, and when a couple have been legitimately divorced and legitimately and legally married, then I think the question should be raised now as to whether that condition should or should not be called adultery. At present we hurl from each side of the line the epithet, at people legitimately married, that they are living in a state of adultery. This question I intend to bring up in connection with this bill in committee of the whole.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I must thank the promoter of the bill for having given an outline of the case. It is a distinct improvement on the procedure we have had in the past. However, I would say that the question I asked has a direct bearing on the case. As yet it has not been explained to me just what are the requirements of the senate; I do not think we know exactly on what we are voting. I have been in the house some eight sessions. When a member first comes here I imagine he takes these bills as matters of routine, but as the years go on some of us begin to inquire with regard to the principles involved and I confess frankly that I do not know exactly under what rules the senate works in these matters. If I am not mistaken—and I speak subject to correction by the lawyers present—we have no statutory arrangements with regard to divorce, hence we hardly know just where we are.

I have heard it stated in this house that there is only one ground for divorce, but that is not correct; to my knowledge divorce has been granted in this house on other grounds than that of adultery, and as far as the powers of this house are concerned, I see no reason why wider grounds should not be recognized. Personally I am inclined to think that there is a danger in over-emphasizing the mere physical act of adultery in making it the only ground for divorce. The other day I came across an interesting statement in the Life and Letters of the Earl of Birkenhead;

> It must be admitted by all the right-minded people that the duties of chastity and continence shall be insisted upon. But so to limit the causes of divorce is to ignore the fact that the spiritual and moral aspects of marriage are incomparably more important than the physical side.

And again:

It is not to the public welfare that utter unsuitability for the marriage state whether the cause be moral, mental or physical, should not involve the same consequences.

That is the considered opinion of one of the most eminent British jurists, so I do not think we can sweep away all arguments of that kind and maintain that divorce can be granted only on one ground.

Further than that, much of this evidence would not be received in a court of law. Since these discussions began I have read a number of the cases and I find very often that the fact that the parties registered at the same hotel is considered evidence of improper relationship. I can quite readily understand that anyone desirous of securing a divorce could easily arrange a frame-up under such circumstances, and collusion might be very common. We have no information before us with regard to a situation of this character. Registration at a hotel might be accepted as evidence in a court of law, but no evidence is adduced to show whether or not the person dressed as a woman really is a woman; a man could dress as a woman and register with the man seeking a divorce, and that would be sufficient to secure a divorce.

Mr. GEARY: There is a provision for physical examination.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The laws of evidence are there, but the practice in the senate committee does not take account of such considerations. Very often we are dependent upon the evidence of men who are professional detectives, partners at that. Such evidence may not be sufficient, and may not be fair to the respondent.

We have been assured that the people who come here seeking divorce do so as a matter of right, but I do not think that is the case either. All these bills are prefaced by a petition; these people come asking a special favour, and so in rejecting their applications it cannot be said we are doing any injustice. Each case must be judged on its merits. The promoter of this bill has joined with the Minister of Railways—

Mr. SANDERSON: I object to the word "promoter." I am not the promoter of the bill; I am sponsoring the bill which stands in my name.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like very much to have the distinction drawn between "promoter" and "sponsor." It is hardly conceivable that the hon. gentleman should bring forward a bill and ask this house to pass it when he is not in sympathy with it. He would throw upon us the responsibility of rejecting it, yet he says he is opposed to the principle of the bill. I submit that this is subversive of political morality.

Mr. SANDERSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker; I did not say I was opposed to the principle of the bill.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The hon. member is opposed to the principle of divorce.

Mr. SANDERSON: I said if the time ever came for me to declare myself in this house on the principle of divorce I should be very glad to do so.

An hon. MEMBER: Do it now.

Mr. SANDERSON: This is not the proper time; the principle of divorce is not before us.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: My hon. friend takes the view that the principle of divorce is not now before the house. The other day I understood the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) to take the ground that the principle of divorce was before the house in each bill, and if the principle of this bill is not the principle of divorce I do not know what it is. So here we have one hon. gentleman saying this is not the time to discuss the principle of divorce, while the leader of the opposition is strongly of the opinion that this is the time when the principle of divorce should be discussed. What are some of us ordinary members to do in the face of opinions of this kind? In any case, the hon. gentleman who seconded this motion—

Mr. McMILLAN: I did not second the motion.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, whether or not this motion is before the house.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In putting the motion to the house, in accordance with the custom, I called the name of the hon. gentleman sitting next to the mover, as seconder of the motion. If I was wrong in using that name the motion is not properly before the house.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then I should like to have the motion before the house in order that I may continue what I have to say.

Mr. HEPBURN: I am prepared to second the motion of the hon. member

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Then it is necessary to put the motion again. It is moved by Mr. Sanderson and seconded by Mr. Hepburn that Bill 96 be now read a second time.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Thank you. Since the motion is only now properly before the house I suppose my forty minutes will begin from this time.

There is another question which has come to my mind very definitely during the course of these discussions. The leader of the opposition has taken the ground that parliament is a high court. I do not know that from a legal standpoint I am competent to differ from him, but I cannot believe that in any real sense, in the sense which concerns us in dealing with these bills, this parliament is a court.

Mr. DUNNING: Will the hon. member permit me to interrupt for a moment? A moment ago I understood him to mention the name of the Minister of Railways. I am anxious to leave the chamber and I would appreciate it if my hon. friend would go ahead and connect me with this bill in the way he wishes in order that I may hear it before I leave. I did not gather what he was saying.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I will go back: I was suggesting that the promoter of this bill, who objects to that word and who would like to be called the sponsor, agrees with the Minister of Railways that we, as members of parliament, are simply judges and that at this stage we have nothing to say with regard to the underlying principle involved. The Minister of Railways together with the promoter or sponsor of this bill voted against a divorce court for Ontario, but they come now and say, "Well, we are in a hopeless position; having voted against a divorce court for Ontario there is nothing else we can do but go ahead with bills of this character. We are simply judges having nothing whatever to say with regard to the principle involved." It is a curious situation when we consider that on one occasion we sit here as law makers and, with the help of the Minister of Railways and the promoter of this bill, reject a bill which sought to take these matters out of our hands; then a few minutes later we appear as jurors, supposed to carry on under regular and judicial procedure; and we are told that we, as jurors, cannot discuss the underlying principle of divorce.

Mr. DUNNING: In quoting my remarks the hon. member goes a certain distance correctly, but I think he knows himself the point at which he departed from that path.

[Mr. Hepburn.]

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should be glad to have an explanation.

Mr. DUNNING: So far as the principle is concerned, once the house has determined that a certain method shall not be followed then it is thrown back upon the method which the constitution of this country provides, and that method this bill seeks to follow. The hon. member talks about the principle, but I think he is a little bit confused as to what principle really is in relation to a bill of this character.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have thought all along that the underlying principle of these bills was the principle of the granting of divorce.

Mr. DUNNING: This bill falls within the scope of the constitution in connection with divorce, that is all.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We have no constitution with respect to divorce; we have a constitution which says that it is within the competence of parliament to grant a divorce, but the constitution does not say anything with regard to the circumstances under which the divorce shall be granted. Under the constitution we are quite free to give these matters to another court. It is quite true that the house, with the help of the Minister of Railways and the sponsor of this bill, has rejected that particular method, but I take it that the Minister of Railways and the sponsor of the bill are beginning to get restless when they realize the result of their action.

The Minister of Railways joins with the leader of the opposition in saying that to a certain extent we are a court.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member is quite correct.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: And that we have to act more or less as impartial jurors. I submit that that is absolutely impossible. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and other members of the house have disqualified themselves from voting on a measure of this kind. The hon. member stood in his place and said, "Under no circumstances whatever can I vote in favour of these bills." I submit that he would be challenged in any court in Canada and would not be permitted to sit as a juror. That would be true also of the majority of those who voted against the Ontario divorce bill. Those who voted against that bill on principle—there may be some who voted against it as a matter of political expediency—and whose position is that under

no circumstances are they justified in passing any act for the granting of divorces, are absolutely disqualified from acting as jurors in a court of this character. They are prejudiced jurors; they have declared themselves, and the people who, as we are told, have paid their money and gone to a great deal of expense in coming here with petitions for divorce are faced with the curious situation that approximately a third of their jury are prejudiced. I challenge their right to vote on a bill of this character. The same thing is true when these bills are before the private bills committee, because approximately one-third of the members of that committee have conscientious convictions with regard to the granting of divorce. They are opposed to it, so they are prejudiced jurors. I take it that they would be challenged in any court of justice, and I challenge them here to-day. We want to do the fair thing to those who come before this house; if they have a right to a divorce let us give them that divorce, but do not let us put ourselves in the position where a third of the members of the court are so prejudiced that the case cannot receive a fair hearing. Some of us are driven to the rather extreme position of voting against these bills, not because we are opposed to divorce but because we are opposed to the whole procedure, and at the present stage we see no other way of accomplishing our purpose of bringing about a change in procedure.

If I understand the rules aright, any five members of the house can demand a roll call vote. A few of us in this corner of the house, along with one or two on the other side, have called for these divisions. But what about the forty, fifty or sixty other members who on religious grounds are opposed to divorce? Why do they not call for a roll call division—if they are in earnest about preventing divorces? Why do they not do everything they can to protest against divorce? Why do they not realize what is going on in the house and come out openly and do all they can to prevent these bills passing? Because they know perfectly well that this is not a true court; they know perfectly well that in this atmosphere we cannot conform closely to judicial procedure; hence for years they have let these bills slip through and the speaker has simply declared them passed "on division." So far as I am concerned I do not intend to take the responsibility of continuing to ask for a roll call division. A single member has only a certain amount of power or influence in this house, but I do urge that we should ask that a vote be taken, if only the yeas and nays. I would not like to be accused of holding up the house by insisting upon a roll call division each time, but I should like to have every bill passed separately and with some semblance of decorum.

Some of us have been accused of introducing this matter simply because we were piqued at the non-passage of the Ontario divorce bill. Personally, I have no interest in that bill. It is true I sponsored it—to use the term of the sponsor of this bill—in the house, but I did that because year after year it has come up and no one has taken care of it. When it was defeated I was in no different position from that occupied by other members, but there seemed to be no way of impressing this house and the country with the seriousness of the situation other than by bringing on a debate or a series of debates of this character. I have no intention of resorting to mere obstructionist tactics. The course followed has been actuated by the desire that the house should be more clearly apprised of the seriousness of the situation. Later on, some of us may feel called upon to move certain amendments in committee, amendments which, I believe, ought to be placed in every divorce bill.

The leader of the opposition made rather a telling point when he said that we ought not to go into the details of evidence at this stage. I will not insist on those details being brought out in the house, but we ought to have, as in this bill we have already had, a certain outline of the case.

If ever I felt any qualms of conscience with regard to taking up the time of the house in connection with such matters as this, they have been all set at rest by some of the communications I have received in the last few days. Only last Friday night I had a letter from a poor woman whose husband is seeking a divorce. The case will come before us a little later on. For reasons that I think the house will appreciate, I do not want to give publicity to the name of the woman, but I wish to read the letter as an instance of what is going on and how unsatisfactory the present procedure is. The case is a Quebec one. I have not had time to go down to the city of Montreal to investigate the matter. Years ago I had something to do with trying to determine the authenticity of certain documents and I remember we used to distinguish between internal evidence and external evidence. I have no external evidence at all with regard to the genuineness of this case, with regard to the truthfulness of the woman's statements, but there is certain internal evidence which would indicate that her statements are true.

Mr. BROWN: Has the case been passed on by the senate committee?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It has been before the senate committee and is shortly to come before us. I would rather the hon. member did not ask me the particular name.

Mr. BROWN: There is no danger of my doing that. The demand for details will all come from elsewhere.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Let me read a few extracts from this letter. She says:

I have never had the chance to defend myself, and for five years I had had to endure insults from my husband's people. I have never been really mistress of my home.

Again:

I have been a good wife and mother for five years with this one exception and all that I have done—

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I rise to a point of order. My hon. friend is quoting from a letter and he must know perfectly well that if he reads a letter, he must lay it on the table. If he does not want to table the letter, he should not read it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There is no rule in this house which makes me lay a private letter upon the table.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I object to the reading of private letters in the House of Commons. My hon. friend is insisting on all evidence coming out, but he is giving us only partial evidence. Surely we should have the whole of it, not scraps.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am reading a letter that came to me. I have not tried to make this a point of evidence in the case.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): What is it if it is not evidence in the case?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: This does not directly relate to the case that is before us. It is an illustration.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Then my hon. friend is out of order. He is not discussing the case.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am discussing the principle underlying these bills, and I would ask the house to permit me to use this letter simply as an illustration to show how unsatisfactory the present procedure is. I am within my rights. Let me begin again.

I have never had the chance to defend myself, and for five years I have had to endure insults from my husband's people. I have never been really mistress of my home.

Again:

I have been a good wife and mother for five years with this one exception and all that I have done I have been driven to do by the high-handed methods of my husband and his people. If I lose my baby I lose everything worth living for. . . . I was married at twenty and my baby came before I was twenty-one. I have been married five years. My other baby has died and I had an operation to please my husband so I could not have children. The child—

Naming it.

—is all I can ever have, whereas my husband could marry again and have other children. Is it right or fair to take my only child from me? He is only four and needs his mother. God knows my heart bleeds for him. . . . He (my husband) receives $300 per month salary . . . . I receive no money from him and am not in a position to earn my own living. . . . . If my husband were made to support me and our boy, I know he would come back to me. Our baby would draw us together. His people are trying, and succeeding in keeping us apart . . . . I know I have been very foolish and made myself open to suspicion, but that is no reason to crush me altogether. . . . I love my baby. Please won't you ask them to give him back to me. If my husband does not love me and will be happier with someone else, I want him to do what he considers best. Only give me back my baby. . . . . You are my last hope and if this appeal fails, I am lost.

Some of us perhaps have regarded these bills with some levity. I do not think there is a single hon. gentleman in the house who will not be touched by an appeal of that character, even as I was touched on Friday night when I received it. Here is a poor woman who has had practically no opportunity of defending herself. This is an uncontested case. I am not sure whether she had the opportunity or the finances to come to Ottawa to defend herself. She speaks about being a good wife and mother with this one exception. Possibly she committed an indiscretion, perhaps worse than an indiscretion. We know nothing, however, about the character of her husband. He, too, may have committed indiscretions, but I recall the saying attributed to one of the teachers in the old days. When a woman taken in adultery was brought to Him, he said: "Go and sin no more." That is not the attitude that is being taken by the house. This woman at the request of her husband, has voluntarily rendered herself sterile; then the child has been removed, not under the mandate of this parliament, and I doubt if under the mandate of a court. The child was simply carried off, and the mother is without her baby. The man is well able to support her; she is receiving no support whatever, and we have in this letter the apealing cry of motherhood:

If my husband does not love me and will be happier with someone else, I want him to do what he considers best. Only give me back my baby.

We read away back in the book of Genesis that Esau, deprived of his birthright by the trickery of his brother Jacob, "cried with an exceeding great and bitter cry." A woman who, at her husband's request, rendered herself incapable of bearing another child, has her only child torn from her, and she says: "He is only four and needs his mother. I love my baby." Then in her naive way she says: "Please won't you ask them to give him back to me."

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine): Does the hon. member know whether or not the statements he has read from this letter are genuine?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I prefaced what I had to say with this statement, that I had been accustomed to distinguishing between external and internal evidence. I have nothing whatever to go on with regard to the external evidence; it is not out of keeping with the evidence as presented before the senate committee, but I would say—and I have been accustomed to dealing with cases not dissimilar to this, having sat for many years on the board of a children's aid society, and I know something of what imposture is—that this letter appeals to me as being a genuine cry of a woman in trouble.

Mr. BOYS: I think a wrong impression is being left on the house and on the country. Let me say at once that I have no sympathy with a man who tries to do what is referred to in that letter, but that case is not before this house. My hon. friend, however, would almost suggest that this unfortunate woman, and many others like her, have no opportunity of presenting their defence. Does he not know that she has every opportunity of presenting her defence before the senate committee? Does he not know that, if she is without funds, she can make application and the husband will be compelled to provide her with sufficient funds to make her defence before the committee? Does the hon. member not know that he himself can go before the senate committee when the case is heard and there present a defence for this woman, or make a motion that she be called as a witness in her own behalf?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That case to which I referred had already been passed by the senate committee, and it will presently come before this house.

Mr. BOYS: We can deal with it then, when it comes before the private bills committee.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, it will come before this house, but if I rise in my place on the second reading of the bill I shall immediately be told that I have no business whatever to discuss the details of the case in this house.

Mr. BROWN: The hon. member says that this bill will come before this house.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes.

Mr. BROWN: Would the divorce bills which have already been voted on, and against which my hon. friend voted, have ever had a chance of coming before the private bills committee if the action which my hon. friend and those sitting around him are taking had prevailed?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No. The bills would have gone to a proper court where the cases could have been properly tried.

Mr. BROWN: The bills would have been thrown aside altogether.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There would have been a court created—

Mr. BOYS: If my hon. friend wants to help this woman, let the bill pass and then he can bring any evidence he desires before the private bills committee, and if he proves there the accusation which he has made against this man, I for one will vote against that particular bill in the committee.

Mr. BROWN: I am quite sure I will.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am quite sure that the stand just taken by the hon. gentleman is a credit to him, and I think it is the feeling of all the members of this house, but I would point out that it was only incidentally that I knew anything of this case. This poor woman saw in the papers that I had been speaking on divorce, and that was the only reason she knew there was such an individual in existence, and hence she took the trouble to write to me. There may be scores of cases of this kind in these three hundred that are to come before this house.

Mr. STEVENS: But surely my hon. friend does not wish to leave the impression that this woman did not know that she was being divorced. She had to receive a notice, and she could have written a letter to the senate divorce committee, or she could have appeared before that committee herself, and could have appeared there as a witness with her expenses paid.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: She could have written a letter to the committee, but it could not have been put in as evidence.

Mr. STEVENS: But she could have been called and had her expenses paid. That is the point my hon. friend is evading.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, no, my hon. friend is going too fast. He says that this woman could have written a letter to the senate divorce committee. I say that if she had written a letter, even if she had made an affidavit, it would not have been received before the senate committee. I am not sure whether the woman knew that she might appear before the senate committee. But further than that, it may be that she was guilty of adultery. I do not know. It is quite conceivable that she may have been guilty, but even putting the worst construction upon the situation, supposing she is guilty, should we necessarily because of that act of adultery turn her out on the street and leave her in such a position that she will be deprived of the comfort of her child? I imagine that if she appealed to the court after a divorce was granted by parliament, the court would not turn the child over to her custody. We are blocked wherever we go, and it is because we are so hopelessly blocked that I feel free to appeal to the members of this house to do something—I do not care what it is. I do not want to impede the procedure of this house, but I want parliament to take some action that will relieve us of complicity in maintaining this impossible situation. I do not know whether I can appeal successfully to the government, or to the Prime Minister. I think the Prime Minister, who is more or less responsible for the business that comes before this house, ought surely to begin to realize that we cannot indefinitely prolong this kind of thing. He has been sitting in this house for a good many years, and he must have seen that there is no adequate provision for our considering these cases in any judicial manner. He must see further that if five or six members undertake to do it, we can block the proceedings in connection with every private bill that comes before the house from now on. I do not want to do this, but I suggest that that very fact demonstrates to us that in our rules of order we have not contemplated dealing with hundreds of these cases as they now come before us.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I, as one member of the government who did vote for the bill to establish a divorce court, ask the hon. member if he does not seek to block the proceedings of this house, and is he not by his vote protesting against the opinions of his fellow-members who do not see eye to eye with him?

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

An hon. MEMBER: He is a poor loser, that is all.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): As one who voted for the bill to establish a divorce court, I do not understand the position my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre is taking, nor do I think he is going to further the chances of passing such a bill through this house by his action, if I may be permitted to say so. As one who voted for a divorce court, I do not appreciate the tactics of my hon. friend, opposing every divorce bill that comes up in order to force his fellow-members who do not see eye to eye with him to vote for a divorce procedure which they do not feel inclined to support.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not opposing every bill that comes up. I said that if I had adequate knowledge of the details of particular cases, I reserved to myself the right to vote on the merits of those cases.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): My hon. friend can have recourse to the committee where he can air every objection that he has to every one of these bills.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Quite so, but the hon. gentleman must recognize that while what he says is formally correct, in practice very few members of this house are going to read through the evidence of three hundred cases, coming one by one before the private bills committee. I for one do not propose to do it. The other point that I did make this afternoon was this—

Mr. GERSHAW: Before the hon. member goes on to another case—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not going further. I have just about done.

Mr. GERSHAW: I would point out that the reading of that very sad letter conveys a rather wrong impression. The statement is made there that the woman went to have a certain operation performed at the request of her husband. I would point out that no reputable doctor and no hospital allows such a thing. It is entirely illegal for the purposes mentioned in that letter.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am sure that my hon. friend, who is a medical man, must know, as a great many of us who are not medical men know, that operations of this kind are being performed constantly.

Mr. GERSHAW: Not for the reasons mentioned there.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, even for those reasons, because this is not an isolated case. I am not suggesting that my hon. friend himself would perform such an operation, but there are medical men who will do it.

Mr. HOWDEN: I doubt very much if you could find a reputable hospital in Canada that would permit such an operation.

Mr. BROWN: I would ask the hon. member, how can he maintain consistency by saying that he is going to vote on the merits of each bill—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I did not.

Mr. BROWN: I understood my hon. friend to say that he was going to vote on the merits of the bill.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, no, the hon. gentleman is mistaken. My own position is this: I said at the very beginning that I took the position personally—it is entirely a personal matter—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Before speaking on the principle of the bill, may I, in order to clear up any misunderstanding there may be as to the powers of this parliament in legislative and judicial matters, read paragraph 844 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

> The proceedings of parliament in passing private bills partake of both a judicial and legislative character. The promoters of the bill appear as suitors while those who apprehend injury are admitted as adverse parties to the suit. The former may prove that their own interests will be advanced by the success of the bill and no one may urge any objection; yet, if the house apprehends that the bill will be hurtful to the community, it may be rejected.

I would not undertake to define exactly what constitutes a bill of divorce, but in view of the fact that to-day we have on the order paper seventy-seven divorce bills, I think the matter is of sufficient importance to warrant our careful consideration. What would happen if we had seventy-seven railway bills, or seventy-seven patent bills, or the same number of any other kind of private bills? We would not pass them as a mere matter of form. Yet these divorce bills strike at the very root of the nation, at the family itself. A former minister of justice, the Hon. Mr. Doherty, who occupied that office in the late Conservative government, defines a bill of divorce in these words:

> An act that grants a divorce is a private act, like any other private act. The house as well as the senate must enact it. The parties come here asking for it, just as they come with other private bills when they want to get something that the general law of the country does not give them. And it is precisely because the general law of the country says: once you are married you can never marry again while your consort is alive, that when one wants to be relieved of the operation of that general law, he comes to the parliament of Canada and asks for a law for himself; and each one of these petitioners goes away, where he succeeds, carrying with him a law that is a law for him —a law that takes him out of the operation of the general law.

This view is also shared by the Hon. Mr. Nickle, a former distinguished member of this house, who on one occasion introduced a divorce bill, and after a long discussion it was passed, but it failed in the senate. At the time Mr. Nickle said:

> It is well known to every member that any person who has the means and cares to present a petition to parliament if he is in a position to demonstrate that adultery has been committed has a moral right to divorce, but in Ontario and Quebec, because we have no divorce courts, there is no legal right to divorce.

Mr. BOYS: Does not my hon. friend agree that there is no general divorce law either in Ontario or in Quebec? Therefore, so far as those provinces are concerned, there is no forum except parliament before which parties seeking a divorce may appear.

Mr. MARCIL: Divorce is not recognized either in Ontario or in Quebec.

Mr. BOYS: There is no divorce court in either province; that is the point.

Mr. MARCIL: I do not want to quote again the views of Sir Hector Langevin which I gave to the house last week, but he was solicitor general when the British North America Act was passed, and he said then that they were not introducing the principle of divorce either in Ontario or in Quebec. However, they found divorce courts already established in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and therefore the matter had to be taken into consideration with regard to the other two provinces. The fathers of confederation were wise men. They decided not to establish divorce courts in Ontario and Quebec, but to place the power of granting divorce in the jurisdiction of the federal parliament, and in this way make it more difficult to secure a divorce; for they were of opinion that it would not be in the interest of the country to facilitate the granting of divorce. Their wisdom was proved by the fact that in the following ten years only seven applications for divorce were granted by parliament. Last year there were 785 divorces. I am glad that there are two provinces in

this Dominion with an admirable record in matters of divorce—Prince Edward Island and Quebec. I respect the views of every member of this house. The people of the west may have different ideas on the subject. The Divorce Act, passed in 1857, has been applied to the western country. At the time that the member for West Calgary introduced the measure before the house with regard to Alberta and Saskatchewan, it was argued that the hearing of these cases by the courts would reduce the number of applications for divorce; but the very contrary has happened. And if we establish divorce courts in Ontario and Quebec the same thing would happen. The people of these two provinces have a right to divorce courts if they so decide, but up to the present they have decided that they do not want such courts. Neither province has yet asked for the establishment of divorce courts. I question very much, even if we had passed the bill recently introduced to establish a divorce court in Ontario, whether we would have been acting within our powers, for the British North America Act, as has been said repeatedly, is a contract between the various provinces, and the consent of the Ontario legislature would have to be secured before we could impose a divorce court on the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have agreed not to discuss the evidence in this or any other case at the present stage, for the very good reason that that evidence is not yet before us, not yet having been dealt with by the private bills committee of this house. In the old days nine senators were required to form the senate divorce committee, but to-day I notice that that committee is composed of only five members. I do not know whether they have to be unanimous or whether a bare majority could accept the evidence adduced before them as being sufficient to warrant a divorce; but in the latter event we would have three senators reporting in favour of a divorce bill their report of course being accepted by the senate, and then in turn this would be automatically accepted by the private bills committee of this house if we followed the usual practice. To this we object. The member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) objects on another ground: he desires to have these cases sent to a divorce court to be set up in Ontario. I object to divorce on the ground that marriage is sacred, that it is a contract for life and cannot be dissolved except by the death of one of the parties. That was the view in England for eighteen hundred years until the passing of the Divorce Act in 1857. But before that time the matrimonial courts annulled marriage for certain reasons. In Quebec we have what are known as judicial separations. Under this procedure husband and wife may separate, and at the same time fair and reasonable provision may be made for alimony and for the custody of the children. We cannot do that; all we can do is to grant a divorce. By so doing we throw the children out on the street and put the guilty party on the same footing as the innocent. So we are establishing in effect the principle of polygamy, for a man may secure a divorce this year, marry again, and next year apply for another divorce, and, that having been granted, marry again, and continue this course indefinitely.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): My hon. friend will admit, however, that the injured party is denied in Ontario or Quebec the right of redress that is available in all the other provinces.

Mr. MARCIL: They get no redress here.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): But the hon. member will not deny that in any of the provinces the courts are there for the purpose of giving redress.

Mr. MARCIL: That may be an argument in favour of sending it to the courts. But at the present time the principal reason why these divorces are becoming so numerous is that there are certain classes of people who get married to-day with the idea that if matters do not go as they expect they can always resort to a divorce court, and if that is not effective in the province in which they reside they can come to parliament, believing that in doing so they automatically obtain a divorce. When they come here they ask a favour; it is a law of exception in this case, because there is no divorce law in either Ontario or Quebec.

I do not wish to delay the house, Mr. Speaker, when the majority have declared in favour of divorce, but I think it my duty to show the grave responsibility which parliament assumes in allowing this state of things to continue. I should like to cite a few words to indicate what has taken place in the United States. Let me quote the Rev. Dr. Gwynne on Divorce in America under State and Church. This reverend gentleman is secretary of an association in the United States whose object it is to preserve among all peoples, irrespective of creed and race, respect for the sanctity of marriage. This body is known as the Sanctity of Marriage Association. I quote:

Let us now look at some results of this anarchic condition of our legislation, as they are seen in the official reports of the Bureau

of the Census. It is not until 1876 that we get any authoritative information in regard to divorce in the United States. The following table shows the increase for fifty years, in ten-year periods:

Ten years ending Dec. 31, '76..	122,121
Ten years ending Dec. 31, '86..	206,595
Ten years ending Dec. 31, '96..	352,263
Ten years ending Dec. 31, '06..	593,362
Ten years ending Dec. 31, '16..	975,728
Total..	2,250,069
Total of persons separated in fifty years..	4,500,138
Total of minor children made orphans in fifty years..	1,689,662
Total of persons bereft or dishonoured in fifty years..	6,189,800

That is what divorce is accomplishing. There was a time when divorce was practically non-existent in this country, but it exists to-day, and if it continues it will be ten times worse ten years from now. In my opinion therefore we should call a halt; divorce should not be granted by parliament at all. In the provinces where divorce is granted the matter is largely one of provincial rights, civil rights being within the province; the solemnization of marriage comes within the purview of the province. For these reasons I can add only one more objection to the principle of divorce and declare that I will oppose it as strenuously as I can every time the opportunity presents itself.

One point is raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) as to increasing the grounds on which divorce may be granted, and not confining it simply to adultery. I do not know why in Canada the cause has been limited to adultery; I do not know on what ground we proceed, whether it is the practice in England. But I find in this book of the Rev. Dr. Gwynne, with an introduction by Doctor Manning, quotations from the Bible which I do not care to read now seeing that they are familiar to all hon. members of this house—quotations from St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and verbatim utterances from our Lord and Saviour; and there is absolutely nothing in all these references which authorizes the remarriage of divorced persons. There is no authority in the Bible for it. So that on what ground divorce has been limited here to the single cause of adultery I fail to see. If we were to follow the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre we might adopt the practice of the United States. There is only one state in the American Union which has never established a divorce court, and that is South Carolina; but in the other states they have as many as fifty-two different causes for divorce. A man is divorced in one state and is married in another, and so on, and altogether there is a most chaotic state of confusion. For many years in the United States a strong effort has been made for the limitation to the federal authorities of the granting of divorce, in order to stem the ravages of the evil. I will say no more, and I hope that more of us who are conscientiously opposed to divorce, and who realize its ravages, will take the opportunity when it arises to voice their opinion, because they know in their inmost hearts that divorce in Canada has reached the stage where it has become a real and a grave problem.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): I was in hopes that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) would give an answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth). I believe that everyone in the house agrees that the question now before us is one of great importance; it is important not only to the individuals who may be concerned in the bills before parliament, but from the point of view of parliament itself; and it is also important to the general public. We were told by the sponsor of this bill that the people of Ontario were not ready for divorce courts. I might reply with equal confidence and authority and tell the hon. gentleman that the people of Canada are not yet ready for the kind of thing we are doing; and if the people of Ontario are refusing to have divorce courts then I as a member of this house am prepared to refuse to follow the present course. Then where does my hon. friend get? I hope the seriousness of the question will induce the Prime Minister or some other member of the government to indicate to the house some reasonable way out. I would suggest that we either, first of all, drop all divorce cases; or secondly that we take them seriously, considering them as they ought to be considered, in a dignified manner, and enlarging the powers of parliament to deal with all phases of divorce, giving authority to the senate committee to look after the children of divorced people, and also the power to deal separately with the cases which may come before the committee, from the point of view of remarriage and on the basis of the merits of each individual case; or, in the third place, if we do not do that, that we proceed as early as possible to refer the matter to the proper courts to deal with. Now, what course shall we pursue?

Mr. ARTHURS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. IRVINE: I am not suggesting that the Prime Minister is more responsible for the situation than I am.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. A point of order has been raised.

Mr. ARTHURS: A good deal of this debate has evidently been out of order. There is a rule of the house which provides distinctly that questions arising in a previous debate in the same session may not be referred to. In this house a bill has been introduced and carried forward to second reading, and which was passed by another house of this parliament, providing for the establishment of a divorce court in Ontario. The whole subject matter of many of the speeches of hon. members who, shall I say, are delaying this house, has consisted in the fact that they are offended by the action of this parliament, to which they should be subject. We have passed upon this matter for this session at least, and any hon. member speaking to any divorce bill before this parliament, either now or during the rest of this session, should be confined strictly to the merits or demerits of the particular case which he is discussing.

Mr. IRVINE: I have no objection to the remarks of my hon. friend; I am glad to note that they do not apply to me. I am just about to conclude my remarks by asking that the Prime Minister or some member of the government respond to the urgent appeal of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), not only in respect to the present bill before the house but in respect to other bills of the same character which will come before the house later. I have pointed out the courses open to this parliament, as I see them. I do not suppose any hon. member wishes to be associated with the present way of doing this kind of business. If the bill we are now considering goes to the private bills committee, where we may obtain information which will enable us to pass the bill in committee and send it back to the house—

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the hon. member is well taken in principle; when the house has passed judgment on a question that question cannot be revived during the same session, but may be revived at another session. However, as I stated the other day, various divorce bills have been introduced, one of which is now before the house; some hon. members are in favour of these bills while others oppose them, as is their right, and it is rather difficult to determine the difference between the general principle of whether or not a divorce court should be established and the point at issue. It is all the same question and I cannot prevent the speakers who oppose these particular divorce bills from bringing up their objections against the principle of divorce itself. However, it is easy for so able a parliamentarian as the hon. member now speaking to confine his remarks as much as possible to the bill presently before the house.

Mr. IRVINE: I shall endeavour so to do; my only reference to the matter to which Your Honour alludes was made in reply to the statement of the sponsor of the bill. I am sorry he was so sadly out of order and I am sorry I followed him in that regard.

I turn again to the Prime Minister in the hope that he will show us some way out of the dilemma, because it must be clear to every hon. member of the house that if we are seriously to consider the three hundred divorce bills which will come before us, we must either sit continuously or not do the work very well. I believe the Prime Minister must agree that this matter of divorce has become too great a task for this parliament to undertake. It is one thing for parliament to have the constitutional right to grant a divorce or a separation when such a thing occurs once a year or something like that, but it is another thing for parliament to consider three hundred of these bills each year together with all the other things to which we must give our attention. That is the situation which has developed during recent years, and that is the situation to which I hope the Prime Minister will address himself now.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): That I may be in order I would make it clear that I am simply seeking to answer a question relating largely to procedure. I gather that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) is of the view that by this time the government should see that this method of dealing with divorce bills is anything but satisfactory, or in other words that under the present method it is within the power of a few members of this house to block the entire business of parliament, if they so desire, in order to demonstrate their dissatisfaction with the prevailing system of granting divorces through the agency of private bills.

I must confess that up to the present time I have not been able to see a way of dealing with these matters other than by a divorce court on the one hand or by private bills on the other. As my hon. friend is

aware, during the present session this house decided against a divorce court for the province of Ontario, and that method cannot be considered again at this time. Until some other method suggests itself I fail to see a better way of dealing with the situation than that which has prevailed heretofore. I think the discussion which has taken place so far and what has been demonstrated as to the amount of time which will be consumed if all individual bills for divorce are to be considered in this house, have made it evident that some method other than that at present in force should be followed, but I would remind hon. gentlemen that the matter is not one to be solved in a moment or by the stroke of a pen. I will say to hon. members of the house that the government will continue as we have been doing to give very serious thought to this question; I could not promise that we will find a solution during this session of parliament, but I would express the hope that by another session, by conference in the interval with members of the house and by other methods, we may find it possible to effect some arrangement which will enable those seeking divorce to secure such redress as should be given them by a means which will commend itself more completely to parliament and avoid a recurrence of a situation such as we have at the moment.

I can only appeal to the common sense of the house in this matter; the government must follow the rules of parliament and the government wish to uphold the rules. It might be possible for the remainder of the present session to allow bills to pass second reading and to go to the committee as has been the case in the past, and for hon. members who wish to raise objections to particular bills, to raise those objections in the committee, it being understood that between now and next session the members of the government and other hon. members of the house will do what they can towards finding some means of freeing parliament from the necessity of continuing to deal with divorce bills along the lines which we have followed thus far.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Before the Prime Minister takes his seat may I ask a question? It seems to me that the answer given is very satisfactory as far as it goes, but we must consider what we are to do for the remainder of this session. I have raised the objection that a number of hon. gentlemen are not competent to sit in judgment on these bills nor because of their religious convictions on this particular question are they competent to be members of the private bills committee. Would it be possible for us to follow the precedent set by the senate, by which divorce bills are sent not to their private bills committee but to a special committee composed of those who have an open mind in regard to the question of divorce? I do not ask for an answer on this point to-day, but I would suggest to the Prime Minister that possibly this might be a way out even for this session. We might appoint a special committee composed of those who are not on principle committed one way or the other; that might relieve the pressure on the private bills committee and at the same time permit of greater impartiality in these matters than is possible under the present system.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka-Ontario): I wish to say just a word in support of the attitude taken by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart). I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) has made himself absolutely ridiculous by his attitude on this question. The hon. member introduced a bill in this house, as was his right; that bill was defeated by the votes of hon. members who have an equal right to express their views. The hon. member was not a good enough sport to take his—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If the hon. member would speak a little louder I would be able to hear him.

Mr. McGIBBON: I hope the hon. member will be equally pleased when he does hear what I have to say. I say that the hon. member was not even a good sport; he introduced a bill into this house, which he had a perfect right to do—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I rise to a point of order. It has not been my conception of order in this house that personalities could be exchanged between one member and another in describing the action taken by a particular member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not gather that the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. McGibbon) has made any personal reference to an hon. member, but he falls into another error; he is referring to a past debate of this session.

Mr. McGIBBON: It was not my intention to discuss the personality of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), or that of any other member in this house; I am simply discussing the attitude he has taken when, having been defeated on a certain bill, he still persists in blocking the business of the house. As one coming from the province of Ontario, and as one who voted

against that divorce bill, I say, with the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), that this debate is not facilitating the purpose he has in view. When the province of Ontario asks for a divorce court then it will be time enough for this house to consider it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in discussing a question which has been already disposed of by this house?

Mr. STEVENS: We have been discussing it for two weeks.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman should confine his remarks to the present bill.

Mr. McGIBBON: I do not know whether or not you are complimenting me, Mr. Speaker, when you restrict me within narrower limits than has been the case with other hon. members who have spoken on these bills. We in the province of Ontario are not going to be dictated to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, either on this question or on any other. If he thinks he is going to gain his object by blocking the business of parliament in order to force upon the province of Ontario something which it has not as yet asked for, he is taking the wrong way to accomplish his ends.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): Mr Speaker, the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has in a very few words this afternoon done much to eliminate the present source of trouble and pave the way to a serious and constructive settlement, not only of the bills which may come up this year, but of the whole question. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that it has been psychologically impossible to discuss any one of these bills without discussing what I call the basic principle of them all. The comment on rule 92 which was read a moment ago by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), illustrates the whole system. The private legislation dealt with in paragraph 844 refers only to occasional private bills; but these hundreds of divorce bills arise from this fact, or principle of law, that matters have to be dealt with as private legislation, either by parliament or by the local legislatures, according to the subject, when they cannot be dealt with properly by courts of judicature.

It has been made quite clear during the course of these debates that this method, call it obstruction if you like, is the most effective manner in which to bring to the consciousness of the house and of the country the importance of this question. This discussion has made at least one point clear in the minds of many members of both houses—a point which had been quite obscure in the minds of the people of the country, and certainly in the province of Quebec—that applications for divorce do not come to parliament merely and exclusively as petitions from certain individuals to obtain the redress of certain individual grievances. It has been amply demonstrated that petitions for divorce come before this parliament because, under our constitution—as far as the provinces of Ontario and Quebec are concerned—this is the only legislative and judicial body which can deal with the question. I have endeavoured, without any spirit of antagonism or animosity toward anyone, to bring home to the minds of the hon. members of the house the fact that this question must be dealt with one of these days in a radical fashion.

Therefore, to that extent, I agree with the hon. member for Bonaventure; but in order to respond in a sympathetic spirit to the invitation of the right hon. the Prime Minister to all members of the house to present their views towards the satisfactory settlement of this important question, I must take exception to other comments which have been made by the hon. member for Bonaventure. The hon. member for Bonaventure has referred to the declarations made at the time of the Quebec resolution by Sir Hector Langevin when these very important questions of marriage and divorce were being discussed. I understood the hon. member for Bonaventure to take the same view as did Sir Hector Langevin, that jurisdiction respecting marriage and divorce had been confined to this parliament in order to prevent the extension of divorce to Ontario and Quebec which had not been afflicted with that plague. But Sir George Etienne Cartier and Sir Hector Langevin did not realize that in wishing to avoid one issue they simply raised a broader one. They did not consent to have divorce enacted for Ontario and Quebec, but they had divorce enacted for the whole of Canada including Ontario and Quebec. They forgot that basic principle of the constitution to which I referred the other day, and to which the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) replied, "Well, it is elementary law": the moment you establish a principle of law you assume the moral obligation to supply the judicial mechanism to put it into practice. My point of view is that the parliament of Canada, having accepted the responsibility of legislating upon marriage and divorce for the whole of Canada including Ontario and Quebec, has left itself open to the receipt of petitions from any in-

habitant of Ontario and Quebec. They can apply to this parliament for a divorce, parliament acting in its dual capacity of a legislative body and a court of justice.

That brings us back to the awkward position which was described by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth). If we are a court of law, then he is absolutely right when he says that my humble self, the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion), the hon. member for Bonaventure, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), and many others are prejudiced upon principle upon these questions. In fact, if we are imbued with the basic principles of our creed it is just as wrong for us to vote for any divorce law or any individual divorce bill, as it would be to vote for a bill of this house similar to those introduced into the English parliament in the time of Elizabeth, or Edward VI, or Henry VIII, declaring that the practices of our religion were blasphemy. It would arouse the indignation, not only of every Catholic member, but of every fair-minded member of the house to put us back to the days of the sixteenth century and to ask parliament to place the stamp of blasphemy upon any article or creed of religion believed in by any hon. member. We have, thank Heaven! passed those days in every part of the British Empire.

I admit, I repeat, that we went for years without reflecting upon the basic issue contained in these bills, but now we are realizing it; and my purpose in raising these debates was simply to bring to the attention of hon. members that, believing as we do, we cannot go on doing what we have done for years past, proclaiming to our people that we are opposed to the principle of divorce, and then letting pass every bill of divorce that comes before the house. It has been said that we ought not to vote for the principle of divorce, if contained in a bill transmitting from this parliament to another body, a court of justice, a jurisdiction granted to parliament by the constitution to be exercised in a judicial manner; in other words, that we cannot transfer to a court of justice those powers which we exercise, but that the principle of divorce is not contained in the three hundred bills before us. That opinion may be held by very respectable people in Quebec, including priests, but I do not think it is good teaching, good law or even good common sense.

Therefore in that spirit I suggest to the members of the government; in the same spirit I suggest to the leading men of the opposition, including and beginning with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett), who is undoubtedly one of the best legal minds of the country, that they approach this question with a spirit absolutely foreign to any thought of party gain or appeal to this province or that, to this creed or that. We will accomplish nothing if we approach the question from the point of view of party gain. There are in the house a large number of members representing millions of law-abiding citizens who are opposed to divorce on principle and who are horrified at the manner in which divorce has grown, just as there are other members who, in an equally respectable manner, one which would call for my respect if not for my adherence, would be horrified at the idea of the house adopting from year to year a series of measures that would, for example, prepare the way for the breaking of the British Empire. To me it would not appeal as much as it would to them, but I would respect their viewpoint. Therefore I think this question should be approached at the same time from the viewpoint of those who are opposed to divorce and from that of those who, not being opposed to divorce, want divorce granted or refused according to some principle of law or practice and some respect for equity.

It has been suggested that if we amend the rules of parliament with respect to divorce bills, we could see, for example, that justice is done to the children; that something is done for the support of the innocent party and the children who may remain in the custody of the innocent party. But there again you strike the rock of constitutional objection, because we cannot deal here with civil rights or property. We are entirely precluded from that. So that my humble contribution to the preparation of a remedy for the situation is to repeat what I said last week. Let us go to the root of the question and, finding that the whole problem of marriage and divorce is intimately connected with the matter of civil rights, with the matter of property; that already all the provinces of Canada have exclusive jurisdiction over the solemnization of marriage, let us come back to the spirit of the constitution and simplify the whole matter by handing the whole problem over to the provinces. This is the only way that we can get rid of the objections, and that we can at the same time give satisfaction to Catholics and to Protestants, to believers in the principle and practice of divorce and to those who do not believe in it.

Moreover, it is the only manner in which we can ascertain whether Ontario wants a divorce court or not. Some say Ontario wants it; some say it does not. Without referring to any past debate I say to-day that I do not yet know. Personally I would be prepared to vote to-morrow for a court of divorce for the people of Ontario if they wanted it, but I have no evidence to that effect. But if we hand the matter over to the provinces, then the people of Ontario, through their legislature which deals with civil rights, with the solemnization of marriage, with property, will be able to take up the whole question of marriage and divorce and establish courts of adjudication to pass judgment upon those questions as upon other questions of civil rights and property. This is the best we can do, and it is the suggestion I offer. I am quite sure if the solution were taken up in a broad way by representatives of the various parties in the house, they would secure for it the agreement of an overwhelming majority of the people of this country irrespective of creed, race and province, because it is the sensible solution, the solution in keeping with the constitution.

Moreover, a point which has not yet been understood, in the province of Quebec, at least, and which I want to emphasize now is this: that if courts of divorce, as Sir Hector Langevin pointed out and as the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) pointed out this afternoon, were established in the eastern provinces prior to confederation, the courts of divorce working at present in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan were established by federal legislation. This was unknown to the people of Quebec until a few weeks ago. I have seen printed in works that are considered as classics in Quebec, the statement that the Dominion parliament should not start the precedent of establishing divorce courts because it had never done so before; that divorce courts existed in the seven provinces because those provinces established them. Therefore, a classical author whose work is used in several of the colleges in Quebec, ignored the fact that the divorce courts of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta existed only under the operation of two federal acts, one passed in 1886, if my memory serves me aright, establishing in Manitoba all English laws as had been in force on the 15th July, 1870, and the other passed, I think, two years afterwards, establishing also all English laws in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. The result was the introduction, under federal legislation, of the divorce law of England of 1857 in those three provinces.

And what about the judicature? This is a most interesting point, which exemplifies the point I made last week, and which was immediately ratified, so to speak, by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan). When a divorce case was taken before the supreme court of Saskatchewan, the judge excused himself on the ground of having no jurisdiction. He said: I see no statute conferring jurisdiction upon me to adjudicate upon divorce. The question was taken to the privy council and the privy council, putting into force that long-standing principle of British jurisprudence, declared: Where there is a law there is a tribunal to adjudicate upon it; and since the federal parliament of Canada has thought proper to introduce all English laws, including the divorce law, in the province of Saskatchewan, there must be a court of law to adjudicate upon such issues, and the supreme court of Saskatchewan, which exercises the same jurisdiction as similar courts in other provinces or in England, is the tribunal to which every ratepayer of that province has the right to appeal. All those questions were absolutely unknown to the people of the province of Quebec, and I dare say to the people of the province of Ontario.

These debates, Mr. Speaker, have not been useless, let my hon. friends on all sides admit. They have been raised, not for the pleasure of obstructing legislation or playing upon the nerves of anybody, but so far at least as I am concerned, and I think in this matter I can speak for my hon. friends on the other side, with the sincere object of finding a solution for one of the most important problems of government, of legislation and of public order. These days have not been lost, these debates have not been in vain, and if the Prime Minister, with the help of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), after consultation with the members of this house and with enlightened men from the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario can find a solution for this great problem, they may be assured that after some years have passed, it will be looked upon as one of the most important achievements of this parliament. It will have been a greater service done to the country than the passing of many of the appropriations and administrative bills which this house spends many hours discussing every session. I do not say this in any spirit of disparagement of hon. members who take more interest in other questions, but simply because in my opinion this is a more important problem.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, to put a practical conclusion to these remarks, I may say that

for this session I am prepared to let pass on division the second reading of these bills. I do not promise to let them pass through the committee and receive their third reading without pointing out some discrepancies in the evidence, but I admit at once—as this question was put to me the other day by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Boys)—that the question of evidence, so far as I am concerned, is entirely subordinate to the question of principle. I consent to let this procedure go on for this year because, as the Prime Minister says, a question of this nature, with all its complexities, cannot be settled at once. Indeed, if the Prime Minister had suggested that he was prepared to settle it this week, I would have taken advantage of my years and have advised him to make haste slowly because this is an important matter. At the same time I request from him, as a Canadian citizen, more so than as a member of parliament, and I request also of his colleagues, and of the members of the opposition, and of every member of this house, that they give sincere and serious consideration to this problem and be prepared to make to the house whatever constructive suggestions they may have, so that we may bring to this vexed question a solution that will be as much in harmony as possible with the requirements of the various provinces and of Canada at large.

Motion agreed to, on division, and bill read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall I call the other divorce bills on the order paper separately, putting a motion for each bill?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Whilst we are yielding, and quite rightly, I think, after hearing the Prime Minister, I think the least that we can do is to have the motion for each bill put separately, and the sponsor of the bill should be in his place as is the case with other bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no objection. That is the rule.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 97, for the relief of Hunter Wilbert Faulkner.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 99, for the relief of William Henry Blackwell.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 105, for the relief of Clarence Percy Shields.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 107, for the relief of John William Telfer.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 109, for the relief of James Ross Curry.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 113, for the relief of Antoine Joseph Bourdon—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 114, for the relief of Arnold Whitchurch Little—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 115, for the relief of Arthur James Taylor—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Bill No. 120, for the relief of Janet Gee—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 123, for the relief of Florence Velma Strachan—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 126, for the relief of William Henry Laverty—Mr. Bothwell.

Bill No. 134, for the relief of Dora Taylor—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 136, for the relief of Helen Awrey—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 145, for the relief of James Clayton Powell—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 147, for the relief of Clare Doutre Walters Bertram—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 148, for the relief of Margaret Duffield—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 149, for the relief of Dorothy Madeline Hanson Campbell—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 151, for the relief of William Thomas Taylor—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 165, for the relief of Florence Jane Sheppard—Mr. Sanderson.

Motions for second readings agreed to on division.

THE I'M ALONE INCIDENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Prime Minister whether or not we shall have the publication at an early date of the notes passed between the United States and Canada with regard to the I'm Alone.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I anticipate that in the next day or two, possibly by Wednesday, we shall be able to lay the paper on the table.

SUPPLY—PROCEDURE

RESUMING ON THURSDAY OR FRIDAY DEBATE ON AMENDMENT

On the order for the house to go into committee of supply:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): When the house rose the other afternoon, by reason of six o'clock being reached, there was under discussion a motion moved by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart) in amendment to the motion that

the Speaker do now leave the chair. Last year we followed with respect to such motions a practice which I understand has met with some expressions of disapproval. It will be recalled that the then member for Victoria, B.C., Mr. Tolmie, moved an amendment, when the house was moved into supply, expressing regret that no action had been taken to prevent the importation into Canada of certain fruits. The motion was discussed but had not been concluded when the house rose, and the next day the Speaker left the chair as a matter of course. Later a motion in similar terms was moved by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Anderson), and on that motion the vote was subsequently taken. The practice then followed would involve in this instance the moving of the amendment made the other day, but proposed by an hon. member other than the hon. gentleman who then proposed the amendment. In order that the matter might be considered by the house the hon. member for Leeds gave notice to revive his motion, so that we might settle the practice if possible and have no uncertainty about it in the future. Having regard to what took place last year it is desirable that we should decide the question in some manner. I have not indicated how, in my opinion, it should be settled, but I felt that it might be decided by Your Honour, in view of what might be said by hon. gentlemen sitting on the government side of the house.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): On Friday evening I anticipated the possibility of this matter coming up to-day and I expressed then what I felt to be the view, with respect to the rule as it had been drawn up, of a committee of this house, which presented its report to the house, which report was subsequently adopted. If the committee had intended that motions introduced on Wednesdays as amendments to the motion for the house to go into supply should be similar to like amendments on Mondays or Tuesdays, I think they would, in the report they presented to the house, have pronounced themselves to that effect. The rule provides that an amendment which is moved on Wednesday drops unless it is then concluded. Last year, as my hon. friend says, there was a discussion with respect to reviving a motion which had been brought in on Wednesday, as an amendment to the motion to go into supply, and Your Honour, addressing the house, expressed the view that if the motion had been submitted in good faith by the hon. member who moved it on a Wednesday, the house, controlling its own procedure, would be at liberty to allow the motion to be revived. Members on the government side accepted the view expressed by hon. members opposite that the motion had been introduced in good faith, on the assumption that it might be revived at a subsequent time, notwithstanding the rule which provided that it should be dropped.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the rule say that it should be dropped?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the rule is that it is dropped.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not think that order No. 7 went as far as that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The point I wished to make the other evening is this: While for the reasons stated, that course was taken last year, we feel, now that the matter is coming up anew, we should know definitely whether it was the intention of the house at the time the rule was adopted to have it apply to Wednesday amendments in a manner similar to amendments moved on going into supply on Mondays. If Mr. Speaker deems this to have been the intention of the committee which amended the rules the government will of course accept whatever His Honour may direct. But I do submit there was an intention in the minds of the committee that motions brought in on Wednesdays as amendments on going into supply should be treated differently from those brought in on Mondays or Tuesdays.

Mr. BENNETT: As this is a point of order and I have already made some observations, perhaps I may be permitted to add a few more words with respect to it. I think the point the Prime Minister has raised overlooks the fact that the real reason behind this is that the Speaker has left the chair. On Thursday he leaves the chair automatically; on Wednesday the amendment was that he do not now leave the chair. But having left the chair on Thursday automatically without motion it follows that it is very difficult to continue the discussion on the amendment that he shall not leave the chair when he has already done so. That was the real difficulty we had to meet last year and which we did meet in the manner I have indicated. Perhaps Your Honour has before you the journal showing what we did in those circumstances when the member for Halton moved an identical motion to that moved by the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., because of the fact that the Speaker having left the chair you could not continue a debate on a motion that he do not now leave the chair, for in reality what we were endeavouring to prevent happening

had already happened—he had automatically without motion put left the chair. That is the real difficulty that has to be met either by reviving the rule or the practice we made continuing last year.

Mr. SPEAKER: Last year the member for Victoria, B.C., when a motion was made that I should leave the chair for the house to go into committee of supply, moved an amendment thereto on the dumping duties, if I remember well. The debate went on until the house ajourned. The next day was Thursday and automatically I did leave the chair when the motion was made to go into supply. Then later on the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Anderson) rose to address the house, two or three days afterwards, on the 10th of May, I think. Prior to that as objection was taken that the debate had lapsed, I quoted what May says, page 476:

If an adjourned debate on such an amendment is standing upon the order paper when supply, for consideration of which in committee it is not necessary to propose the question for the Speaker's leaving the chair, is to be taken, the order of the day for resuming the adjourned debate is removed, and procedure on the amendment lapses, in order that the Speaker, in obedience to standing order 28 may leave the chair without question put.

Last year my ruling was that if the procedure had lapsed the question itself did not lapse. A question which has been decided by the house is a judgment of the house and it cannot be revived during that session. But when as in that particular instance the procedure lapses it does not follow that the question itself lapses and it can be revived. Here is what May says at page 234, 12th edition:

When an order of the day has been read, the proceedings thereon may be cut short by the adjournment of the house whilst those proceedings are in course of transaction, or before their resumption, when they have been postponed at a quarter past eight o'clock. An order of the day, in such cases or if, when the order is read, no day is appointed for its future consideration, drops off the notice paper, as the house has made no order thereon.

That is the case in the present instance.

In committee the same result may be produced, either by a failure of a quorum of the house, or by a resolution directing the chairman to leave the chair. To replace a dropped order of the day upon the notice paper, a motion is made before the commencement, or after the close, of public business, to appoint the order for a subsequent day. These motions, which are made without notice, are usually treated as purely formal motions.

In the British system of parliamentary government the greatest latitude is given in regard to freedom of speech and the discussion of public matters, and when a question accidentally lapses by some definite rule that question may be revived. It is a dropped order, as May says, and it can be revived. In the present instance the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart), having given due notice to revive his lapsed motion is perfectly in order in taking it up to-day. Last year—and I speak from memory—the motion was not made by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Anderson), but as far as I remember there was an agreement between both sides of the house that the question should come to an issue and the hon. member simply continued the debate.

I therefore rule that the present motion is in order; the superseded debate can be revived, subject of course to the decision of the house.

Mr. DUNNING: There is another point, based upon your present ruling, Mr. Speaker, which will require decision ultimately; that is the question of whether, with respect to the revived debate, those who spoke upon it formerly have the right to speak again as though it were a new motion, or whether, being revived, it is a resumption of the debate rather than a new discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a dropped order but the house revives it. What has been said before cannot be repeated. The debate simply continues. Those who have not spoken on the motion may speak, but those who have already spoken may not speak again.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would like to ask another question with regard to the revival of a motion of this kind. Is any latitude to be given as to the time within which a motion is to be revived? Would it be the first day thereafter on which the Speaker is in the chair and a motion is made for the house to go into supply, or may it be revived at any time before the end of the session?

Mr. SPEAKER: The notice is given; then the motion is called and it is for the house to decide if it will carry or not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This debate was discontinued on Wednesday; it could not be continued on Thursday or Friday because on those days Your Honour left the chair automatically. Should the motion to revive the amendment necessarily come on the first day we seek to go into supply thereafter, or may it come at any time during the remainder of the session?

Mr. BENNETT: I should think it would be the first day, as a matter of practice.

Mr. SPEAKER: May says:

To replace a dropped order of the day upon the notice paper, a motion is made before the commencement, or after the close, of public business, to appoint the order for a subsequent day.

I must give a broad application to this practice; the motion should be presented at the earliest moment, because it is liable to be dropped again. Of course, when the motion is made for the revival of this dropped order it is for the house to say whether or not it wishes the question to be revived. The house may vote either for or against the motion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would like to point out that on Friday evening I made it quite clear that with regard to this motion the government had no intention of opposing its revival; I simply intended to bring to the attention of the house the anomaly which now has arisen with reference amongst other things, to the future date when the motion might be revived.

Mr. BENNETT: I think it important that we should have this matter settled because, as Your Honour has already intimated, it is a question which undoubtedly may arise frequently during the remainder of this session. If a substantive motion to revive is necessary it seems only necessary for me to point out that, since the government has a majority, the motion never may be revived and therefore could not be dealt with, which is exactly the opposite to what His Honour the Speaker now intimates should be done. That was one of the reasons which influenced us last year in adopting the practice suggested by Your Honour, instead of reviving it by a substantive motion, as perhaps the Prime Minister will recall, in order that no question might arise with respect to the fact that the Speaker had automatically left the chair in the meantime and it would seem senseless to move an amendment which would prevent him from leaving the chair when he had already left it. The suggestion of Your Honour on that occasion was that someone on this side of the house, if he so desired, when the Speaker was about to leave the chair on Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday could move an amendment in terms similar to those of the amendment previously moved. The reason that the amendment could be in the same terms was the reason just given by Your Honour, namely that the house had not decided the question. Once the house decides the question it may not again be heard during the current session, but the house not having decided it and there being no expression of the will of the house with respect to the matter, as the authorities put it, it was thought desirable that we should revive the motion by moving a new motion. The Prime Minister has pointed out, and I believe this was in the mind of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning), that if the motion is revived we are reviving something which has been disposed of by the house already through the Speaker leaving the chair automatically; therefore the motion that the Speaker do not leave the chair is no longer one which could be intelligently placed before the house with respect to that matter. The ruling of last year certainly offered a logical solution of the difficulty, namely that the opposition might, if it so desired, move a substantive motion in terms exactly similar to those of the motion which had lapsed by reason of the Speaker leaving the chair at six o'clock and supply being carried on next day by reason of the fact that the Speaker left the chair automatically. That is the real difficulty as I see it, and I think we should arrive at a solution which will avoid inconvenience, difficulty or acrimonious misunderstandings in the future.

Mr. SPEAKER: These seems to be an agreement with regard to the continuation of this debate, so I will ask hon. gentlemen to allow me to write my ruling in this case. At all events, my ruling to-day is substantially the same as that given last year.

Mr. DUNNING: If the suggestion of the leader of the opposition were followed it would bring up the difficulty as to speakers once again. If the motion is a new motion, which I understand was the case under last year's procedure, I take it that a new debate opens immediately in which those who participated in the former debate could take part, and because of that fact we might have an endless succession of speakers. The method suggested to-day by Your Honour avoids that difficulty; the motion for revival brings about the continuation of a former debate, which preserves the order of speaking just as though the debate had not been interrupted.

Mr. SPEAKER: Last year the hon. member for Halton,—I speak from memory,—when he rose to speak, said he intended to present a motion similar to the one which had been dropped, but I have no recollection that he did make the motion; there was an agreement on both sides that there should be a revival of the debate. If I may be allowed to do so I will give my ruling in writing, so as to fix what seems to me sound jurisprudence.

Mr. BENNETT: The Journals of the house of Monday, May 14, 1928, at page 403, show:

Mr. Anderson (Halton), seconded by Mr. Stirling, moved in amendment thereto:

That all the words after the word "that" be stricken out and the following substituted therefor:—

"in the opinion of this house the necessary action should be taken by the government forthwith to effectively control the importation into Canada either on sale, or on consignment, of natural products of a class or kind produced in Canada, under conditions which prejudicially or injuriously affect, or threaten to prejudicially or injuriously affect the interests of Canadian producers.

That was a motion which had been moved by the hon. member Victoria (Mr. Tolmie).

Mr. CAHAN: I do not know whether it would be possible for Your Honour to modify your decision of last session. At that time I thought that it was a slightly erroneous decision in view of the precedents which I had then gathered together. These precedents showed that the motion and the proposed amendment thereto on the next day on which a motion was necessary to go into supply were entered by the Clerk of the House upon the orders for that day. In the minds of previous speakers of this house it was considered as a motion which had been temporarily superseded and which revived of itself without any further substantive motion. I have not the precedents with me to-day, but at that time I thought there was just a shade of difference between them and what I understood to be Your Honour's decision on that occasion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As Your Honour has thought it well to give your decision in writing, I would suggest to my hon. friends opposite that we might continue with the debate of last week without at present committing the house either way as to what the future practice will be.

Mr. BENNETT: When we rose the last day we discussed this matter I had the floor, and perhaps I can proceed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think so.

Mr. BENNETT: Unless it is desired to call it six o'clock. I must say that I have not my papers with me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it would be only fair, Mr. Speaker, to take up some other matter between now and six o'clock, and resume this debate at eight o'clock this evening. I would suggest that we take up one or two of the resolutions relating to railway matters.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ACQUISITION OF THE QUEBEC, MONTREAL AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY

The house in committee on Bill No. 72, respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway.—Mr. Dunning.—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Authority to purchase.

Mr. DUNNING: This bill has been called because it is one of those which has been before the railway committee and has been thoroughly examined there.

Mr. BENNETT: I was not here when the matter was last considered, but there appears to be some opinion that the road is not worth $6,000,000. There seems to be an impression that a report was made on a previous occasion fixing a much lower price.

Mr. DUNNING: I am sorry that I have not my papers with me at the present moment, but I have sent for them. The members of the railway committee, who are also members of this committee, will remember that the railway officers who undertook all negotiations with respect to the acquisition of this particular property gave the particulars as to the replacement value of the property and the value of the equipment. I may say that the value of the equipment is much above the normal equipment value which would be required for a road of this mileage, and it had a very important bearing upon the price factor. With a small extension which can be arranged for in the future, this line will provide the Canadian National Railways with a water grade line down the south shore of the St. Lawrence, and will obviate the necessity of considerable double tracking on the existing main line through what is the third most congested section, from a traffic point of view, on the whole Canadian National Railways.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the mileage of this line?

Mr. STEVENS: The schedule of the act says that the whole comprises a railway mileage of 191 miles.

Mr. DUNNING: That is the figure I had in mind. The great economic advantage to the Canadian National is the fact that it will save double tracking over a severe grade on the main line. This line formerly belonged to the Delaware and Hudson and a water grade will be secured which can be connected with the existing main line at a point past the summit of the grade for which double tracking

would be necessary if this line were not acquired. This line traverses a very important and quickly developing industrial area south of the St. Lawrence river from Montreal to Sorel, and when the bill was before the house previously I gave the names and the populations of the different towns through which it passes. The officers of the Canadian National consider this a good buy from the point of view of railway economics in connection with the national system.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the minister know what weight of steel is laid?

Mr. DUNNING: I am sorry I have not that information.

Mr. BENNETT: We are paying $31,000 per mile for the road.

Mr. DUNNING: Perhaps we had better let this stand in the meantime. The information was given in committee that the amount of equipment is far in excess of the amount normally involved in such a line. The equipment purchases made by the Delaware and Hudson for this line had to do with that company's car relationship in Canada, and the equipment is an important factor in the matter. I shall be glad, if my hon. friend desires to press the matter to allow the bill to stand.

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. DUNNING: The whole matter was very thoroughly discussed in the railway committee:

Mr. BENNETT: It is about $31,000 a mile for the line?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: One would like to know what weight of steel is used, what type of locomotive, and whether or not the roadbed is in fair condition.

Mr. DUNNING: The roadbed is in fair, but not good, condition. The equipment is in excellent condition. I will get the information for my hon. friend.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of Bill No. 130, to amend the Canadian National Railways Act.

[Mr. Dunning.]

He said: As I explained in response to a question when the bill was introduced, it seeks to make a number of minor amendments to the Canadian National Railways Act, amendments which are made necessary by references which were rather mixed up in the revision of the statutes but which will become clear to anyone reading the sections which are designed to correct the errors. There is, however, one important provision which is contained in section 2 of the bill. It can be dealt with probably more intelligently in committee of the whole than at this stage of the bill. Briefly, it seeks to make available to the Canadian National Railways the provisions of the Expropriation Act, and as it will be of some interest to my legal friends in the house, I can say that the object of it is to endeavour to secure a uniform procedure in connection with large matters of expropriation which, from the point of view of the Canadian National, can be more conveniently carried on through the exchequer court, than by the means available in various parts of the country. As is well known, the exchequer court can, in minor cases, delegate to a district court or other judge an investigation, but by this amendment it will be possible, in large cases, to make available the machinery of the exchequer court. In looking over the debates at the time when the Canadian National Railways Act was originally passed, I gather that there was then a very substantial desire to make available that machinery, but the matter was not pressed and the ordinary provisions of the Railway Act were made available. After looking into the matter with some degree of thoroughness, I am of opinion that, as regards large expropriations such as are sometimes involved in matters connected, for instance, with the Montreal terminals and so forth, the exchequer court is better machinery than would otherwise be available. For the information of the house I may say that such expropriations as have taken place in Montreal recently have been taken under the Government Railways Act by the minister in order to make available the provisions of the exchequer court procedure instead of the ordinary procedure which would be available in such cases. I would suggest that all these various features can be better dealt with in the committee stage of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT: It must be a matter of gratification to the minister that he has in this bill settled one question, that is, who brought in the act for the consolidation of the Canadian National railways. There is no question about that because he will admit that

the statute is the Canadian National Railways Act of 1920 and at least the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was not in power at that time. So we know from the government itself who consolidated the national railways, who provided the machinery by which the consolidation was carried out, and this act is to make certain that other roads will be brought within the scope of that act. There is just one difficulty about expropriations through the excehquer court—

Mr. DUNNING: Before my hon. friend leaves that point, he will admit there is a great deal of difference between the authorization in spirit and the authorization in practice.

Mr. BENNETT: I thank the hon. gentleman, because otherwise my statement might have been incomplete. He will recall that the proceedings in the Privy Council were not terminated until after the right hon. gentleman had accepted office.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad my hon. friend brings up that point, because I have looked into it and I find that the decision of the Privy Council was given after we had consolidated the roads under the act, and not before.

Mr. BENNETT: All I can say is I do not think the right hon. gentleman can be exactly correct. I think the present government passed the order in council providing for it, but if the decision in the Privy Council had gone against the country, the consolidation would have been made impossible.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The question before the Privy Council was simply a point of law. We had appointed Sir Henry Thornton and the consolidation had taken place under an order in council we passed before the Privy Council had decided the point of law.

Mr. BENNETT: I never like to contradict without having the record beside me, but I happen to recall the summer in which the decision was given, because I heard it given in the Privy Council, and I think Sir Henry Thornton was not appointed until after I returned from England.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will give my hon. friend the exact date.

Mr. BENNETT: At any rate, we have settled one question: namely. that the act was passed in 1920, and the further fact that this government passed the order in council under that statute, without the statute the order in council was impossible, so at least—

Mr. DUNNING: The act was a dead letter until the order in council was passed.

Mr. BENNETT: Without the act there could be no order in council.

Mr. DUNNING: And without the order in council there could be no Canadian National system.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, the system, but no consolidation of it. The system existed in the statute, but the railways were not consolidated until the order in council was passed. The hon. gentleman may say that he is the stepfather of the enterprise, but the father was the statute passed in 1920.

There is one thing I have to say about the use of the exchequer court. It works a great injustice against people in a small way in life, who are really unable to grapple with the situation. This session I have received several letters amongst them one this morning which I received from British Columbia in connection with the expropriation by the government of property near North Vancouver for a rifle range. The exchequer court took proceedings and arrived at certain conclusions. These people were told that they could have $75 for a lot of land which cost them, with taxes since they bought it, several hundred dollars. They say: We are wholly incapable financially of embarking in exchequer court litigation. The provisions of the old Railway Act enabled one right in the community, with the aid of a district court judge, to carry on these proceedings, and it could be done without the aid of a solicitor at all. Frequently the owner himself presented his case, brought in his witnesses, and had it disposed of. Certainly I have known very great injustice to be done where people are placed in a position such as contemplated by this bill. I agree entirely with what the minister has said with respect to large matters in a city like Montreal, for instance, but might it not be desirable to say, "Where the sum tendered by the government for the land taken does not exceed" so many dollars,, so as to make clear the question of juridiction. I am only throwing out this suggestion at the moment for the consideration of the minister, because on the second reading of the bill I am not going to take up the time of the house needlessly, but when it comes back to the house I should like to discuss that phase, having regard to

the cases that have been brought to my attention recently in connection with the Vancouver rifle range, where if the information that I have received is correct, considerable hardship has been done to the owners of property in that locality.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the second time.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY—SIMCOE POSTMASTERSHIP

By unanimous consent the house resumed from Wednesday, April 17, consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Robb for supply, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Stewart (Leeds):

That all the words after the word "that" in the motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"In the opinion of this house the Postmaster General has acted in a most arbitrary manner and in utter disregard of the letter and the spirit of the Civil Service Act in connection with the recent appointment of a postmaster at the town of Simcoe."

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at six o'clock last Wednesday I was directing attention to the fact that under the provisions of the Civil Service Act any objection to a particular candidate named by the Civil Service Commission must come from the deputy minister, not from the minister himself. That fact was referred to by the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) in one of his public addresses. But, as he said the other day, he was prepared—as indeed he must be under our institutions—to accept responsibility for the actions of his deputy. I merely say that to close the matter with which I was then dealing.

But before I proceed more particularly with the resolution introduced by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Stewart) I desire to point out that in Le Droit, under date of April 20, 1929, an article appears in which it is alleged that the attack against the Postmaster General is being made virtually because he happens to be of French origin. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say how strongly we resent such a statement in the public press of this country A free translation of the article—which I will not read in full lest it should empty the house—would be this in part:

These attacks need hardly surprise us since Mr. Veniot himself has done all he could to provoke them. It is a crime for certain people to see that constitution is respected, to see that the two official languages are on a footing of equality, and that the field of action of the French language is extended a little. We do not fear to say that certain people object to the father of the bilingual postage stamp more than to the minister who is charged with favouritism.

Could anything be more injurious to the peace and happiness of the commonwealth, could anything be more subversive of the unity of this Dominion than the publication of an article of this character—it is signed by Charles Gautier—in which it is asserted that the minister because he is the father of the bilingual postage stamp is being attacked in this house, when as a matter of fact the true reason for our criticism is his inefficiency in the conduct of his department. This is another passage from the same article:

All this noise about certain appointments or dismissals is like a tempest in a teapot; it is the madness of fanaticism against a minister who is convinced that the sun shines for everybody, and acts accordingly. A minister who, like Mr. Veniot, tries to put in practice the letter as well as the spirit of the constitution deserves the support of all political and national elements.

Those of us who recall a report of a speech by the Postmaster General that appeared in the public press of Montreal—in regard to which the hon. minister stated that he had been inaccurately reported—find here a reflection of exactly what was said on that occasion. Here is an appeal being made once more to racial origin and to political predilections, the kind of appeals of which the Postmaster General is a past master, and we resent with all the strength of which we are capable this editorial allegation that the effort on the part of the opposition to bring to the attention of the Canadian people the gross inefficiency that at the present time characterizes the conduct of the Post Office department is in any sense influenced by the fact that the minister happens to be of French-Acadian origin. It would make no difference to us from what race he is sprung. We are not dealing with the man, we are not dealing with his racial origin, we are not dealing with his religion; we are dealing with the Postmaster General, with the man who has been entrusted by the Canadian people, through the Prime Minister, with the conduct of a great department of the government, and if in the conduct of that department it becomes necessary for those who sit to the left of the Speaker to draw attention to the gross inefficiency of his administration,

we shall resent such a construction being put upon our criticism, and we shall ask the Canadian people for their judgment as to whether this sort of thing which has been going on for the last ten years is to be continued, whether our efforts to bring about the correction of abuses and maladministration are to be frustrated at every turn by an appeal to the bilingual issue. It is time that such appeals be frowned upon, it is time that some more effective answer was made to the charges directed against the hon. gentleman's inefficient administration of his department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment to the motion to go into committee of supply which deals with the case of the appointment of a postmaster at Simcoe. With that I propose briefly to deal, for it is now apparent not only from the number of cases which have been brought forward in this house, but from the letters which every member to your left is receiving as to what is happening in his district, now that attention has been focussed upon the Postmaster General's department, that a general motion only will satisfy the people in this regard. It is no longer the Simcoe post office; it is every post office where the minister has had an opportunity at the behest of Liberal members to exercise political patronage in this department of the public service.

Let me for a moment draw the attention of the house to the fact that in the effort to promote a decent public service and bring it under the control of the Civil Service Commission many, many difficulties were experienced. Those difficulties were raised not any more by the Liberal party than by the Conservative party. But it was fortunate that at the particular moment the Union government was in power and found it possible to place upon the statute books legislation that enabled us to have a civil service so far as possible free from politics. What was the purpose of the Civil Service Act? The purpose, first of all, was to promote efficiency in the public service and, secondly, to assure continuity in office so long as the civil servant did not interfere in the politics of the country, and thereby give a dignity to the service of the crown that had been denied in days gone by.

I repeat what I said the other day, that at the election of 1911 a very large number of the public servants believed that because the Liberal party had been in power so long they were perfectly within their rights in taking an active part in the elections of that year. They did take an active part, and they paid the price by being removed from office. I well recall the circumstances under which Mr.—now Sir Robert—Borden's government passed an order in council providing that if members of the House of Commons would certify over their signatures that given individuals in their communities had been offensive partisans at the election, they should be removed from office. I also recall that the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier approved of the general terms of that order. Action was taken accordingly, and when last session the hon. member for Willow Bunch (Mr. Donnelly) was able to stand up in this house and say of his own knowledge that he believed a given person to have been guilty of political partisanship, you will recollect, sir, that at once I said the incident was ended so far as we were concerned. He was absolutely within the order in council, and the postmaster who he said, of his own knowledge, had been guilty of offensive partisanship undoubtedly must have expected to be relieved from office. Why? Because it has always been contended, before the Civil Service Act was passed at all, that any servant of the crown who saw fit to take part in elections publicly must be prepared to yield up his position if the fortunes of war went against him. The Right Hon. Mr. Fielding, former Minister of Finance, laid down a principle—I do not know that I can repeat the exact words—that any person appointed to a public position, as a servant of the crown, must first of all discharge his duties as such. He was not thereby debarred from taking an interest in public affiairs, or to exercise his franchise if he so desired, but he must not interfere actively in the politics of the country, for, by so doing he ceased to be a servant of the public.

This Civil Service Act with all its defects, as we all must realize, was made possible in its present form when a union government was in power. It is the duty of all of us, whether we sit on the right or the left of the Speaker, or whether we constitute a group of lesser numbers than those who sit directly to the right or to the left, to assist, in my judgment, in promoting the efficiency of that act. It should be maintained in all its power and efficiency, and no government in power to-day —and they may not be to-morrow, meaning by to-morrow some future time—would dare say that the act should be repealed. This act should not be tampered with, and that is why we as a party are taking the strong stand that we are taking to-day. It was held by the privy council many years ago, in a case that came up from Australia—and the member from Marquette (Mr. Glen) will remember

it—that no public servant could be dismissed from office without cause being assigned and a reason given, to enable him to defend himself and his reputation from all that is involved in being dismissed from office without an opportunity to be heard. Only the other day you will recall that General Booth was removed from office by the high council of the Salvation Army. An injunction was applied for and granted by Mr. Justice Eve. Why? Because it is an elementary rule of our law that a man who occupies a position such as he did must not be removed from office unless he has had an opportunity to be heard, and has been given the reasons for which it is proposed to dismiss him. Mr. Justice Eve granted the injunction.

I recall, as I stand here, the case of an Indian agent dismissed by order in council, and he does not know to this day why he was removed. But I also recall, too, that Mr. —now Sir Robert—Borden laid down the rule that no man should be removed from office without having an opportunity to defend himself against the charges laid against him.

Many of the cases that were read the other day by the Postmaster General are cases in which men were active partisans. They had to be removed from office because of that. I recall two cases in the city in which I live, one of them, I believe, a collector of customs, the other occupying a position in the land office. Both tendered their resignations immediately after the election, because they had gone out and taken an active part in the election. The postmasters named by the Postmaster General the other day were dismissed because they had taken an active part in the election. Any man who went out and took an active part in the elections of 1925 and 1926, whether he be a Liberal or a Conservative, must have known at least the consequence of his own act. He must now expect the consequences and give up the office which he holds, because he has seen fit to participate actively in a political campaign rather than give his service to the state in the way in which I have indicated.

Now, look what has happened in this country. For sixteen months, from October to February, the Postmaster General on an average has dismissed one postmaster a day. That is the return to this parliament. That is his record, one a day. And what is more, Sir, let us turn to his record in connection with the Civil Service Act; take the Department of Justice, the Department of Trade and Commerce, the Department of Finance; take any of the other departments and compare the number of cases in which the Civil Service Act has been overridden with the number of times it has been overridden by the Postmaster General. You had the figures given you the other day. Practically as many as all the other departments put together. The Postmaster General has seen fit to overrule the Civil Service Act of this country to that extent. Was that accident? Does anyone think that all those men were dismissed, as mere accidents?

And that brings me to this case from Simcoe. I dealt with the facts the other day, and now it would seem to me the situation is simply this: a vacancy; applications for the appointment; a decision by the Civil Service Commission; a rejection by the deputy minister. And then you ask: was that rejection warranted on any ground of high public policy, or by the statute itself? And, unless you can affirmatively answer that question then indeed you fail. If the Postmaster General, through his deputy, rejected, without warrant, then on the ground of high public policy—meaning by that the efficiency of the post office service —this motion is warranted and it should be adopted by this house.

What are the facts? Without going into them in further detail to-night, it is only necessary to point out that, first of all, you have an amputation case. You have a case in which the disabled soldier was a soldier who had suffered the loss of both his limbs below the knees, one below the ankle and the other between the ankle and the knee. The amputation cases are not easily taken care of in this country. It is not easy to re-establish the amputation case. It is not easy to provide positions in the public service for those who have suffered an amputation of both legs. There are a limited number of positions which they can fill. They are very limited in number. In some instances they are able to operate elevators with but one arm, or with one leg. You find them doing work of that kind. But there is a limitation upon the work that they can do, and that is the reason, I take it, that the statute provided for a preference being given to the disabled soldier over the ordinary case of the returned man. His disability gave him a preference over his fellow, the man who fought side by side with him, the man who came out of the war whole in body while he came out with his legs gone, or his arms gone, or suffered a disability recognized by pension. He then receives at the hands of the law, under the statutes of this country, a preference over the man who came out of the war whole. This man had a preference given to him by law, and the Civil Service Commission in reckoning that preference gave him the posi-

tion. And why? We have it that Doctor Roche and Mr. Tremblay both saw the applicant. They realized that he was fit to discharge the duties of postmaster at Simcoe. The Postmaster General says "I say he is not. This man could not handle mail bags, could not do the work that I think he should be able to do". And yet that excuse was not brought up until long after he had been awarded the office by the action of the Civil Service Commission itself. Was it warranted? Is there any question but that there was political interference which brought about this situation? Is there any doubt about it? In making his defence the other evening the Postmaster General referred to certain things which took place at the meeting in Simcoe. I hold in my hand a copy of the Simcoe Reformer of October 18, 1928, a Liberal paper—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

An hon. MEMBER: It is independent.

Mr. BENNETT: I confess that I am not in a position to state with any degree of authority; I assumed it to be a Liberal paper from its name, but names do not always correctly interpret political opinions. The other evening the Postmaster General said that Mr. Whittaker seemed rather convinced by the story told by the Postmaster General in his speech at Simcoe. According to this paper Mr. Whittaker is quoted as follows:

If Mr. Veniot is correctly reported, what he says absolutely untrue. His motive for attributing these statements to me is very clear, in that such a declaration on my part would absolve Mr. Veniot and his followers from all suspicion of patronage in my case. I had not intended to say anything more for publication about my side of the question, but in view of this absolute fabrication I feel compelled to make public what actually happened in this regard from the beginning, and to expose certain untruths contained in Mr. Veniot's address at Simcoe.

Last summer, after word of the appointment of Mr. Bowyer to the postmastership had come through, I was approached by a member of the local Liberal executive, presumably delegated by W. H. Taylor, M.P., the Liberal member for Norfolk, and was offered a proposition somewhat as follows: The local Liberals, backed by the member, were to agree to lend me their support in securing an appointment at Brantford, Ont. In return I was to promise to maintain a discreet silence in regard to my treatment at the hands of the Postmaster General and not to be seen conversing in public with any person known to be of the Conservative stripe. In addition, I was to be bound by the conditions of a letter which they were to submit for my signature and which was to be made public prior to the public announcement of my appointment. The purport of this letter was to the effect: (1) That I had no grievance against the local Liberal member or any of his followers. (2) That I was now satisfied that I would not have been physically able to handle the position of Postmaster at Simcoe. (3) That I felt duly grateful to the postal department for their foresight in refusing to allow me, in spite of myself, to assume a position the duties of which they considered, in the kindness of their hearts, to be far to onerous for a man in my position.

After due consideration of the principles and ethics involved in this proposition, I, as an ex-soldier of His Majesty's forces, could not bring myself to be a party to a dishonourable scheme of this kind. Consequently my answer to their plan of barter could only be a flat refusal.

Nothing further happened in regard to the purchase of my silence until the evening before Mr. Veniot's meeting in Simcoe. It was the night of October 3, when my friend Sam Morris of Port Dover, also an amputation case, was approached by A. A. Winter, K.C.S, of Simcoe. They were attending a meeting in Port Dover in connection with proposed improvements to the harbour, at which Hon. J. C. Elliott, Minister of Public Works, was present. In the course of their conversation, Mr. Winter stated that the local Liberal party were prepared to secure for me any job which I would be able to handle, and at this time suggested that Mr. Morris get in touch with me and arrange an interview with the government party the following night in Simcoe to discuss the possibility of finding me a position.

Accordingly the interview was arranged through Mr. Morris, but for some reason Mr. Winter dropped out, and we went to Mr. Veniot's meeting with no definite appointment in prospect. At the conclusion of the meeting, Mr. Morris accompanied me to the platform, where we secured the attention of Mr. Taylor, M.P., who at once brought up my refusal of the Brantford proposition. I reiterated my stand in this regard. He then expressed his willingness to remove the conditons of acceptance referred to above, since he admitted being resposible for having them attached to the proposal.

It was at this time that Mr. Veniot approached us, and after shaking hands with us, as a matter of course, he stated that he would help me get the position. He remarked that I was not to consider the post office episode a personal matter and that he bore me no hard feelings. This was all that was said between us, and, after shaking hands again, Mr. Veniot bade me good-bye.

The statement which he attributes to me as having been uttered at this meeting constitutes an absolute falsehood and a deliberate attempt to lead the public astray, as well as a contemptible effort to justify his position by shifting for onus for his high-handed conduct from his own shoulders.

Before departing, Mr. Taylor said that we would have a talk about the matter of the Brantford position. Ten days have elapsed and I have heard nothing more about it. In any event I could not conscientiously become a party to such an arrangement, which savors of the same political patronage as has permeated the entire case. I wash my hands entirely of all dealings with the men who, in my heart, I believe have been guilty of the basest treachery to a man who fought for his country and sacrificed both limbs on the fields of France.

I will not read the rest of the article, which is a discussion of what took place at Simcoe; I am not concerned with that at the moment. This is the statement made by Mr. Whittaker in reply to the remarks of the Postmaster General. We all remember the kind of letter the Postmaster General wrote in connection with another case, in which he left out the important facts. Asked why he did not state those facts as they were; asked why he was willing to write something which he knew to be untrue he said he did not desire to hurt anyone's feelings. What confidence can we place in the word of a minister who writes such a letter as that? I put that question to this house, and there are hundreds of people throughout Canada to-night asking the same thing, men and women who have read the debate, men and women who hold small offices as postmasters and postmistresses throughout our rural communities; they are asking themselves that question to-night just as I am putting it to you. Heretofore it always has been the rule that when we had such a letter as was produced the other evening over the signature of a minister of the crown, we could rely upon it as representing the facts, but we now have a minister of the crown saying it was not true, that he knew it was not true and that he wrote the letter in that way for some purpose other than the real reason appearing on its face. I say that conduct such as that does merit the disapproval of the Canadian people through their representatives in this parliament.

I have not had an opportunity to look up the records, but some effort has been made in that direction in order to see if there ever was another case such as that, and so far as I have been able to find out there never was another. There it is. Some of my hon. friends who have followed the debates in other countries will remember that in one case in England a minister of the crown was peremptorily dismissed by his Prime Minister because there appeared to be some suspicion of a lack of frankness on his part. Hon. members may recall that within the last few years one minister of the crown resigned his office, great though it was, because of some suspicion attaching to the attitude he had taken with respect to a public matter, and those who have followed affairs in India will recall that a prime minister dismissed from office a minister of the crown who had given a letter to the public under circumstances which raised some suspicion as to the bona fides under which it had been done. We in Canada sometimes follow a looser practice and allow ourselves to be deluded by outside considerations. With the facts as stated I have no hesitation in asserting that Mr. Whittaker would have been postmaster of Simcoe to-night if some one had not interfered for political reasons.

Let us see what that interference was. There is the statute—not the regulation—which says that the applicant must be a bona fide resident of the locality; that was read to this house the other afternoon and I will not read it again. Mr. Bowyer did not reside nearer to Simcoe than two miles from Hamilton. He was assessed on a piece of property in Simcoe, but his letter clearly indicates that in his opinion he at least was not residing in Simcoe at that time. There is the statute; the inspector found him at Mount Albion; the other gentleman sent out to investigate found him there also. Therefore I say we have no satisfactory answer to the question which hon. gentlemen are asking themselves in this house: Was the rejection warranted? That is the question which must be answered; everything else sinks into insignificance. Stripping this case of everything else we have just one question to answer: "Was the rejection of Mr. Whittaker warranted?" Everything was regular up to that point; the vacancy, the advertisement, the application, the investigation, the appointment to office as far as the Civil Service Commission could do it, the report that he was physically fit, the inspection, the visit to Ottawa by the applicant and the rejection by the Deputy Postmaster General, who, you will recall, the other day in another case which was dealt with by the Postmaster General pointed out that he took a certain action because the minister told him to do so. That is part of the record. As I say, we have the rejection by the Deputy Postmaster General, and the only question this house can ask is very simple. It is this: Was that rejection warranted? When the members of this house vote upon this motion they vote yea or nay to that quetion, "Was the rejection warranted"? Was the Postmaster General warranted in rejecting this young man who had suffered two amputations and who walked up and down the corridors of this building, parading himself before the Postmaster General in order to demonstrate his ability to walk without the aid of a cane. He sold his business to obtain the better job. He points out that he was receiving a pension for his disability; he was within that favoured, ultra-preferred class. I ask the members of the house, sitting as judges, whether that rejection was warranted? Is there one of us who is free from political bias who would say that upon those facts the rejection was warranted? That

is what we must vote upon; that is what the issue is; that is what this amendment to the resolution to go into supply means.

When we find the public journals endeavouring to inflame the public mind by making the appeal to forty per cent of the population of this country that the attack upon the Postmaster General is being made because he is of French origin, we say that that is an insult to the house, and we on this side of the house will continue to do our duty. We make that answer to this and all similar cases. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) can make some other answer to his constituents in Regina and elsewhere, but we will stand for even-handed justice for every man and woman in this country regardless of race or religion.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. gentleman's followers in Saskatchewan are now going in the directly opposite direction.

Mr. BENNETT: I am glad the hon. minister said that, because the only report I ever saw was the report of a public speech made by the Premier, Mr. Gardiner, himself in Saskatchewan and to which I directed the minister's attention last year.

Mr. DUNNING: I shall be glad to send my hon. friend a copy.

Mr. BENNETT: I shall be glad to see it. As the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) is now in his seat I would ask him to define to the house, in order that it may not be said in the remote sections of the constituencies of this country that appeals are being made to racial animosities and prejudices, what the constitutional rights of the French and English are under the constitution with respect to bilingualism. I ask him to define that so that there will be no misunderstanding. It is the duty of the Attorney General of Canada to do that.

The article in Le Droit says that the Postmaster General is being attacked because he is the father of the bilingual postage stamp. Before supply is granted I want the Minister of Justice to define the constitutional rights of minorities and majorities, and then it will be seen that there never has been a departure by the Conservative party from those rights as established by the constitution. It will be remembered by those who know the political history of this country that the Conservative party, because of a judgment of the privy council defining the rights of minorities, went down to defeat and almost suffered extinction at the hands of the electorate. Those are the facts, and it is time that this sort of thing was discontinued, that efforts to make political capital out of such statements in the by-ways and hedges of the remote sections of the country be stopped.

When the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Canada has defined what the position is in law; when he has defined the constitutional rights with respect to bilingual postage stamps and other matters of that kind, then he will find that no voice has been raised against the enjoyment to the full of the rights of all men and women under the constitution, be they majorities or minorities. The old red herring has been dragged across the trail—the old effort at which hon. gentlemen opposite are past masters; the effort which has served them so well in days gone by but which will not continue to serve them again. The record will be placed upon Hansard to show that there is no doubt that there has never been a time when this has been the case. It has been said within the shadow of parliament that an attack is being made on the Postmaster General for one purpose only, and in the discharge of our constitutional duty we must point out these facts.

This is a very serious matter to those of us who have been endeavouring as best we can during the last year to keep down such agitations to stop them whenever we have seen them, and to endeavour to promote unity, harmony, respect and regard for the constitutional rights of all peoples in this country. When a statement like this appears in the public press and is allowed to go uncontradicted it is taken as being admitted, and gathers force and strength as it travels along.

But that is not an answer to the question. Was the rejection warranted? I have heard no words from the Postmaster General which would establish before a responsible judge or jury the fact that it was warranted. It is upon that question that we will presently vote. This resolution is limited to the Simcoe post office, but there are many other cases which will be dealt with before supply is granted to the Post Office Department. We will vote upon this resolution and presently upon a general resolution, in the public interest, and which touches the administration of the post office, declaring that the utter disregard of the Civil Service Act, and gross partisanship in dismissals to the extent of one per day for sixteen months by the Postmaster General merits the condemnation of this housse.

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, first of all I desire to refer to some of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat

(Mr. Bennett). I hope he will pardon me if I think that the greater portion of his remarks have perhaps no bearing whatever upon the resolution which is now before the house.

He made a statement at the beginning of his remarks with regard to the censure which should be placed upon a certain newspaper for saying something which did not have a tendency to promote harmony and unity among the peoples of this country. I am going to leave it to the house and to the country as to whether the remarks with which the hon. gentleman prefaced his address would have the tendency of promoting harmony and unity among the peoples of this country.

Because my time is limited I desire to refer first to what the hon. gentleman said in his remarks the other evening. I read his statement with a good deal of care, and I must say in this connection that I am not interested in making a defence of the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot), because, in my humble opinion, Canada has never had, among the excellent postmasters general who have presided over the department, a gentleman who has conducted the affairs of that department with greater efficiency and with more regard for public service than my colleague the present Postmaster General has done and is doing to-day. I feel that I should make some reference to the remarks made the other evening by the hon. gentleman when he referred to my hon. friend the member for Norfolk-Elgin (Mr. Taylor), and said that he was going to show his connection with this particular matter. I will read what he said: It appears at page 1671 of Hansard:

> But the Civil Service Commission had no knowledge of it.

That was the question of Mr. Bowyer's entitlement.

> The minister said he had; and why did the minister intervene? Is not this the fact? The member for that riding, as I shall presently show—

And as he never did show.

> —and the Liberal organization in that county, said, "We must interfere and get this job for Bowyer." That is the record, as I shall show in a moment.

I followed his remarks the other evening and I listened with great attention to his remarks to-night with some expectation that he would carry out the promise he then made to show that the hon. member for Norfolk-Elgin or somebody else had interfered in the matter so as to enable Mr. Bowyer to get this position. But though he made that promise, which apparently came so readily to him at the time he was making those remarks, neither in his subsequent remarks the other evening nor in his remarks to-night has he said one word that would by any possibility connect the hon. member for Norfolk-Elgin with endeavouring to obtain this appointment for Mr. Bowyer as is suggested in that paragraph.

Mr. BENNETT: I read what Mr. Whittaker said.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend knows perfectly well that he made a suggestion that he was going to prove what he said, and he carried on with that flourish of trumpets which is so peculiarly his own. But he took great care never to get back to it again during the whole course of his speech.

Mr. BENNETT: Then the hon. member could not have been listening.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Why did he not get back to it? Because evidently he has read the record and he knows that from one end of it to the other there is not the slightest vestige of evidence to bear out that statement.

Mr. BENNETT: It was on the minister's personal file, I suppose.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Whatever file it is on, my hon. friend promised to prove it and he did not do so.

Mr. BENNETT: I read what Whittaker said.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Let us just consider this. What are the facts?

Mr. BENNETT: Excuse me. I regret I interrupted the minister and I shall not do so again.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will try to keep to the facts in connection with what the record shows. I have only forty minutes, but I do not object to interruptions as long as they do not take too much time.

Let us consider the facts. It is only fair to the returned soldier who has not obtained the position, that all the efforts and misrepresentations that may be made from any side of this house shall not prejudice him. Let us get clearly into our minds first of all that this is not a contest between a Liberal and a Conservative. Both applicants were Liberals.

Mr. McGIBBON: One was an official Liberal. The other was not.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not know exactly what my hon. friend means by an official Liberal or an official Conservative, but I know what an artificial Conservative is. In order that there may be no question in regard to the matter, may I call attention to the gentlemen

who recommended Mr. Whittaker. First of all the file shows that he was recommended by Doctor W. A. McIntosh. Anybody who knows anything about the county of Norfolk-Elgin and the town of Simcoe knows that Doctor McIntosh is one of the most influential Liberals in the town of Simcoe, a former president of the Liberal Association and a prospective candidate in that riding in the 1926 election in the Liberal interests.

The next recommendation comes from Mr. Groff, manager of the Bank of Montreal, not an active politician but a man who is known to be a prominent Liberal in the town of Simcoe. Next comes George Williamson, whose letter shows that he was in favour of Whittaker and at the time of writing the letter, dated the 22nd February, 1927, addressed to the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. George Williamson was president of the Liberal Association of the town of Simcoe. Also in the editorial of the Globe newspaper of the 6th October, 1928, it is shown that this young man voted for Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the general election of 1917, and it shows perfectly clearly that, although he was a disabled returned soldier at that time, he was a very enthusiastic Liberal. That is the question with regard to politics, and I cannot understand why, in view of those facts which my hon. friends must know, they would endeavour to argue that the matter is a political one.

What is the next point? I must get it clearly into the minds of every hon. member and everyone in the country that this is not a contest between a returned soldier and a civilian for this office. It is a contest between two returned soldiers, and, if I may say so, two of the most gallant young returned soldiers who were privileged to come back from France and Flanders, because they both served in the war with distinction and with great credit to their country. It is true that Bowyer had to give a wrong name in order to get his enlistment because he was very much under age, being only a little over sixteen. Mr. Whittaker was a little over seventeen. Both enlisted before they were of military age. Unfortunately Whittaker was in France for only eight months when he suffered a very severe injury resulting in the loss of both feet and making him what is known as a double amputation case. The other boy remained in France for, I think, two years, fighting for his country with great gallantry. He came back with honours and medals. Therefore, in that respect the men are equal.

Then comes the question referred to by my hon. friend as to the disability. One man, Whittaker, had a total disability—and this is something that I refer to with some hesitation, but I think the facts should be clearly before the house before we vote on this motion—and he was obtaining the pension that is given to a man who is 100 per cent disability.

Mr. McGIBBON: So much more to his credit.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I was not asking my hon. friend for that suggestion, and I do not know that it is helpful in the discussion. If, however, he insists, I have no objection.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Except that it is taking up my hon. friend's time.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. That is the situation. Very shortly afterwards, in 1918, Whittaker was taken on the staff of the Soldiers Settlement Board. For nearly six years he had a position with that board, receiving somewhere around $1,800 to $2,200 a year.

Mr. PRICE: Which was coming to him, which he received as remuneration for his services.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Surely nobody would suggest that any department of this government would pay anything that was not coming to anyone. He earned it. He was hired and he received that salary. He received it, of course, in addition to his pension, making between $3,400 and $3,500 that he was drawing altogether. He thought that he could better himself by taking a position which he was offered with a jam company in Simcoe, where he received a somewhat smaller salary, perhaps a little less than he was getting with the Soldiers Settlement Board; but he was at home and naturally, I suppose, the expenses were a little less.

I want to follow Mr. Whittaker's statement just a little further because my hon. friend was good enough to refer to the fact that something took place at some meeting at which I was present. The meeting to which he refers took place in the town of Port Dover. I will just read the clause which he read, and then leave it to the judgment of the house to say what was the impression they received from that statement. He said:

> Nothing further happened in regard to the purchase of my silence until the evening before Mr. Veniot's meeting in Simcoe. It was the night of October 3, when my friend Sam Morris of Port Dover, also an amputation case, was approached by A. A. Winter, K.C., of Simcoe. They were attending a meeting in Port Dover

in connection with proposed improvements to the harbour, at which Hon. J. C. Elliott, Minister of Public Works, was present. In the course of their conversation Mr. Winter stated that the local Liberal party were prepared to secure for me any job which I would be able to handle, and at this time suggested that Mr. Winter get in touch with me and arrange an interview with the government party the following night in Simcoe to discuss the possibility of finding me a position.

I do not want to do this young man an injustice but I leave it to the judgment of the house to say if the reasonable inference from that statement was not that these discussions took place at the meeting which I attended, and I want to say positively that no such discussion took place in my presence. I see that my hon. friend disclaims any intention to convey that impression. If so, I accept his intimation. Nothing whatever was said at the meeting I attended with regard to Whittaker obtaining a position or anything of that kind, and I say that whoever drafted that statement did not at all events successfully make it very clear that that was what he intended to convey.

Certain things have been said by him and read by my hon. friend with regard to false statements being made by the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot). I want to refer to certain statements that were made by Mr. Whittaker, and I leave it to the house to judge. Mr. Whittaker made an affidavit, and in his statement he says—I do not know just what to think of this, but it appears in the Globe of the 15th of October:

> As a matter of fact I had owned the business only four months and naturally had not a chance to discover if it were a profitable business. I would never have made any declaration about it if the Civil Service Commission had not advised me that if I wished to show that I was properly re-established—

I think he means "not" properly re-established.

> —it would be necessary for me to take an affidavit to the effect that my business was not paying. Mr. Veniot has now used this affidavit as an instrument to prove that I lost nothing by selling my business. I can only say that if I had not received my notice of appointment as postmaster I still would be the owner of that business, and I am sure that I could have made a success of it.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps my hon. friend who is so ready with his "hears, hears", will listen to the kind of success this man said, in his affidavit, dated April, 24th, 1928. He states:

> (1) In February, 1928, I purchased a monumental stone business believing it to present an opportunity for successful re-establishment.
>
> [Mr. Elliott.]
>
> (2) That I had only a layman's knowledge of said business.
>
> (3) That since entering this business I have steadily depleted my financial resources without any adequate return.
>
> (4) That my experience during the past three months indicates that competition in this business is so keen as to force me either to seek more capital in order to carry on or wind up affairs.
>
> (5) That I see no prospects of securing more capital and I shall be obliged on this account to relinquish said business at a considerable loss.

There you have his affidavit that he could not carry on the business unless he could get more capital, that he saw no prospects of getting more capital, and he must relinquish the business at a considerable loss. Then you have his statement later that he is sure that if he had retained the business he would have made a success of it. All I have to say is that those are his statements, and the house can take them for just what they are worth.

Something has been said with regard to the duties which the postmaster had to perform. Some suggestions have been made by hon. members that the duties of the office were changed after the applications were in, making the duties more onerous than they were formerly, and making the office a class 2B, which it was not before. Perhaps I should give to the house just what was said in that regard. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) says at page 1657 of Hansard:

> And the classification was changed after the application was made.
>
> Mr. Veniot: No. The hon. gentleman is not stating the exact truth. I do not mean that offensively at all.

I know he would not. Then the hon. member for Vancouver Centre goes on:

> But the Postmaster General will admit that the change to class 2B took place after the application was made.

That shows that my hon. friend, who always wants to be fair, while desiring to be fair, at least has a most suspicious mind. I just took the trouble to look the point up. The dismissal of Lawson took place on the 15th of January, 1927. The chief superintendent of the post office service on that date issued this letter to the district superintendent at London:

> The district superintendent is informed that the Postmaster General has authorized the removal from office of Mr. I. D. Lawson, postmaster at Simcoe, in view of incompetency. The office is to be placed for the present under the temporary charge of Mr. Charles E. Kaid, of Simcoe, the transfer to date from the 1st of February, and concurrent with the temporary transfer, the office is to be changed to the grade 2B basis.

That was on the 15th of January, the date of dismissal of the former postmaster, and one month and two days before the advertisements were issued asking for applicants to fill the position that had been vacated. That decides to a certain extent, when it becomes a class 2B office, what the salary is to be. The minimum salary is $2,040 per annum with annual increases of $120, and the advertisement that went out was in accord with that understanding. It also stated that the applicants must be either natural born or naturalized British subjects and residents of Canada for three years, and must possess the ability to perform efficiently the duties of the office. After all, I submit that that is the real test of the kind of postmaster they were trying to get—he must be a postmaster who could efficiently perform the duties of the office.

Next the suggestion was made by my hon. friend, but it was not pressed in his remarks, and so I shall pass over it very briefly, that Bowyer was not a resident of Simcoe. It is quite apparent that when the inspector first went out to make his inspection, Bowyer and his wife were on one of Bowyer's father's farms near Hamilton. Bowyer apparently had not been reestablished to anything like the same extent that Whittaker had been. He reported that Bowyer was not a resident of Simcoe. Now, I appeal to my hon. friend's fairness, if the member for the riding, the Postmaster General, the Deputy Postmaster General and the inspector were trying to make out a case to have Bowyer appointed, would it have been reasonable for the report to have been sent in as it was that Bowyer was resident outside the locality and in the vicinity of Hamilton.

Mr. ARTHURS: They cannot give the inspector all the instructions.

Mr. ELLIOTT: And he cannot have all the wisdom. The inspector gets pretty definite instructions. If my hon. friend will look at the book of instructions issued to each inspector he will find that he has to make these examinations, bearing in mind the class of duties that are to be performed, the amount of mail to be handled, the distance it has to be taken, the number of rural routes to be served, and the handling of the mail bags.

Mr. ARTHURS: Will the hon. minister lay a copy of those instructions on the table?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am sure the Postmaster General will accommodate my hon. friend.

Mr. ARTHURS: Will it be done?

Mr. ELLIOTT: If my hon. friend wishes it.

Mr. ARTHURS: Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT: They are public property. My hon. friend will understand that these are all departmental regulations. I wondered whether my hon. friend's suspicions with regard to residence and to the grade of the post office being changed arose from a naturally suspicious mind, so I obtained the voters' list for the town of Simcoe. It is based on the assessment that was made before applications were called for. I find at page 74 Bowyer's name and his wife's appear as tenants. The fact of the matter is that his father had several farms in the vicinity, and this boy, who perhaps was not quite as efficient as he had been before he went overseas, worked for his father on several of the farms, and his explanation at the time the inspector made his inspection was that he and his wife were during the summer visiting at a farm in the vicinity of Hamilton. The finding is that he was all the time a resident of the town of Simcoe. So I think perhaps that disposes of the question of residence.

Next we come to the question of how these appointments are made, what is required. It will be found that as far back as 1918 an arrangement was made between the Civil Service Commission and the postal department as to appointments to the postal service. On account of the necessity of appointing officials who would be able to perform the duties, which duties were better known to the postal department than to the Civil Service Commission or anybody else, the postal inspectors were to pass upon these various applicants. That is the practice which has been followed since that time. In that connection may I call the attention of the house to the statement made by the chairman of the commission, Doctor Roche, to Mr. Williamson, in a letter of February 24, 1927:

> No doubt you are acquainted with the procedure in filling such positions. The position is locally advertised by the department, applications to be sent in to the district superintendent of the postal service, London. This officer will despatch one of his inspectors—

That is, the district superintendent of postal service at London, will despatch one of his inspectors.

> —to Simcoe on a certain date to interview the applicants, and it largely depends upon the report of the inspector and district superintendent as to who receives the appointment.

In a letter dated February 26, 1927, addressed to Colonel Parkinson, who was then Deputy Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Doctor Roche made a similar statement. He said:

> The commission however largely depends upon the report of the post office inspector and

district superintendent of postal service, who, after interviewing all the applicants, place them in order of merit from the post office standpoint.

And another similar letter appears at page 107 of the file, written to Mr. Beverly Anderson, who had interested himself on behalf of either Mr. Whittaker or Mr. Collver, in which it is stated:

It will largely depend upon the nature of that officer's report as to who will secure the position.

That was the practice, and it was followed in compliance with the regulations. I have the letters here, but as my time is short I will not trouble the house to read them. One is dated February 22, 1918—shortly after the act came into force—and is from Mr. Foran, secretary of the Civil Service Commission, to Doctor Coulter, the answer being dated February 26, 1918. These brought about the arrangement by which the local postal inpectors were to make the examination of the applicants. A postal service inspector did make that examination and reported thereon. The same applies to Mr. Bowyer. In a letter of March 10, 1927, Mr. Foran, secretary of the commission, writing to the superintendent of the postal service at London, says:

Mr. Bowyer is being advised that his application has been transferred to you for the necessary report on his qualifications.

I think the house perhaps has not received from my hon. friend from Leeds or from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition as clear an impression as is desirable that these examinations are not made by the Civil Service Commission's inspectors, but by the inspectors of the postal department.

Now, what is the report? When the report comes in the man placed first on the list is John Alexander Wallace. He had no previous postal experience. He represented Norfolk county in the Dominion parliament from 1921 to 1925, and he served on the board of governors of Toronto university and of the Toronto General Hospital. I think he was the Progressive member for the riding at that time, and I do not believe you could find a man better qualified to make a good postmaster. However, he was a civilian and was passed over. From the standpoint of political advantage to the member, I have no doubt that that would have been the most advantageous appointment to make. He was evidently a man of prominence in the community, but his case never was pressed. The next man reported on was Charles Rex Bowyer. This is the report of the examiner:

[Mr. Elliott.]

Charles Rex Bowyer is a married man, 28 years of age. Has a good education. Resided at Simcoe until about a year ago, but is now living at Mount Albion. Has had no postal experience, but would devote his entire time to the work. Was a student previous to enlistment and since discharge has been farm manager for his father, W. A. Bowyer, and is engaged in looking after some seven or eight farms owned by his father. This applicant states that owing to his being a minor he enlisted under an assumed name, that of C. R. Musgrove, and served twenty-seven months in France with the R.C.H.A. Discharged by reason of demobilization. No physical disability. Is a fine type and impressed me favourably.

The next man is Donald Smith. Then there is the name of Grover C. Murdock. He was not a returned man. He is the next on the list, and Whittaker was only seventh on the list. So that if Bowyer had not been appointed, in all probability one of the other returned men would have come in next instead of Whittaker.

Well, the examination was made, and the report reached the Civil Service Commission in due time. But on account of the difficulty in identifying Bowyer with Musgrove—because that was the name under which he enlisted as he was under age—some considerable time was taken in making sure that he was the same man, and, on February 18, 1928, Mr. Foran, the secretary, addressed this letter to the Deputy Postmaster General. I will just read the last paragraph because it is No. 32 on the file, and the whole letter appears on the file:

I should be glad, therefore, if the department could furnish the commissioners with a definite report, at as early a date as possible, with reference to Mr. Whittaker's physical fitness for this postmastership.

The report comes in a little later, and is dated 5th March, 1928, and is as follows:

When questioned, Mr. Whittaker stated that it would be impossible for him to do any heavy lifting.

If the Simcoe post office were a revenue office, the postmaster could, if necessary, hire an additional clerk to perform the heavy work and in the case of a city office, there would be sufficient other work so that it would be necessary for the postmaster to perform duties of a heavy nature, but, in the case of a 2B office, it is my opinion that what is required is a working postmaster.

His appointment, therefore, would probably make it necessary to add an additional employee to the 2B Simcoe post office.

I find my time passing pretty rapidly, but I want to call attention to this: The notice was issued. Now, what I say is this, that the judgment that was being relied upon by the Civil Service Commission, in making this ap-

pointment, was the judgment of the inspector from London who reported that Whittaker was unable to perform these duties, and you will note—if my hon. friends will be good enough to look at the appointment dated May 29, 1928—that it contains this clause which, I venture to say, will not be found in many notices if in any other; it certainly is not in the appointment when Mr. Bowyer was notified:

(Appointment subject to physical fitness.)

It also calls attention to the fact that:

The deputy head may at any time before the expiration of six months reject any person assigned or appointed to any position under his control or direction, or he may extend the period of probation within which such person may be rejected for another six months; and the cause of rejection, or the reason for extending the period of probation, shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission.

And the ruling of the Department of Justice dated the 9th December, 1919—and I think this is very important; it is on the bottom of the notice that was sent—

Mr. DUNNING: Sent to whom?

Mr. ELLIOTT: To Whittaker. The ruling reads:

If the deputy be reasonably satisfied upon preliminary examination of the person nominated that the latter is unsuitable or not qualified for the duties of the office or employment to which he is assigned, I think he may, if he think it advisable, reject him without entrusting him with the discharge of any duties; otherwise in conceivable cases considerable prejudice to the public service might ensue.

Mr. PRICE: Will the minister permit a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. PRICE: Was Whittaker given an opportunity to show what physical fitness he had to carry on?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I was just hoping that would be the question my hon. friend would ask: Was Whittaker given an opportunity to show what fitness he had to carry on? My contention, Mr. Speaker, is that in view of the report of the inspector who, by arrangement between the Civil Service Commission and the post office, is the inspector upon whose judgment the Civil Service Commission must depend, he never was appointed. What would be the sense, I would ask my hon. friends—

Mr. PRICE: He was recommended by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would ask, what would be the sense in giving him a trial? What would be the sense in giving a trial to a man who had been reported by the competent official as being quite incapable of performing the duties of the office to which he was about to be appointed?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Answer the question.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Why would you take a man who was reported by the inspector as being incapable of performing the duties and give him a six months' period of probation?

I am now going to come to what I think is a complete answer to this resolution. What does the act say? The act says, section 24:

The deputy head may, at any time before the expiration of six months, reject any person assigned or appointed to any position under his control or direction, or he may extend the period of probation within which such person may be rejected for another six months; and the cause of rejection, or the reason for extending the period of probation, shall be reported by the deputy head of the commission.

Mr. CAHAN: Whittaker had been appointed subject to probation.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Oh no. My hon. friend has not, I am afraid, been paying the attention which he usually pays. He had been appointed subject to a certificate of physical fitness, and no certificate of physical fitness had ever been made to the inspector who is the judge as to physical fitness, and who reported that he was physically unfit.

Now, I also want to call attention to this—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg the hon. gentlemen to kindly listen to the hon. member.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I want to say I would not object to the question, only the time is very short, and I had hoped that my hon. friends during this discussion would get into their heads what really took place in connection with this matter.

I referred to the question of rejection. I want—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. M. F. HEPBURN (West Elgin): In my observations in this house I have always been impressed with several things which emanate from the other side of the house. One is that on every possible occasion my hon. friends hug the old flag to their bosoms, raising shouts of patriotism. Another is how, when they find some unfortunate individual, they can depict most terrible conditions and pose as the champions of such an unfortunate.

I refer to the famous McConachie case in Halifax. In the present case hon. gentlemen opposite are taking advantage of the infirmities of a poor unfortunate soldier in order to make political capital. The expression has been coined to-night that we might differentiate between an official Liberal and an official Conservative; some further reference was made to an artificial Conservative, and I would particularly refer that expression to hon. gentlemen opposite if they are really sincere in their desire to look after the interests of returned men. I would ask them to turn their attention to the provincial government of Ontario, and in this connection I am going to refer to just one town, the town of Simcoe, whose post office is under discussion now. I find that since 1926 the provincial government has appointed many men in that town; they appointed the clerk of the surrogate court, a civilian and a Tory; the issuer of motor licenses and the examiner for motor licenses, civilians and Tories; the entire staff of the liquor store, all Tories and all civilians with one exception. Those appointments were made during the time my good friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion) was on the Liquor Control Board. I do not know just what effort he made to curb the greatest exponent of patronage in this country, Hon. G. Howard Ferguson, or whether he made any effort. I would also point out that just recently the jailer of the town of Simcoe resigned and according to the Brantford Expositor his successor has been named already in the person of George M. Boughnee, a civilian and a defeated Tory candidate in that riding.

Now I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that they are not humbugging the people of Ontario at all by putting their feet in one direction and their face in another with regard to the returned men, their duplicity is so apparent that they are not going to get by with it. My riding adjoins the county of Norfolk, in which county this controversy has arisen, and I want to assure the Postmaster General that he has nothing whatever to fear with regard to these unfair attacks. I say that Mr. Whittaker, a poor unfortunate soldier, has been caught in the whirlwind of this Tory barrage, and is finding himself left with so many public utterances which are not true and according to fact that I believe he is sadder and wiser for having been a tool in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) read certain extracts from the Toronto Globe with regard to a statement made by Whittaker in which he said an attempt had been made to buy his silence. In order to refresh the memory of the house I will read just what Mr. Whittaker said:

> Last summer, after word of the appointment of Mr. Bowyer to the postmastership had come through, I was approached by a member of the local Liberal executive, presumably delegated by W. H. Taylor, M.P., the Liberal member for Norfolk, and was offered a proposition somewhat as follows: The local Liberals, backed by the member, were to agree to lend me their support in securing an appointment at Brantford, Ontario. In return I was to promise to maintain a discreet silence in regard to my treatment at the hands of the Postmaster General and not to be seen conversing in public with any person known to be of the Conservative stripe. In addition, I was to be bound by the conditions of a letter which they were to submit for my signature and which was to be made public prior to the public announcement of my appointment.

I do not hesitate a moment to read that statement because I want to read something else which has a direct bearing upon the question, another statement of which I believe the leader of the opposition had full knowledge when he read Mr. Whittaker's statement to the house. Surely he wants to be fair, so why did he not go further and read the reply which was broadcast throughout the country by Doctor English, who was named by Mr. Whittaker as having been the intermediary between the Liberal party and himself in the attempt to buy his silence?

Mr. BENNETT: I can assure the hon. gentleman that I have not seen the document to which he refers.

Mr. HEPBURN: You are going to hear it now and I will tell you that I do not think you are going to like it very much.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HEPBURN: Be patient; you cannot disturb me in the least. Here is what Doctor English said with regard to his being a party to this so-called conspiracy:

> Doctor Sanford English, whom Mr. Whittaker presumes was directed by Mr. Taylor to approach him last summer, declared to The Advertiser, without reservation of any kind, that he went to Mr. Whittaker, who is his personal friend, entirely of his own free will, without Mr. Taylor's knowledge, and that Mr. Whittaker, in attaching Liberal significance to his conversation, is going quite beyond the mark of truth.

From his actions I am beginning to think that Mr. Whittaker must be a Conservative.

> "The Liberal executive did not send me; I went of my own free will, interested in George Whittaker's case as a friend." Doctor English said. "I thought he did not receive fair play, because the Civil Service Commission should not have sent out the notice of his selection

until his appointment was approved by the postal department, and that was the only reason, outside of our personal friendship, for my going to him."

"Mr. Whittaker intimated to me when I spoke to him several weeks ago that he did not think he was physically fit for the Simcoe postmastership," Doctor English continued. "I then suggested to him, all as my own idea, that he should state that and other facts in a public letter, and then proceed to get another job if possible."

"I don't happen to be a member of the Liberal executive, and no newspaper, no indivdual, Mr. Whittaker or anybody else has the right to insinuate for one moment that I went to him as a go-between for the Liberal party," Doctor English concluded. "I went to him solely as a personal friend and a fellow war veteran. Mr. Whittaker has given me a raw deal, because it was all my own idea."

The leader of the opposition went further and quoted more so-called scandal; he gave another statement by Mr. Whittaker in which he said:

It was the night of October 3 when my friend, Sam Morris, of Port Dover, also an amputation case, was approached by A. A. Winter, K.C., of Simcoe. They were attending a meeting in Port Dover in connection with proposed improvements to the harbour, at which Hon. J. C. Elliott, Minister of Public Works, was present. In the course of their conversation, Mr. Winter stated that the local Liberal party was prepared to secure for me any job which I would be able to handle.

That very definite statement was read in this house. I have in my hand the denial not only of Mr. Morris, who is the publisher of the Port Dover Maple Leaf, but also of Mr. Winter, K.C., of Simcoe. Mr. Winter said:

The statement made by Mr. Whittaker that I approached Mr. Morris, of Port Dover, in connection with this matter is absolutely false. Mr. Morris will bear me out in this statement.

Here is the signed statement of Mr. Morris:

Colonel Winter's statement is correct. He did not approach me with any offer or in any way in regard to the case. The offer, as reported, was made to Whittaker long before the Port Dover meeting.

The offer in question was the offer made by a personal friend, Doctor English, whose statement I have read to the house.

This unfortunate fellow was driven even further by those who I believe tried to make political capital out of the Simcoe postmastership. In order to establish himself in Class A of the eligible list he had to prove that he had not been properly re-established. On his return from the war Mr. Whittaker was placed with the Soldiers Settlement Board, which position he held for six years, and from which he resigned voluntarily. In order to put himself in class A of the eligible list he had to make a certain affidavit, which I wish to read to the house. He purchased a monument works, and I have here his statement with regard to his financial standing after having purchased that business in Simcoe. He said:

I have been informed that to secure this preference it is required that the disabled ex-service man shall not have been re-established. I think I may claim that I am not re-established. When I made application for this position a year ago, I was then working under contract for St. Williams Preservers, Limited, Simcoe, Ontario. .This contract was terminated in October last. From October to February, this year, I was unemployed.

It might be claimed that I am now re-established in business. I would like to say, however, that the effort I have been making to re-establish myself is not proving successful. I thought I saw an opportunity when I used my small savings to purchase this monumental stone business but I have been losing money steadily. I have had no experience in this business and I find that my ignorance, coupled with my inability to do any of the actual skilled labour required, is too great a handicap which my resources, now depleted, could not overcome.

Following that statement, this man made a sworn affidavit as follows:

(1) That in February, 1928, I purchased a monumental stone business believing it to present an opportunity for successful re-establishment.

(2) That I had only a layman's knowledge of said business.

(3) That since entering this business I have steadily depleted my financial resources without any adequate return.

(4) That my experience during the past three months indicates that competition in this business is so keen as to force me either to seek more capital in order to carry on or wind up affairs.

(5) That I see no prospect of securing more capital and shall be obliged on this account to relinquish said business at a considerable loss.

This affidavit was taken at Ottawa, and whoever was behind Mr. Whittaker prevailed upon him to make an affidavit which I am going to prove to the house was absolutely false. I do not know just who did it, but certainly there was influence working behind him. Here is what Mr. Whittaker said in his own statement:

Mr. Veniot made such capital out of the fact that I had stated that my business was not a paying one.

It is true that he said his business was not a paying one, but that is an affidavit which was made in the city of Ottawa when he was probably surrounded by a few of his Conservative friends. The statement continues:

As a matter of fact, I had owned the business only four months, and naturally had not a chance to discover if it were a profitable business. I would never have made any declaration about it if the Civil Service Commission had not advised me that if I wished to

show that I was properly re-established it would be necessary for me to take an affidavit to the effect that my business was not paying. Mr. Veniot has now used this affidavit as an instrument to prove that I lost nothing by selling my business. I can only say that if I had not received my notice of appointment as postmaster I still would be the owner of that business, and I am sure that I could have made a success of it.

I want the house to get the significance of these various statements made by Mr. Whittaker. It proves to me quite clearly that this unfortunate fellow certainly had powerful influences working behind him for the one purpose of making political capital out of his infirmities.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Would the hon. member be good enough to give the date of that affidavit?

Mr. HEPBURN: This affidavit was made in Ottawa on April 24, 1928.

Our political friends went much farther and tried to introduce politics into the Canadian Legion. I happen to be a member of the Canadian Legion in the city of St. Thomas, and a resolution was introduced into that body for the sole purpose of discrediting this government. What was the result? The Canadian Legion threw out the resolution by unanimous consent. Why did they do that? They are not interested in choosing as between one or another returned man so long as the government is carrying out the principle of giving the returned man the preference. I will not quote this resolution, as it appears in the records of the Canadian Legion.

The report of the inspector showed very clearly that Mr. Whittaker was not physically able to handle this job. Any member of this house with any knowledge as to how a man is handicapped through having to walk on two stumps can realize that he could not carry on.

Mr. PRICE: Did he not carry on a grocery business under his own name?

Mr. HEPBURN: He never worked in a grocery store, nor did he ever own a grocery store.

Mr. PRICE: Did he not do that before he made application to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. PRICE: Was not the inspector sent there as a friend of the department?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is out of order.

[Mr. Hepburn.]

Mr. HEPBURN: The inspector reported that he was not physically fit to carry on the work in a class 2B post office, and if he were appointed it would be necessary to put another man on the staff to do the work for him. What would be the position of Mr. Whittaker then? He would be holding a nominal position and drawing salary, and the other man would be doing the work; in other words, he would have his pension supplemented by something like $2,040 per year.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is what has happened now.

Mr. HEPBURN: There are many double amputation cases in this country, and if it is fair to put Mr. Whittaker in an office where he would hold a nominal position and thereby supplement his pension, why is it not fair to extend that privilege to every other double amputation case in this Dominion? This country prides itself on trying to do the fair thing by its returned men. Last year I sat on the pensions committee and I believe that we made it possible for all returned men to obtain equity and justice. I believe we pay the highest rate of pension of any country in the world, and if any returned man with a hundred per cent disability is not able to obtain sufficient to live on, then it is up to the pensions board to supplement his income; it is not up to any particular department to give him a nominal position and appoint another man to do the work.

The motion which is before the house reads:

That all the words after the word "that" in the motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"in the opinion of this house the Postmaster General has acted in a most arbitrary manner and in utter disregard of the letter and the spirit of the Civil Service Act in connection with the recent appointment of a postmaster at the town of Simcoe."

What is the spirit of the act? I think it was pretty well set forth, by a letter which was written by Doctor Roche, in which he outlined the usual procedure followed in filling an appointment of this kind. He said:

I have received several similar letters on behalf of this gentleman, and have no doubt that he would make an excellent postmaster. The commission, however, largely depends upon the report of the post office inspector and district superintendent of postal service, who after interviewing all the applicants place them on order of merit from a post office standpoint. If Mr. Whittaker has not as yet been re-established, his disability would of course entitle him to the preference, and I can assure you that the very best consideration will be given his claims by the commission before an appointment is made.

The point I desire to make there is that the usual procedure followed by the commission is to have the proper inspector in that district make a report. That procedure was carried out in the first report of Inspector Murray, who is a very capable man, and who stated this with regard to Mr. Whittaker:

George Edward Whittaker is a married man, twenty-eight years of age. Has a very good education. Has resided in Simcoe for about two years and eight months. He has no postal experience but would devote his entire time to the work. Was at school previous to enlistment and since the war has been an adjuster for the soldier settlement board, and is now accountant and office manager for the St. William's Preservers at Simcoe. Enlisted in the 55th battery and served in France eight months with the 22nd battery and discharged as medically unfit and recived 100 per cent pension. This applicant has a double amputation below the knees, and I do not think he would be able properly to attend to the duties of the office with this disabilty.

That was the first report of the inspector. The Civil Service Commission then sent out the inspector to get another report as to the physical ability of this man to carry on.

Mr. IRVINE: They sent out the same inspector, did they not?

Mr. HEPBURN: The same inspector, and this is what he said with respect to Mr. Whittaker:

I would say that on the 3rd instant, I again interviewed Mr. Whittaker, and would say that his right leg is amputated about three inches below the knee, his left at the ankle, and he walks without the use of a cane. He states that he was with the St. Williams jam factory for three years and in that time was off for one month with a blister in his right stump. He also states that it is necessary for him to go to Toronto at intervals for adjustments to his artifical limbs.

When questioned, Mr. Whittaker stated that it would be impossible for him to do any heavy lifting.

If the Simcoe post office were a revenue office, the postmaster could, if necessary, hire an additional clerk to perform the heavy work, and in the case of a city office there would be sufficient other work, so that it would not be necessary for the postmaster to perform duties of a heavy nature, but, in the case of a 2B office, it is my opinon that what is required is a working postmaster. Apart from the postmaster, there is one man in the office, who works from 5.30 a.m. to 9 p.m., with some hours off for meals. His actual working hours are 12 hours each day, and in his absence the postmaster does any heavy work.

If the department requires a working postmaster at Simcoe, it is my opinion that an additional male clerk will be necessary in the event of Mr. Whittaker's appointment, as he is not physically capable of performing any heavy duties.

Mr. SPENCER: What reason is there for sending the same inspector twice to cross-examine this man?

Mr. HEPBURN: Certain men are allocated to certain postal districts; they cover those districts and become very familiar with them.

Mr. BENNETT: They asked for a definite report.

Mr. HEPBURN: The Civil Service Commission asked for this second report. W. J. May, district superintendent, chief of the whole district, concurred in the report of his inspector. This is what he said:

Replying to departmental memorandum of the 24th ultimo file POS—Simcoe, having regard to the physical fitness of George Edward Whittaker who was an applicant for the position of postmaster, the district superintendent would advise that Inspector Murray interviewed Mr. Whittaker on the 3rd instant, and his report in connection is enclosed for the information of the department and commission.

It would appear that Mr. Whittaker's disabilty would not permit hm to perform the duties such as would be expected of a postmaster of a grade 2B office, and his appointment, therefore, would probably make it necessary to add an additonal employee to the establishment of the Simcoe post office.

The charge has been made of political partisanship and almost everything else; but as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) pointed out, this is not a matter of choosing between a Grit and a Tory. Mr. Whittaker told me repeatedly, while he was lobbying here in Ottawa, that he was a strong Liberal, and that all his people were Liberals. The Globe depicted him on one occasion as being carried on his father's back to vote for Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It was also pointed out that the men who recommended him were not only representative Liberals but executive Liberals in the riding. It was not a matter of choosing between a returned man and a civilian either, because both men had enviable war records. I have under my hand a telegram from the Canadian Legion of the town of Simcoe. Strange to say, they were backing another man entirely; outside of both of these men they chose a third. The telegram reads:

Norfolk county veterans endorse candidature of Mr. Roy Collver for position of postmaster at Simcoe. Your cooperation requested.

So it seems to me that the Postmaster General instead of disregarding the spirit of the act, really carried out the spirit of the act, and when Mr. Whittaker was proved to be physically unfit for the position—and I am very sorry for him—the next in order of merit was chosen, that is the first on the eligible list of returned men. I can see nothing wrong with that. If anybody disregarded the spirit of the act, it was the Civil Service Commission when, knowing Whittaker was physically unfit, they issued a certificate in his favour.

An hon. MEMBER: And he was seventh on the list.

Mr. HEPBURN: Yes, and on top of that he had been reestablished. Another significant fact is that after they had issued this certificate, they put this notation on it: "Subject to physical fitness". Apparently they thought they were not doing the right thing, and yet the Postmaster General has to bear the brunt of all this. I tried to find out, from the Civil Service Commission and others, who had advised Mr. Whittaker to take this false affidavit. It was not done officially. Whoever did it, did it unofficially. I think the Postmaster General has been the victim of circumstances in this case, and were it not for the disgruntled Globe and our Conservative friends endeavouring to make political capital out of it, nothing would have been said about the matter. The most unfortunate part of it is that Mr. Whittaker did not keep his position in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment, land settlement branch. He had a good position there which he was capable of filling, but he thought he was moving into better fields. That of course, was his own business. When, however, the question is one of seeking a position which he is not fitted to hold, I do not think it is fair to the country that we should appoint Mr. Whittaker to an office, and then appoint another man to do the work for him.

I am going to vote in support of the Postmaster General, and I believe I am doing the fair thing. I am not going to take up more of the time of the house because I think too much time has already been wasted. I could quote many newspapers, favourable to the Postmaster General, including even The Farmers' Sun, the comment of which might be of interest to our friends from the west. This is what The Farmers' Sun has to say:

> There are 17,000 postmasters in Canada and the Deputy Postmaster General refused certificates of ex-soldiers in four cases, as follows:
> (1) Because the ex-service man intended to keep his other job and farm out the post office to somebody else at half price, pocketing half the salary himself.

The Tory papers certainly made a great fuss about this until the boomerang came back and hit them in the face.

> (2) Because of old age and unfitness for the position.
> (3) —

And this is the important one, in this case:

> —For physical unfitness.
> (4) For lack of proper qualifications.

We must have some regard for the qualifications of men seeking public office. I could instance a case in a town in my county where a returned soldier was chosen for a position and within a few months he had embezzled about $1,700 of the country's money and had got away. Another man was put in his place and he also got away with a considerable sum of money. Then a third man was put in and he is serving efficiently and well. This goes to show how careful we must be in getting a man qualified to fill the office. In my county there was another case where several returned soldiers applied for a position. They were all disqualified and a lady who was the cousin of a former Conservative member for the riding got the position. At that time there was no howl from my hon. friends; they were meek as cats, in spite of all their apparent sentiments in favour of returned soldiers.

Let me say to the Postmaster General that he need have no fear with regard to the sentiment of the clear-minded people in southern Ontario. While the rubbish put forth across the floor might appeal to unenlightened minds, there are very few of them, if any, in that particular district.

Mr. O. B. PRICE (Westmorland): It is not my intention to permit the remarks of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) to pass without some observations which I have to make in connection with this appointment. I am sure it has been clear from the beginning of this debate that the matter of appointments by the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) has been, from start to finish, one of political expediency. For the past week the Postmaster General has not been able to get one item of his estimates through, and he has met with severe criticism because of the fact that political interference has been permitted to intermingle with his duty. This has been apparent from the various cases that have been brought to his attention. The criticism he has received has been such as has never been directed towards any previous minister of his department.

Who was this man Whittaker, about whom there has been so much talk? He is a returned soldier, having lost both of his legs below the knee. At the time of his appointment he was running a store, which called for considerable energy. He was in the grocery business.

Mr. HEPBURN: No, he was not.

Mr. PRICE: My hon. friend knows all about it. I am speaking now. He was running a general store.

Mr. DUNNING: No, he was not. He never had to do with a general store.

Mr. PRICE: I may be in error, but in whatever business he was working, it required considerable physical energy, and he carried on. What occurred? A position as postmaster was advertised and he applied to the Postmaster General for appointment. He was recommended to the department of the Postmaster General for appointment. What happened? It was found out that his political leanings were not of the right kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. PRICE: They were not of the right kind and some excuse had to be made to get him out of the position. That excuse was similar to the one offered in other cases that have been referred to on the floor of the house during the past week. They set about forthwith to send an inspector to investigate. I do not know his name, although I presume it was given to-night. I believe the same thing occurred in this case as has occurred in New Brunswick since the present administration took office, and especially since the present Postmaster General was appointed, namely, that a suitable official was sent to perform the duties of investigation. The strongest objection that I have heard to-night and the last few days against this man's fitness to fill the position, was with regard to his physical condition. The postmaster has to sort the mail, lift the bags, and do certain little duties, but to hear the arguments advanced to-night from the other side you would think in order to handle the mail bags the postmaster had to be a Sandow. What are the Canadian government railways doing to-day? Let me ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) if there are not in the employ of the government railways to-day switchmen, on whom the precious lives of hundreds of people depend, and who in some cases are performing their duties efficiently minus an arm or a leg. These men are supposed to be alert and active and strong enough physically even to turn a switch with one arm, a switch that either turns a train into a siding or runs it out on the main line. Does not the minister agree with that?

Mr. DUNNING: May I point out that it is the man's brain that determines whether he turns the switch one way or the other? The arm simply carries out the dictates of the brain.

Mr. PRICE: I am very much surprised at the minister making such an observation, because it requires considerable physical force to turn a switch. Did the minister ever turn one? No, and that is why he does not know. I have, and I know. That is a pretty lame excuse, and it must be apparent to the people throughout this country that the excuses made by this administration, particularly in connection with the Postmaster General and his appointments and dismissals, and the manner in which investigations have been conducted, do not reflect credit on the present administration.

Let me give only one little example, and this is a very mild case compared with others that have been brought forward. At the little village of Hartland, the postmaster, Mr. McCullum, died. He had as his assistant, Miss Currie, a very nice young lady, who had had previous experience in the postal service at that place. In the usual course Miss Currie was asked to act until such time as a permanent postmaster or postmistress should be appointed. This she did. Eventually the position was advertised, but in the meantime Miss Currie was advised that a Mr. Lasky would take charge in her place. Among those applying for the position was Miss Currie, who had previously acted as assistant to the postmaster, Mr. Lasky and a returned soldier. The Civil Service Commission recommended that the returned soldier be appointed, returned men having the preference, but before his appointment had been confirmed by the Post Office department, he received notice that under the rules and regulations of the department another appointment had been made, and that he would not have the opportunity of demonstrating whether or not he was fit for the position. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the whole thing has been political from start to finish. It has been a question all along of political expediency. I want to say to the Postmaster General and to the government that in making appointments such as they have, they are flying pretty strongly in the face of public opinion. Furthermore, should the Postmaster General continue in this way there will be investigations which possibly have not been contemplated in the past, and with all due regard for the ability of the Postmaster General, let me tell him that he will come in for more criticism than he has met with during the last week.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) started out this evening rather warmly, making the whole ministry practically responsible for the utterance of a newspaper

called Le Droit published in the city of Ottawa. I hope the hon. gentleman himself will never be held responsible for newspaper articles, and I think it is unfair to hold the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) responsible for the utterance of this newspaper. As some hon. members of this house may know—the French members read Le Droit daily,—it is an independent newspaper which has been criticising the government every second day for not making appointments according to its own views. The paper has been carrying on a very intensive campaign especially against the Department of Justice because certain appointments have not been made, in the province of Ontario, where there is a large proportion of French-speaking people, and generally throughout the country. Some months ago this paper conducted a very extensive campaign regarding the civil service, taking up that old issue which has been threshed out thoroughly in the last fifteen years, that the French-speaking people have not their proper percentage of appointments in the various departments at Ottawa. This newspaper, therefore, cannot be considered as an organ of the party.

The hon. leader of the opposition also referred to the bilingual stamp.

Mr. BENNETT: Pardon me, I did not. I read from the paper that referred to it.

Mr. MARCIL: When in connection with the diamond jubilee of confederation a meeting was called two years ago, presided over by the Governor General, I was appointed vice-chairman of a committee, which included Sir Lomer Gouin, Sir Robert Borden, and Senator Graham, to organize for the celebration. Remembering that confederation had been brought about by the representatives at that time of the two great races in this country, that Quebec was the keystone of the arch of confederation as it exists to-day, and that without the consent of Quebec there would never have been any confederation in this country, we decided unanimously in this committee to have a celebration that would appeal to both races, that our publications would be in both languages, and the jubilee celebrated throughout all the provinces. We asked for the cooperation of all the provincial governments, and incidentally we made the suggestion that as the language of the International Postal Union is French, it would be an appropriate occasion to place at least one French word on the Canadian stamps of this country, showing that French is one of our official languages. This was done on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Marler, seconded by Mr. Tom Moore, both members of the committee. The proposal carried unanimously, and was transmitted through the governor in council to the Postmaster General. I mention that to show that this request was made by a non-political committee brought together for the purpose of organizing the celebration of the jubilee of confederation. The leader of the opposition, for whom I have a great deal of respect and esteem, may be called upon some day to fill a still higher position than the one he now occupies. Would he allow me to ask him to glance at the past history of the Conservative party and to remember that there was a time when the province of Quebec was the backbone of the Conservative party in this country, and that the greatest of all Conservative leaders understood the spirit and did not stick to the letter, when he came to deal with the people of the province of Quebec? Minorities the world over are sensitive of their rights, sometimes of their duties, and they wish to be treated fairly and honestly. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman, who knows Quebec thoroughly, and who has had occasion since he has been chosen leader of his great party to speak in Montreal, the city of Quebec, and other parts of the province, will at all times be a friend of the idea of concord and union in this country. Canada can only stand when the two great races understand each other thoroughly and give to each other that which is their due. I need not go back into the past history of the province or of Canada. We all know what the French-speaking people have done for this country, and what they are doing at the present time and are prepared to do. I hope that for his own sake and for the sake of the party that he now leads he will not permit the mistakes made by the former leaders of the Conservative party, those who trod in the footsteps of Sir John A. Macdonald and lost power as a consequence through alienating the people of the province of Quebec.

There is another question that I should like to lay before the house. The impression should not go abroad that civil service reform was initiated by the Conservative party. I had the honour in 1908 to be associated with the late Hon. Sydney Fisher, then Minister of Agriculture, when he introduced the first Civil Service Act. That was the first attempt to establish civil service reform in this country. From 1867 to 1873 and from 1878 to 1896 the Conservative party were in power, but they found no time to introduce a civil service act to bring about civil service reform. It was

not until 1908 that, as I have said, the first move was made in this direction. The act applied to the inside service.

In 1911 there was a change of government, and in 1921, just before the general election, the Conservative party realized that in adopting the Civil Service Act of 1918 they had gone too far, and the Spinney bill was introduced by the late Hon. Mr. Spinney, who then represented the county of Yarmouth, for the purpose of taking away from the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission certain classes of employees, one being rural postmasters. These men had never been considered civil servants; they are not now, being part-time employees. The Spinney bill was intended to eliminate precisely this class of men. The late Hon. Mr. Edwards, whose absence at the present time we regret, was one of the strongest supporters of the bill, as was also the late Sir Sam Hughes, another of the strong men of the Conservative party. Mr. Spinney gave this brief explanation of the purpose of his bill:

> I first wish to state that it is conceded that when the Civil Service Act was framed and enacted in 1918 the commission was given powers and obligations entirely in advance of those entered into by either the United States or Great Britain, imposing duties beyond the ability of any commission, however efficient they may be, to accomplish without some sacrifice to the public service.
>
> On account of serious complaints against the administration of the Civil Service Commission, for reasons already assigned, from both inside and outside parliament, it was deemed advisable to appoint a special committee of the house to make careful inquiries into actual conditions and, if necessary, to offer practical suggestions in order that a remedy might be applied.

The bill had practically the unanimous support of the Conservative party, and it proposed to exempt from the operation of the Civil Service Commission three classes; one, men employed on railways and ships; two, postmasters; three, labourers. We were on the eve of an election. We have a saying in Quebec, the more things change the more things happen again. Well, I have seen this parliament change nine times, and I have seen the same game played by the same men on both sides of the house—in one way when they are sitting to the left of the Speaker and in another way when they are sitting to his right. It was thought at the time by the Conservative party that the bill if enacted would afford opportunity of making a large number of appointments throughout the country; but such strong opposition developed that finally the bill was withdrawn. In 1914 hon. gentlemen who were then members of the house will recall that the late John Sinclair, member for Guysborough, moved for a return showing the number of dismissals that had been made by the Conservative party in the last three years following the general election of 1911. It took a couple of sessions to get the return. When it came down it showed that there had been eleven thousand dismissals and twenty-two thousand appointments in that period of time. It had been explained that the introduction of the rural mail service was one of the reasons for the large number of dismissals. In my county I have only a very small mileage of rural mail service, and certainly the numerous dismissals of postmasters there were not for that reason; they were dismissed purely for political reasons.

A moment ago the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Price) condemned the Postmaster General's conduct in regard to the dismissal of certain officials in New Brunswick. Let me cite an instance of a man who played probably the most important part in encompassing the defeat of the present Postmaster General, at the time that he was appealing for reelection as premier of New Brunswick, and bringing into power his successor, the Hon. Mr. Baxter. I refer to Mr. Angus McLean, the man who organized the pulpwood and waterpower resources of Grand Falls. He was postmaster of the post office at Chaleurs; he lived hundreds of miles away. He had the work done by the clerks in his office. He took a prominent part on the hustings against the Liberal party in New Brunswick, and when I called the minister's attention to this, he said, "The member for Bonaventure will allow me to apply the law to Mr. Angus McLean." I am sorry the member for Westmorland is not in his seat, for I am sure he must be familiar with these facts. Mr. Angus McLean returned the compliment by doing me the honour of coming into my constituency and making speeches against me, but I am glad to say they had very little effect on the electorate.

For many years I have had the honour to represent a constituency where the people agree to live together in harmony. One-third of my constituency is English-speaking and Protestant. The Anglicans generally are Conservative, the Presbyterians, Liberal. For forty or fifty years up to 1870 the French-Canadians gave practically a solid Conservative vote, but in 1890, the Hon. Mr. Mercier, who was then one of the greatest public men in the province of Quebec, carried the constituency by the strength of his appeal to all classes of the population. In 1891 an English-speaking Protestant was elected by an overwhelming majority of the Roman Catholic vote, although his opponent was a Roman Catholic.

It shows the broadmindedness and tolerance prevalent throughout the province of Quebec.

The postmastership at Simcoe has been thoroughly discussed. I would remind the house that up to 1918 our political history discloses that the principle followed by both parties was "to the victor belong the spoils". An attempt was made to change that state of affairs, but the Conservative party overdid itself, and to-day I have no doubt that the members of the Civil Service Commission—especially the chairman, Doctor Roche, with whom I had the honour to sit in this house for many years when he represented the constituency of Marquette—would be the first to declare that the commission is not equipped to look after the outside service as it should be looked after. What happens? The Civil Service Commission calls upon the inspector of the district. He is not the official of the Civil Service Commission. He is the official of the post office, called upon by them before they make a report, and, as the late Mr. Spinney said, the Civil Service Commission have to accept the report of the post office inspector. They have no other officials at their disposal.

The Civil Service Commission costs over a quarter of a million dollars a year. It costs half a million dollars a year to equip it with all the necessary officials it needs to carry on its work. So that I think we should go back to the principle that we used to have in the old days, which was a very old principle of the British constitution. After all, the Postmaster General is responsible for what takes place in the Post Office department. He is responsible to this house, and we individually are responsible to our constituencies. When an election takes place in Calgary, the voters there vote yea or nay, for or against the leader of the opposition, who carries on his back the faults and the advantages of his party, the iniquities and otherwise which may be charged against it. We are all in the same position at election time. We have to answer for all that has been done.

When I came to the house first there was no Civil Service Commission; there was no railway commission; there was no soldiers re-establishment commission; there were none of these various commission, which have taken away from the representatives of the people the privileges they used to have in the old days. I receive many letters to-day from my old constituents, the oldest among them, because I have reached the second generation now, telling me that at such and such a time I could have obtained appointments on the Intercolonial railway. The Minister of Railways and Canals at that time had the administration of the road. I could appoint a snowshoveller, a section man, or one of the working gang. But that to-day is impossible. An application is received by a member who forwards it to the minister, and that is the end of it so far as the member is concerned. And still we have to render to our people an account for all these things. The people look to us; they look to the member of parliament who is responsible for everything that is going on. He has to render an account for the actions of all these commissions; he has to vote the money in this house. I am compelled to repeat what has been repeated very often: we have removed responsible government from the shoulders of those on whom it used to rest. Responsible government should rest upon the representatives of the people. The Postmaster General is in exactly the same position as all the other ministers, but when we consider that he has 17,000 employees under him is there any comparison possible between him and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, for instance, or the Minister of Justice? Why, in my constituency there is not a single employee of the Department of Justice. The only man who comes into my constituency having any connection with that department is a non-resident judge who sits once or twice a year. I have no representative of the Department of Trade and Commerce in my constituency, therefore, there can be no change in that respect. But I have nearly 100 post offices, and that is the case generally throughout the whole country.

All things considered, I think that the Postmaster General deserves the thanks of this country for the energetic manner in which he has carried on the duties of his office. In the old days, when the Liberal party came into office in 1896, the post office department was at a very, very low ebb. Sir William Mulock, who took charge of that department, was perhaps the greatest of all our postmasters general. He introduced penny postage and put Canada on the map of the empire; he brought about efficient service in the Post Office department, and, all in all, was as I say the greatest of all our postmasters general. The present Postmaster General is following in his footsteps, following the principles laid down by him, introducing reforms as the country develops. He has introduced, for instance, the air mail service, establishing rapid communication and transportation from one part of the country to the other. If for no other reason, therefore, than to second him in his valuable efforts I think this house will take

the view that not only in relation to this case of Simcoe—where, after all, the Postmaster General should have something to say, otherwise he is a nonentity, with no privileges at all— but in relation to other cases as well, this amendment should be thrown out by an overwhelming majority.

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

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Rosetown): Mr. Speaker, there are three parties in this house, at least so-called. I have always looked on a political party as a group of men who have gathered around a set of principles, and who have organized for the bringing of those principles into effect.

In dealing with this question, I may say that this is one of the questions that this group in this corner is often called upon to decide as between the two parties. This little group has often been placed in this position before. Now, we decided years ago to vote on the merits of any question before the house. In this case a vital principle is concerned, and one on which for many years we, as an organized economic group, have pronounced repeatedly. This, as I see it, it is not a case of deciding on anything specific, or deciding as to the discharge of one postmaster and the appointment of another in his place; although I know that in that regard a good deal of hardship has been created even since the last federal election, which we can easily find to be the case where some of these country post offices have been established in conjunction with a store. A man who is appointed postmaster in a given district sets up a little business, and the first thing we know he is thrown out of office because of party politics, and then he has to move his business. That is a real hardship; and I should think that, at this late date, 1929, more than sixty years after confederation, this game of party politics should come to an end.

As to the amendment itself, it is a question of patronage in general, so far as we are concerned, and we are utterly opposed to such a thing. We cannot overlook the fact that since 1921, I am sorry to say, this government has done practically everything in its power to discredit and destroy the work of the Civil Service Commission. In fact, one of the members of the Liberal party, speaking on the budget a little while ago, advocated that "to the victor belongs the spoils." I refer to the member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff).

Every year a greater number of appointments is made subject to the proviso, "notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act." The little group in this corner are here in support of certain definite principles in this matter, and even when deciding as between the two parties, with whom a principle does not seem to count for a great deal, we have, as I say, to decide on the merits of the question. And we also have to take into account the course we are expected, by our constituents, to follow. Every member who calls himself a Liberal-Progressive, even if sitting with the Liberal party, must find it rather hard to vote with the government on a question of this kind. As one of the speakers to-night has already said with regard to the discharge of civil servants, this is a case of political expediency. To the members in this corner this whole case looks like one of party expediency, and I do not want this incident to pass without letting the house know where we stand on this question. In closing I want to say that we are unalterably opposed to patronage in any form.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken part in this discussion but for the remarks just made by the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans). However, I feel it my duty to tell the house of my experiences with the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot). The hon. member for Rosetown has intimated that it might be hard for the Liberal Progressives to support the government on this occasion, and he has suggested that we should express ourselves against what he calls the violation of the principles of the Civil Service Act by the Postmaster General.

Since coming to this house I have had several experiences with the Post Office department. I have had one or two experiences with that department within the last year or so, since the present Postmaster General took office, and I want to say that I found him absolutely insistent that the provisions of the Civil Service Act with regard to returned soldiers be strictly observed. I have had no occasion to recommend the dismissal of any postmaster. I hold just as firmly as do hon. gentlemen opposite the view that these matters should not be questions of patronage, but according to my experience during the last two or three years, in the face of strong requests coming from members of the Liberal party for the appointment of certain individuals to office, the Postmaster General has stood firmly by the position that the law should be observed and that the soldiers should get the preference to which they are entitled. In that position I strongly uphold him.

The hon. member for Rosetown frequently assumes this holier-than-thou attitude, intimating that we who sit in this row and who call ourselves Liberal-Progressives are not true to the principles which we have enunciated time and again in regard to the Civil Service Act. In view of his remarks to-night I felt it my duty to pay at least this tribute to the Postmaster General, and to say that in my experience he has been true to those principles and to my knowledge has refused on more than one occasion to yield to pressure which was brought to bear upon him in order to have him depart from the principle that returned soldiers should receive a preference.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): In view of the remarks which have been made by the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) I want to direct the attention of the house for a moment or two to the facts which were placed on the record by my colleague the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott), but which I feel perhaps are not yet quite appreciated in connection with the motion before the house. The motion is:

That all the words after the word "that" in the motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"In the opinion of this house the Postmaster General has acted in a most arbitrary manner and in utter disregard of the letter and the spirit of the Civil Service Act in connection with the recent appointment of a postmaster at the town of Simcoe."

My hon. friend from Rosetown has suggested that there is some great question of principle involved in connection with which he feels he should record his vote on this occasion. I submit that if the facts which have been placed on record by the Minister of Public Works are carefully examined it will be found that no question of principle is involved in any way. If I may say so, this is simply a flimsy attempt to find some ground for criticism of my colleague the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot), particularly in connection with returned soldiers. My good friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) prefaced his remarks by a great deal of discussion with regard to dismissals and with regard to the Civil Service Act; he even travelled as far as India and finally cited the case of the Salvation Army. I do not know what that had to do with this case; after all what we are dealing with is a vote of censure on the Postmaster General with regard to the appointment of a postmaster for the town of Simcoe. So we must discover the facts with regard to that particular case and it is on those facts that we must decide how we are going to record our votes.

[Mr. Brown.]

A vacancy occurred early in 1927 and, as the Minister of Public Works pointed out, that office was immediately declared a 2B office, which is an office requiring what is called a working postmaster. That is, it required a postmaster who would not simply sit in an office and direct proceedings but who would take a direct part in the work, who would be prepared to do his share in the handling of mail bags, the sortation of mail, the taking of those bags to the place of delivery to the courier, the lifting and emptying of the bags on the table, the standing and sorting of mail into the boxes, and so on. Perhaps I know more about these things than some hon. members, because I happened to have a father who was a postmaster. All this work must be done in connection with a 2B office and in January, 1927, not after the applications were received as was suggested by my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) but immediately after the vacancy occurred, that office was declared a 2B office and the advertisement issued. I am not sure that the advertisement has been put on record, but it indicated plainly that it was a 2B office by the fact that the salary to start was $2,040 per annum whereas, as we all know, revenue offices are on the basis of a small salary plus a percentage of the revenue received.

As has been pointed out by the Minister of Public Works there is an impression abroad in this country that this is some sort of dispute between a disabled ex-service man and a civilian. It is well to remember that according to the record, which is on the table of this house, no less than ten ex-service men and fourteen civilians applied for the position, twenty-four applicants in all. There were not simply the two ex-service men to whom reference has been made during this debate; I think there were at least six or seven ex-service men who had good records and who were well reported upon by the inspector. That advertisement described those who were eligible for appointment as follows:

According to law preference is given among candidates possessing the necessary qualifications, first, to persons who are in receipt of a pension on account of disabilities received as a result of war service, who by reason of such service are unable to continue their pre-war occupation and who have not been successfully re-establishd; and secondly, to persons who have been on active service overseas or on the high seas.

Candidates must be Britsh subjects and must have resided in Canada at least three years.

The leader of the opposition mentioned the fact that the statute made a prescription with regard to residence, but I would ask hon. gentlemen to note that the statutory prescription

with regard to residence has nothing to do with the particular locality but requires three years residence in Canada. The residence provision is in the advertisement itself, and the advertisement states that applications will be received from residents of Simcoe and locality. There is the advertisement; according to law preference is given to candidates possessing the necessary qualifications who have disabilities and have not been re-established, and after that come those who have seen service overseas. Who is to decide as to who "possess the necessary qualifications"? What are the regulations of the Civil Service Commission? To whom do they look to decide who has the necessary qualifications? One of the hon. members in the far corner asked about the sending of an inspector. I have in my hand the instructions which were issued by the Civil Service Commission in February, 1918, to the various post office inspectors, asking the inspectors to co-operate in reporting in connection with the qualifications of candidates. The commission do not use the officers on their own staff, but utilize the post office inspectors for the purpose of deciding who possesses the necessary qualifications. That has been the practice since 1918, and applies to other departments as well. Generally speaking, a report is made by an officer of the department for which the appointment is to be made. The Minister of Public Works has read half a dozen letters which go to show that in this particular Simcoe case the Civil Service Commission asked the Post Office department to pass on the qualifications of the candidates. I will not read them all, because my hon. friend has put them on record, but the following letter, written by Mr. W. Foran, the secretary of the commission, to Mr. May, the district superintendent of postal service at London, is very significant. The letter is dated March 10, 1927, and reads as follows:

> You will find herewith an application for the postmastership at Simcoe from Mr. Charles R. Bowyer. Mr. Bowyer is being advised that his application has been transferred to you for the necessary report on his qualifications.

The secretary of the Civil Service Commission sends that application to the superintendent of the Post Office department in order that a report may be received as to his qualifications. That application is sent not to the minister, but direct to the district superintendent.

The Minister of Public Works quoted several letters in which Doctor Roche, the chairman of the commission, pointed out to those who were recommending candidates that the commission largely depended upon the reports of the post office inspector as to who would get the positions. He outlines the whole procedure in a letter of February 26th, 1927, to Colonel Parkinson, as follows:

> The commission, however, largely depends upon the report of the post office inspector and district superintendent of postal service, who after interviewing all the applicants place them on order of merit from a post office standpoint. If Mr. Whittaker has not as yet been re-established, his disability would of course entitle him to the preference, and I can assure you that the very best consideration will be given his claims by the commission before an appointment is made.

The definite statement is made that that is the procedure which is followed in all cases, namely, that the post office inspector is the one who makes the report and whose report is recognized by the commission.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): After considering these reports, does not the final authority rest with the commission?

Mr. RALSTON: It is quite true that in law the final authority rests with the commission, but these people are the agents of the commission, and I am going on to point out that the commission appoints these agents and say in effect, you are the ones to decide.

Mr. STEVENS: No, no.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Not to decide, to report.

Mr. RALSTON: I will permit the hon. members to interrupt in order to ask a question, but I am going to try to continue my argument without being interrupted too much.

I admit that the commission have the legal jurisdiction, but the commission use as their agents the inspectors of the Post Office department, and they are the ones from whom they ask a report.

The applications come in and they are sent to Mr. May, the district superintendent at London. Mr. May sends them to Mr. Murray, the inspector for that particular district, and Mr. Murray goes and interviews the candidate. He did that in this case, and finally sent in a report which is found at page 130 of the return. This is a very long, detailed report setting out the particulars of the candidates, their residential qualifications, their disabilities, and all about them placing them in order of merit. He reported on no less than twenty-two candidates, besides two whom he was unable to interview. As has already been pointed out by my hon. friend, the candidate at the top of the list in order of merit, is a civilian named Wallace, the next is Mr. Bowyer, the seventh on the list is

Mr. Whittaker and Mr. Collver is in ninth place. They appeared to have very good candidates in Simcoe. The report has this to say about Mr. Bowyer:

Charles Rex Bowyer is a married man 28 years of age. Has a good education. Resided at Simcoe until about a year ago but is now living at Mount Albion. Has had no postal experience but would devote his entire time to the work. Was a student previous to enlistment and since discharged has been farm manager for his father, W. A. Bowyer, and is engaged in looking after some seven or eight farms owned by his father. This applicant states that owing to his being a minor he enlisted under an assumed name, that of C. R. Musgrove, and served 27 months in France with the R.C.H.A. Discharged by reason of demobilization. No physical disability. Is a fine type and impressed me favourably.

The next ex-service man is sixth on the list, he is Mr. Wark, who, by the way, is ahead of Mr. Whittaker. He had no physical disabilities and was very well recommended. The next, the seventh, is Mr. Whittaker, about whom the report has this to say:

George Edward Whittaker is a married man 28 years of age. Has a very good education. Has resided in Simcoe for about two years and eight months. Has had no postal experience but would devote his entire time to the work. Was at school previous to enlistment and since the war has been an adjuster for the soldier settlement board and is now accountant and office manager for the St. Williams Preservers at Simcoe. Enlisted in the 55th battery and served in France eight months with the 22nd battery and discharged as medically unfit and received 100 per cent pension. This applicant has a double amputation below the knees and I do not think that he would be able to properly attend to the duties of the office with this disability.

The next returned man is ninth on the list; that is Mr. Collver, and the report says:

Roy Ward Collver is a married man thirty years of age. Has a good education. Has resided his entire life in the vicinity of Simcoe as he lives on Nixon No. 1 R.R. two miles from Simcoe. Has had no postal experience but would devote his entire time to the work. Has been mostly engaged in farming. Enlisted in the 133rd battalion and served about two years in France with the 14th battalion. Discharged by reason of demobilization. Has now an appeal before the federal appeal board for a pension and it is stated that he will receive 75 per cent disability. It is thought that this applicant's disability would prevent his proper performance of the work.

The inspector said that this man who had a 75 per cent disability could not properly perform the work. If it is contended that politics were being played in this particular instance, Mr. Collver would have been a very attractive man to appoint, because he was recommended by the Norfolk Veterans and Colonel Pratt and by Mr. Anderson. He is the ninth on Mr. Murray's report and has a 75 per cent disability. Yet he was turned down because it was felt that a 75 per cent disability would prevent him from doing the work of that office, and yet the hon. gentlemen opposite say that a man with a 100 per cent disability should have obtained the position. Let us put it the other way; they say that the Postmaster General should not accept the report of an inspector who says that a man under those circumstances could not carry out his duties.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Does the hon. minister know that the Postmaster General approved the appointment of a man at Billing's Bridge who had a 100 per cent disability?

Mr. RALSTON: I have no idea of what he did in that case, but I would imagine that Billing's Bridge is not a 2B office.

Mr. VENIOT: The Postmaster General did not appoint him, it was the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. STEVENS: That is the same thing.

Mr. RALSTON: That was the report of March 28, 1927. There was some delay, as has been suggested by the Postmaster General, because some difficulty arose in connection with Bowyer's enlistment, and there was a very sharp letter from the Postmaster General with regard to the residential qualifications of some of the candidates and he certainly showed no partiality for Bowyer in that letter. I think it was in October, 1927, when these applications reached the Civil Service Commission. But officials of the Post Office department were not the only ones who took time in connection with the matter. Although it was in October, 1927, when the applications reached the Civil Service Commission, the first word from them was the following February, February 18. Therefore, I do not think the matter of delay is important one way or the other in connection with this particular case. At any rate the report goes to the Civil Service Commission and, as the record shows, an inquiry is instituted with regard to Mr. Bowyer's residence. It is found he is resident in Simcoe. On February 18, 1928, comes this significant letter which is found on page 144 of the record. Let it be remembered that the Civil Service Commission had before them the report of Mr. Murray which I have read, which stated that he did not consider Mr. Whittaker was able to carry on the duties of the office, and in which he also reported on the other applicants. This is a letter which comes from

the Civil Service Commission. Does my hon. friend suggest that the commission were still going to act on their own judgment, or were they accepting that of the Post Office department? Listen to this. This is dated February 18, 1928:

With further reference to the postmastership at Simcoe, Ontario, I am directed by commissioners to say that they will be prepared to select Mr. G. E. Whittaker, O.A.S., for this position, provided the department feels that he possesses the necessary physical fitness to perform the duties.

I am to point out that the commission is endeavouring, in common, with the Past Office department, to provide for seriously handicapped cases to as great a degree as possible, and postmasterships have been mentioned as particularly suitable employment for such applicants. In this case the Amputations' Association is strongly supporting Mr. Whittaker, as well as the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, both claiming that his disability will not prevent the proper discharge of his duties. I should be glad, therefore, if the department could furnish the commissioners with a definite report, at as early a date as possible, with reference to Mr. Whittaker's physical fitness for this postmastership.

There was a recognition again that the decision was to lie with the Post Office department. They say: We are ready to recommend him if you say he is fit. What happened? The Post Office department then asked for another report, and on page 122 of the record will be found a letter written from the department at Ottawa to the superintendent, enclosing a copy of the letter of the Civil Service Commission and asking that a full report be made. That letter is sent to Mr. Murray who, on March 5, 1928, makes a full report which has been read and which was put on the record the first day of the debate by the Posmaster General. Mr. Murray goes into the matter very thoroughly, and he finds once more that Mr. Whittaker could not properly fulfil the duties of the office. That report is forwarded to Mr. May, district superintendent, who concurs and makes some further report about it to the same effect. It goes to Mr. Gaboury, Deputy Postmaster General, and he forwards it to the Civil Service Commission. I ask hon. gentlemen in all fairness: would they not expect there would be nothing more about the matter?

What happened? That report goes to the Civil Service Commission on March 16, 1928, and on May 29, two months and a half afterwards, the Civil Service Commission issues a notice to Mr. Whittaker, but, as has been pointed out by the Minister of Public Works in a brand new form, a form that I think has rarely if ever been seen before in the files of the Civil Service Commission. It bears the notation: "Appointment subject to physical fitness". This means: we hereby certify that you, Mr. Whittaker, are qualified for the position provided you are physically qualified. The Post Office department had already decided that he was not physically qualified, and that report had gone to the Civil Service Commission. That is the appointment to which the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart) refers as being the appointment or decision of the Civil Service Commission. It is not a decision at all; it is a conditional certificate—if you are physically fit, you can be taken on. The Postmaster General says that he does not hide behind his deputy. In view of the report of the inspector, he issues written instructions—and they are on the file—to his deputy stating that in view of the report of the inspector he cannot accept the certificate with regard to Mr. Whittaker. Mr. Gaboury accordingly writes to the Civil Service Commission telling them the same thing and asking them to make a new appointment.

What is the result? The result is that, not the Postmaster General, nor Mr. Gaboury, nor Mr. Taylor, nor anybody else but the Civil Service Commission, without any further correspondence, issues a certificate, without any condition in it, in favour of Mr. Charles R. Bowyer, selecting him as postmaster of the post office at Simcoe. Those are the facts. That is why I said when I commenced my speech, that it seems to me we are getting a bit off the track when we are talking about questions of principle in dismissals. We have a simple question to decide: Did the Postmaster General act arbitrarily or reasonably? Had he reasonable grounds for acting as he did in connection with this particular case? My hon. friends say that he acted directly contrary to the spirit of the act. I have only a moment to refer to the act. As the hon. member for Leeds suggests, under the act the Civil Service Commission had the right to make appointments, but section 24 reads:

The deputy head may, at any time before the expiration of six months, reject any person assigned or appointed to any position under his control or direction, or he may extend the period of probation within such person may be rejected for another six months; and the cause of rejection, or the reason for extending the period of probation, shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission.

2. Where a person is rejected, the commission shall thereupon select another person to take the place of the one rejected.

Mr. STEVENS: Does not that section clearly indicate that a probationary period must elapse before the rejection occurs?

Mr. RALSTON: I only want to point out, in answer to my hon. friend, that in 1919 an

opinion was asked for by the Department of Agriculture with regard to that particular section. I have before me the correspondence that has been tabled. I will not take time to put it on record, but I will read the paragraph which is an answer to my hon. friend's question. The department were asking the same question of the Department of Justice: Must we take a man on if we do not consider he can do the work? Can we reject him without a period of probation? The answer of the then deputy minister, Mr. E. L. Newcombe, now a Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, is dated December 9, 1919. It is quite a lengthy document, but this paragraph occurs in it:

If the deputy be reasonably satisfied upon preliminary examination of the person nominated that the latter is unsuitable or not qualified for the duties of the office or employment to which he is assigned, I think he may, if he think it advisable, reject him without entrusting him with the discharge of any duties;; otherwise in conceivable cases considerable prejudice to the public service might ensue.

Mr. STEVENS: But "the deputy of course, like other individuals, must yield compliance to the law as justly interpreted." Let the minister read the whole thing.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not going to read the whole thing.

Mr. STEVENS: No, it is not advisable to read it.

Mr. RALSTON: It goes on:

The fact that the man selected is not as good as his predecessor; or in your words, not a man of reputation or outstanding ability, would not, I should think, in the absence of other objections, justify the deputy to reject him, provided he have passable qualifications. The deputy, of course, like other individuals must yield compliance to the law as justly interpreted—

Mr. STEVENS: Hear, hear.

Mr. RALSTON: And an interpretation in accordance with the opinion of the then Deputy Minister of Justice would be regarded by most people in this country as being "justly interpreted."

—no matter what his view may be as to the policy of the law; and it must be realized that the provisions of the Civil Service Act are designed to limit selections for office to those who apply and compete, rather than to enable a deputy minister to obtain the officer who in his opinion is the best available for the position; moreover, even among the competing class, returned soldiers are by law preferred if they obtain sufficient marks to pass the examination.

[Mr. Ralston.]

I do not think that I can add to the above in the absence of further particulars as to the nature of the information or inquiry upon which you refused to accept Mr. Betts, and as to whether or not he was afforded an opportunity of probation.

So well and so authoritatively was that extract which I read first regarded by the Civil Service Commission of that day, not the Civil Service Commission under the Liberal government, but the Civil Service Commission of that day under the Union and Conservative government, that that extract which I have read was incorporated into the notice which goes out to every applicant, including Mr. Whittaker, and his attention was called to section 13 of the Civil Service Act, which is the probation section now section 24, "subject to the following interpretation," given to it by the Department of Justice, and then that particular portion of the opinion was printed right on the face of the notice which he received. In other words, it told him that he could be rejected without a period of probation.

Do my hon. friends suggest that in view of that we can fairly charge that my friend the Postmaster General acted directly contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Civil Service Act, when as a matter of fact he acted in absolute accord with the act as interpreted by the Deputy Minister of Justice? I do not think that that is a fair conclusion to come to; I do not believe it is a conclusion to which this house or this country will come. I say that my friend the Postmaster General —I am speaking to some gentlemen on the other side of the house who have had the responsibility of running departments—has some responsibility to the public service of this country, and he has some responsibility with regard to his officials, to these men he appoints expecting them to do their work. They make reports to him in the regular course of their work, and if those reports and recommendations were overruled by a blue pencil in the hands of the Postmaster General, and he said, "I will do something else," there would be a very loud hue and cry with regard to a man who would ride over the opinion of his responsible officials. It seems to me to be the case of being damned if you do and damned if you don't. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Postmaster General accepts the opinion of officers whose honesty has not been called in question in the slightest, men who themselves have been nominated or designated by the Civil Service Commission themselves to make these investigations and report, I believe that this country will absolve him of any arbitrariness and of

any unreasonableness or of any intention but justly and fairly to observe the Civil Service Act and to administer the department entrusted to him.

I think there is also some justification for the department's conclusion to be found in outside evidence altogether, evidence not within the reports; for I find that the gentleman who recommended Mr. Whittaker, Mr. Johnson, the manager of St. Williams Preservers, Limited, told the Civil Service Commission at the time that he had been carrying on as a bookkeeper. Another man in the Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment who recommended him says that he finds his present work, which Mr. Johnson had said was that of a bookkeeper "rather arduous" and he would like to go into the post office where shorter hours would make the work desirable. But in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that one man at least in that post office was at work from 5.30 a.m. to 9.00 p.m., I question whether he would get the benefit of the shorter hours that he expected. Another man, Mr. Groff, who made a recommendation, said that Mr. Whittaker was "unfit for duties requiring physical activity." All these recommendations are on the file. These ought to be considered when we are passing on whether the Postmaster General had reasonable grounds for the conclusion he came to.

There are also on the file a couple of letters which I should like to read. There was a letter from the Postmaster General to Mr. Sutcliffe, of the Amputations Association. The Postmaster General there wrote a letter which, it seems to me, ought to convince most people in this country that he is trying to do and has been trying to do the fair thing for the ex-service men. He writes:

> I note what you say touching efforts having been made to modify the preference given to returned soldiers under the act. Let me assure you that such attempts will never receive my support. I am prepared at all times to give preference to returned soldiers wherever their physical disability does not render them incapable of doing the work of the position they apply for, but I claim that it is not fair that the postal service should be called upon to provide positions for men who cannot do the work owing to their physical disability. If their disability is so great as to exclude them from such positions, I feel that the Pensions Act should be changed so as to give such men greater financial assistance if what they are receiving now is not considered sufficient. It would be better to do this than to seek to place these unfortunates in public positions which call for such work as would render the service they are willing to give inadequate, and consequently lower the standard of efficiency exacted by the public.
>
> Canada, to my mind, owes it to the 100 per cent disability men to place them in a position where it should not be necessary for them to apply for public positions in order to live in comfort and provide for their families.

That is the expression of the man who is now being charged with having acted arbitrarily and gone directly in face of the Civil Service Act in order to deprive ex-service men of their rights and particularly the 100 per cent disability cases.

May I say one thing more to indicate the reasonable ground which the Postmaster General had? There was some talk in one of his letters in regard to Whittaker being re-established. I do not know whether he was re-established or not. I only hope he was. I happen to know intimately a veteran who is in a very similar position to his and nobody sympathizes with him more genuinely than I do in the plight in which he finds himself. I know some of the difficulties of the amputation cases but at the same time I believe that veterans themselves will consider that the Postmaster General was on pretty sound ground not alone in connection with the public service but for the benefit of returned men generally, and I believe that the ex-service men themselves will agree that it is not in the best interests of the returned soldiers to insist on being put into positions where they are not physically fitted to carry on because that simply lends support to people who are seeking to take away the preference which is given to ex-service men. It enables them to argue, that the efficiency of the public service is being injured by this provision.

But the Postmaster General said something about Mr. Whittaker being re-established. What was the position? I just want to see if he was reasonable in connection with this, and I think his reasonableness in connection with the whole case might be judged by it. Major Ashton, of the Soldier Settlement Board, writes that Whittaker was employed five years with the board, that he received several promotions and salary increases on merit, and that he resigned from the staff of the board in August, 1924, to go with the St. Williams Preservers, Limited. We know that he had the position there of bookkeeper and office manager for two or three years until October, 1927. His own letter says that his contract was terminated—I understand that it was terminated voluntarily, and he left the St. Williams Preservers, Limited, and went into a monumental stone business. He was, as a matter of fact, bookkeeper in the St. Williams Preservers, Limited, when he made application

for this position. Later in February 1928, he bought the Monumental Stone business. The Minister of Public Works has read the declaration and the statement which Mr. Whittaker made in the papers with regard to his prospects in this business. I do not make any choice between those two statements and hon. gentlemen can take whichever they like, but I do submit that the Postmaster General ought not to be charged with being arbitrary or unfair when he forms the opinion that Mr. Whittaker was reestablished within the meaning of the act. Be that as it may—

Mr. SPEAKER: It being eleven o'clock—

MESSAGE FROM HIS MAJESTY THE KING

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have received from the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs a message issued by His Majesty the King from Craigwell House today. I think hon. members would be interested in hearing it, and if the house will give me permission I will, notwithstanding that we are past the hour of adjournment, read the message. It is as follows:

In looking back on my long illness and recovery my heart is full of thankfulness of far deeper origin than any mere sense of relief.

I have been brought back from danger and weariness of the past months by the wonderfull skill and devotion of my doctors, surgeons and nurses. And help has come from another source of strength; as month after month went by I learned of the widespread and loving solicitude with which The Queen and I were surrounded. I was able to picture to myself the crowds of friends waiting and watching at my gate and to think of still greater numbers of those who in every part of the empire were remembering me with prayers and good wishes. The realization of this has been among the most vivid experiences of my life.

It was an encouragement beyond description to feel that my constant and earnest desire had been granted—the desire to gain the confidence and affection of my people. My thoughts have carried me even further than this. I cannot dwell upon the generous sympathy shown to me by unknown friends in many other countries without a new and moving hope. I long to believe it possible that experiences such as mine may soon appear no longer exceptional: when the national anxiety of all the peoples of the world shall be felt as a common source of human sympathy and a common claim on human friendship.

I am not yet able to bear the strain of a public ceremony but I look forward on some appointed day to joining with my people at home and overseas in thanking Almighty God not merely for my own recovery but for the new evidence of a growing kindly significance of the true nature of men and nations.

In the meantime I hope this message may reach all those even in the remotest corners of the world from whom I have received words of sympathy and goodwill.

(Signed) George R. I.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, April 23, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST READING

Bill No. 169, respecting the Great Lakes and Atlantic Canal and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Smith (Stormont).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

Third and fourth reports of select standing committee on standing orders.—Mr. Morin (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REFERENCE OF DIVORCE PETITIONS TO COMMITTEE

Mr. L. H. JELLIFF (Lethbridge) moved:

That the petitions of Gladys May Carter, Nellie Farrell, and Cecilia Leta Rice (nee Smith), severally praying for the passing of an act to grant a divorce, and to dissolve the marriage of the petitioners, which were presented to the house on the 17th April, instant, together with the report of the clerk of petitions thereon, be referred to the select standing committee on standing orders, for the purpose of considering the suspension of standing order 92 in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. M. F. HEPBURN (West Elgin) moved:

That the petitions of Vera Maud Gendron (nee Carpenter), and Edith Spencley (nee Smith), severally praying for the passing of an act to grant a divorce, and to dissolve the marriage of the petitioners, which were presented to the house on the 17th of April, instant, together with the report of the Clerk of Petitions thereon, be referred to the select standing committee on standing orders, for the purpose of considering the suspension of standing order 92 in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GARLAND, Carleton (for Mr. Casselman) moved:

That the petition of Dewlyn John Chubb, praying for the passing of an act to grant a divorce, and to dissolve the marriage of the petitioner, which was presented to the house on the 17th of April, instant, together with the report of the Clerk of Petitions thereon, be referred to the select standing committee on standing orders, for the purpose of considering the suspension of standing order 92 in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

Mr. L. S. R. MORIN (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville) moved:

That the second report of the select standing committee on standing orders, presented on April 18, be concurred in.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: What is the effect of this report?

Mr. MORIN (St. Hyacinthe): It dealt with a petition which was presented a day or two late on account of misunderstood information received from the senate.

Motion agreed to.

REGULATION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC

PAPERS RELATING TO CONVENTION BETWEEN UNITED KINGDOM AND UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether or not certain documents might be laid on the table of the house with respect to the convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America in regard to the regulation of the liquor traffic, which convention was signed at Washington on January 23, 1924, and ratified on May 22 of that year. I have seen published in the press what purported to be copies of official correspondence which took place between the government of Great Britain and the government of the United States during the two years prior to the signing of that treaty, and I would like to ask that the official correspondence which took place just prior to and during the negotiation of the treaty be laid on the table of the house in order that we may have authentic copies before us.

Then I understand from the public press, although not of recent date, that that draft convention was presented to the Imperial conference at London, where it received consideration and I understand certain proceedings took place with regard to it, together with certain official correspondence between the government of Great Britain and the government of this country before the treaty was actually signed. If there is such correspondence which in the public interest could be produced I should like to have it laid on the table in order that we may know exactly under what conditions Canada gave adherence to that treaty.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think it should be possible to lay on the table at an early date the correspondence requested by my hon. friend and I will endeavour so to arrange matters.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

PAPERS RELATING TO DISMISSALS OF POSTMASTERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River)): On Friday last, I think, the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) referred to a ruling made by the Department of Justice with regard to section 4, or at that time section 13, of the Civil Service Act, dealing with probations. Yesterday the Postmaster General tabled some papers relating to this matter, but he did not table the full file of the case from which the ruling the department originated. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) or the Secretary of State (Mr. Rinfret), between whose departments the correspondence took place, to table that correspondence for the information of the house.

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): I was asked to lay on the table all the correspondence I had, and my department had at that time no correspondence with the Department of Justice. Therefore it can not be said that I did not produce the full file so far as my department was concerned. I could only produce what I could gather from the Civil Service Commission and from the Department of Justice, and that is what I laid on the table yesterday. If the other departments have any correspondence it is not up to me to produce it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am asking that one of the ministers of the departments concerned table that information as it relates to the discussion on this question.

SUTTON POSTMASTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Vancouver-Burrard): A few days ago the Postmaster General undertook to table the balance of the file relating to the post office at Sutton, Que. He tabled an additional file but it does not seem to be complete without the Civil Service Commission file, so I would ask if he would table that file with reference to this post office.

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): I produced everything I had in my office. It is not my place to run after the Civil Service Commission for their file, but if it is absolutely necessary I would ask the Secretary of State to take up the matter, since it is under his department.

Mr. CLARK: Then I would ask the Secretary of State if he would be good enough to secure the file from the Civil Service Commission relating to the post office at Sutton, since these other files are not complete without that additional information.

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I will undertake to produce that file. In a general way I might say that the best method of obtaining complete files is to place motions on the order paper.

Mr. CLARK: These files were laid on the table as the result of such a motion, but additional papers have been asked for which necessitate the production of the Civil Service Commission file.

NEW WESTMINSTER POST OFFICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): I would make a similar request with regard to the appointment of a stenographer in the New Westminster post office. The Postmaster General brought down his file, and it seems necessary now to have the Civil Service Commission file in regard to the same matter.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS

NORTHERN ONTARIO PUBLIC WORKS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka-Ontario): I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) when I may expect the return which was passed by the house on April 8?

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): I expect to be able to table the return within the next few days. I can not say definitely within a day or two, because the various branches of my department have been very busy.

CIVIL SERVANTS UNDER $100 PER MONTH

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. E. SPENCER (Battle River): On March 13 I placed some questions on the order paper with regard to the civil service, and on April 4 those questions were passed as an order for return to this house. I have heard nothing of the matter since, and I would be glad to know when these papers will be brought down.

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I have a note here concerning all these orders for returns and I may tell my hon. friend that this order is promised very shortly.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): On February 28 I directed a question to the Prime Minister in which I asked whether it was the intention of the government this session to introduce an amendment to the Northwest Territories Act regarding trial by jury, and the Prime Minister promised an answer in a few days.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): It is my impression that the Department of Justice has been giving attention to this matter, and if I am not mistaken the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) stated some days ago that it was his intention to introduce such a bill. I believe he has answered the question.

SUPPLY—SIMCOE POSTMASTERSHIP

The house resumed from Monday, April 22, consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Robb for supply and the amendment thereto of Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have only a very few moments at my disposal, so the house will pardon me if I go hurriedly. When the house rose last night I was discussing the reasonableness of the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) in coming to the conclusion that Mr. Whittaker had been re-established, and I said that whether or not Mr. Whittaker's business prospects were as he said in his affidavit, in which

he stated that he would probably have to sell at a loss, or whether they were as he stated in the newspaper, in which he said he expected to go on successfully, it seemed to me there was ample evidence by which a reasonable man could come to the conclusion that Mr. Whittaker had been re-established.

I want to make just one point in this connection. There is an idea abroad throughout the country, due to regulations regarding long service pensions, that a man's salary is affected in some way by his pension. That is so in certain cases with regard to long service pensions, but I want hon. gentlemen to understand that disability pensions do not affect a man's salary in the public service in any way. That is to say, Mr. Whittaker could be enjoying the position which he held for five years with the soldier settlement board; he could be enjoying his position as book-keeper and office manager with the St. Williams Preservers, Limited; he could carry on his own business and his revenue would be in no way affected by his pension or his pension by his revenue.

I would like to point out one matter which I think has been omitted from the record. The other evening the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) in reading the notice of appointment which was sent to Mr. Whittaker and which appears in Hansard at page 1672, only read down to the signature of the secretary. I feel sure that he must have intended to go on, but his attention was apparently distracted and as a result the certificate does not appear in the record complete. I have only a moment or two left, but I think it is important that that certificate be completed. The balance of the certificate which the hon. leader of the opposition read into Hansard at page 1672, is as follows:

Civil Service Act, 1918: Sec. 13. (1) The deputy head may at any time before the expiration of six months reject any person assigned or appointed to any position under his control or direction, or he may extend the period of probation within which such person may be rejected for another six months; and the cause of rejection, or the reason for extending the period of probation, shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission.

(2) Where a person is rejected the commission shall thereupon select another person to take the place of the one rejected.

(3) The commission shall, after investigation, decide whether the name of a rejected person shall be struck off the list as unfit for the service generally or whether he shall be allowed a trial in some other position for which he may be eligible.

(Ruling of the Department of Justice dated the 9th December, 1919: "If the deputy be reasonably satisfied upon preliminary examination of the person nominated that the latter is unsuitable or not qualified for the duties of the office or employment to which he is assigned, I think he may, if he think it advisable, reject him without entrusting him with the discharge of any duties; otherwise in conceivable cases considerable prejudice to the public service might ensue.")

Then follow sections 14 and 31 of the act regarding oaths to be taken by officials.

The last paragraph which was read by the hon. leader of the opposition directed the attention of Mr. Whittaker to the ruling of the Department of Justice, and Mr. Whittaker therefore knew when he received that so-called notice, which after all is not a notice of appointment, but a certificate of selection subject to the physical fitness of the applicant, that he was not entitled as of right to probation under the ruling of the Department of Justice.

I would like to say a further word with regard to probation. It seems almost unreasonable to talk about taking a man on probation who has been reported on by the responsible officers of the department, not once, but twice, and not by one officer, but by three, and solemnly putting him on probation for one, two, three, or six months. What would happen? Mr. Collver, who has only a seventy-five per cent disability, and who had been reported on as physically unfit, would want to be put on probation next, and so on down the line. We have the minister taking the position, which seems to be fair I believe in the opinion of members of this house, that those are the reports the commission has asked for, those are the reports which came to him, and on those reports he made his decision.

Our friends have talked a good deal with regard to the fact that Mr. Whittaker was a one hundred per cent disability case. As I said last night, we all realize his disability and have every sympathy with him as a disabled veteran with a fine war record, but let us not forget the fact that the difficulty with regard to ex-service men is not confined to one hundred per cent disability cases. Sometimes I find even more difficulty; I believe other hon. members of the house find more difficulty, and the Department of Pensions often finds a great deal more difficulty in endeavouring to re-establish men with 30, 40, and 50 per cent disability. These men are receiving only a portion of the full pension and they have difficulty in finding jobs where their limited capacity can be utilized and thus enable them to make up their income to a living standard. We must remember that while this is a one hundred per cent disability case, at the same time there are other

cases of disabilities, perhaps not so great but in connection with which the men have almost as great a handicap in the labour market as men with one hundred per cent disability and who are receiving one hundred per cent pension.

Mr. SPEAKER: Time.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, we are discussing to-day, as we have on one or two previous occasions, an amendment to the motion to go into supply. That amendment is as follows:

That all the words after the word "that" in the motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"In the opinion of this house the Postmaster General has acted in a most arbitrary manner and in utter disregard of the letter and the spirit of the Civil Service Act in connection with the recent appointment of a postmaster at the town of Simcoe."

I wish to draw particular attention to the words in the resolution "in utter disregard of the letter and the spirit of the Civil Service Act." The terms of the act have been discussed at considerable length, but the only attempted defence has been that which was made by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) last evening, and during the few minutes remaining to him this afternoon. The action of the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) has identified the government with the Postmaster General in regard to this particular case and in regard to the other cases which have been brought forward as illustrations in support of our argument and in support of this amendment.

Let me refer first to the Minister of Public Works. Last night he referred to the action of the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) in this regard as being exemplary. He said it was the action of the best postmaster general which Canada had ever had. He also stated that the opposition had no right to bring this matter forward because the two individuals who were more particularly concerned were Liberals. Because Mr. Bowyer and Mr. Whittaker were Liberals the Minister of Public Works asked what right the Conservative opposition had to bring the matter forward. I will answer the minister very definitely. The right we have of bringing this matter forward is the right of every citizen of Canada to have his grievances aired in parliament; that is the right. That is a right which we propose to use on behalf of any citizen whose case appeals to us as being a fair and proper one to bring to parliament. Rarely has there been a case which has been more clearly within that right than the particular case now before us, where the government itself, through the action of one of its responsible ministers, has over-ridden and derided the Civil Service Act.

My hon. friend the Minister of National Defence intimated that the Postmaster General had no other course open to him. As I proceed this afternoon I trust that I shall be able to show that there was a different course, not only open to the Postmaster General, but obligatory upon him to follow.

There are three parties to this dispute. In the first place, there is the public; in the second place, there is the civil service of Canada; and in the third place, there is the Postmaster General. Mr. Whittaker is the victim in the case, but the parties to the dispute are the three whom I have mentioned.

In regard to the public, there is the right of citizens of Canada to apply for admission to the civil service of Canada. They have a further right; if they comply with the provisions of the Civil Service Act, they have the right to expect, if they are successful under that act, that they shall receive as a reward for their application whatever position may be vacant. There is another right the public has. It is clearly set down in the statute that certain forms of examinations shall be followed, and a decision shall be arrived at as a result of those examinations. The public has still another right; they are the taxpayers of Canada and they have the right to demand that the government of Canada and its ministry shall follow the act in letter and spirit, as we say in our amendment. I pause here to say to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that unless the government, whether it is this government or any other government, enters into the administration of the Civil Service Act in spirit as well as in letter, then there can be no successful administration of that act. If a minister, or the government itself, is to be permitted to evade that act by a strict or a strained interpretation of the letter of the law, or by a disregard of the spirit of the law, then there is no hope for the successful administration of that act.

If this house by rejecting this resolution approves of the stand of the Postmaster General, as the government is asking the house to do; if this house does that and approves of the actions of the Postmaster General in this case and in scores of other cases of which this is but an illustration, then I say that you are undermining the confidence of the people of Canada in the civil service and you are disorganizing the civil service itself. You are reducing the efficiency of the service and you are interfering with discipline and coordination

within the service. What hope is there for the civil servants of Canada if this act is ignored, this act which is their charter of liberty, shall I say?—under which they expect, when they claim rights, their rights will be respected?

As regards the government, I have already intimated that the government has identified itself in this matter with the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot); it is behind him and, through the mouth of its spokesman put up last night, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott), it has declared that he is, in this action and in his record with regard to these matters that we have brought forward during the last few days, the best Postmaster General that Canada has ever had.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STEVENS: We now have not only the government but the whole party behind the Postmaster General. What are the facts in this case? They are clear and comparatively simple. In the first place, there is a post office vacancy; second, there are twenty-two applications to fill the vacancy under the terms of the Civil Service Act. Let me pause at this moment to bring to the attention of the house what the Civil Service Act states, because this is not some regulation that may be passed at the will or the whim of a government. It would be well for the house to realize that this is a statute of Canada, brought into being by, I think, the united opinion of the parliament of Canada, as a necessity in this day. It is a departure from what obtained twenty, thirty years ago. The minister has repeatedly stated, and in fact his sole defence is that years ago, in 1896, 1905, 1911, 1912 and so forth, Conservatives or others have done as he has done in this instance. But the Civil Service Act was passed in 1918 for the purpose of doing away with the very abuses which, he states, were practised by Conservatives, Liberals and others in years gone by. The Civil Service Act is the product of parliament in response to a nation-wide demand for a departure from the old spoils system and for the erecting in this country of some orderly method of dealing with the great civil service. It is quite clear to anyone that twenty, thirty, or forty years ago the civil service of Canada, in its scattered condition as it was then, was a comparatively small affair. When I went into the west thirty-five years ago there were comparatively few people and the settlements on the prairies were few and far between, with very little of the civil service organization in that vast west. What is the situation to-day? There are several million people, great cities, well organized communities, immense public business, hundreds of millions of dollars being collected here and there and passed on to the treasury of Canada. Under what?—a civil service who now come under the act, and the necessity for the act has been demonstrated beyond all peradventure. So we have twenty-two people making application under the act. What does the act say? It says:

> Save as otherwise provided in this act or in any regulation made hereunder, neither the governor in council nor any minister, officer of the crown board or commission, shall have power to appoint or promote any employee to a position in the civil service.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): What section is that?

Mr. STEVENS: Section 19. Section 20 states:

> Except where otherwise expressly provided, all appointments to the civil service shall be upon competitive examination under and pursuant to the provisions of this act.

Then it goes on with a description of what the commission shall do. Among other things it states:

> The appointments to any local positions in any province shall, so far as practicable, be made from bona fide residents of such locality.

That section was inserted in the act for a specific purpose. Let me dissociate it from the local picture we have before us. It was realized that a vacancy might occur in Vancouver and that someone in Ottawa, desirous of moving to the Pacific coast and enjoying the salubrious climate of my city, might make application. As a matter of fact, in years gone by they used to do that in large numbers, but it was recognized that it was unfair to have a nation-wide competition for a position in one locality. Therefore the act provided that the applicant must be a resident of the locality. I turn over a couple of pages and I find another provision. This is a very sacred one in the eyes of the people of Canada. It provides:

> The commission shall prepare and maintain a special list of persons in receipt of pensions by reason of their services in the war who
>
> (a) have from causes attributable to such service lost capacity for physical exertion to an extent which makes them unfit efficiently to pursue the avocations which they were pursuing before the war;
>
> (b) have not been successfully re-established in some other avocation; and
>
> (c) desire to be placed on such list.

In other words, it sets up the preference list. What happened? As I say, twenty-two applications were made, but I shall refer to

only two, because it is not necessary for the moment to deal with the others. One was Mr. Whittaker and the other was Mr. Bowyer. In the first place, Mr. Bowyer was disqualified under section 21, not being a resident of the district. In the second place, he was without question re-established. Mr. Whittaker, on the other hand, was a double amputation case in receipt of 100 per cent pension, but a resident of the district and reported by the officials to be competent for the position. It is true that over a period, a hiatus of six months, where there was a long delay in making the final selection, due entirely—and this is significant—to negligence or delay on the part of officials of the Post Office Department to make their report, some question arose whether Mr. Whittaker could physically carry on the job. After the Civil Service Commission under the terms of the act received the reports of the inspector of the Post Office Department, they gave a certificate which was read by the minister a moment ago and which, I think he said, was a certificate of application. As a matter of fact, the certificate is one of appointment of postmaster. Those words are in large leaded type at the head of the notice.

Mr. RALSTON: It is a certificate of selection.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend says it is a certificate of selection. I am going to read the certificate itself. It is headed:

Civil Service Commission of Canada
Certificate of appointment of postmaster.

Mr. RALSTON: I would ask my hon. friend to read the certificate.

Mr. STEVENS: This was one of the last points of defence of the Postmaster General. He said that it was not an appointment; that it was just an intimation that the man was selected. Not only was it an appointment, but it was so accepted by Mr. Whittaker. According to the file Mr. Whittaker sold out his business. Not only did he do so, but he did not hear for over a month afterwards that he was rejected. How did he hear this? He heard it from a newspaper report. That was the first intimation he received. Then he learned from his competitor, Mr. Bowyer, who subsequently got the job, that Mr Bowyer knew all along that he was going to get the job although Mr. Whittaker was allowed to go on thinking for one month after this notice of appointment was given that he had the job. But this is not the only case.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. CANNON: What does the paper itself say? That is the point.

Mr. STEVENS: I shall have a lot to say about this paper, I may tell the Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon), before I am through.

Mr. CANNON: Read it.

Mr. STEVENS: I will read it, certainly, and if my hon. friend is very anxious I will deal with that part now, although I had intended to take it up later. It says:

Certificate of Appointment of Postmaster

As the Solicitor General apparently wants all the hieroglyphics, I will give them too:

PO-37882 Copy May 29, 1928

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dispense.

Mr. STEVENS (Reading):

Post office Simcoe, county of Norfolk-Elgin, Ont.
Name of appointee—Mr. George Edward Whittaker, O.A.S.

Not the name of the selectee, you will note, but the name of the appointee:

Address of appointee—Simcoe, Ont.
Salary rate—$2,040 per annum, with an annual increase of $120 until a maximum of $2,280 has been reached.

Now I come to the point that my hon. friends opposite want to inveigle me into reading, and which I am going to read and deal with. The minister has just said within the last twenty minutes that this man was rejected because he was re-established.

Mr. VENIOT: No.

Mr. STEVENS: The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) said a moment ago that this man was rejected because he was re-established.

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. STEVENS: I cannot contradict the minister, but invite him to read Hansard and see if I am not correct.

Mr. RALSTON: I invite my hon. friend to read it too.

Mr. STEVENS: On the certificate is printed this note:

Appointment subject to physical fitness.

An hon. MEMBER: Ah!

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend in the back seat says, "Ah!" Now what does that qualification mean? It means this: Mr. Whittaker was a double amputation case. Much has been made of that fact. The Postmaster General says that this man could not properly handle the position because he had to handle large sacks of mail; that was the argu-

ment of the Postmaster General. Now in this post office we find that there are five clerks. The Postmaster General says that Whittaker was rejected because he was physically unfitted to handle heavy bags of mail. Here is a post office with five clerks, and the chief occupation of the postmaster, according to the Postmaster General, is to handle heavy bags of mail. The thing is absurd.

Mr. VENIOT: May I correct my hon. friend, who, I am sure, does not wish to state anything that is wrong? I did not say that Whittaker was rejected because of that fact. I said that he was rejected because of the report of the inspector which stated that fact.

Mr. STEVENS: We have a new reason for his rejection almost every moment. Every time you knock down one argument, another is raised. I say that the Postmaster General has repeatedly stated during the last few days that this man could not handle heavy sacks of mail, and I leave that to the judgment of the house. What are the facts? Mr. Whittaker was found to be qualified in every way, but during that hiatus of six months of which I spoke, the query was insinuated, not in the Civil Service Commission, but in the Post Office Department that possibly Whittaker was not physically fit, and so the Civil Service Commission—the body constitutionally authorized to decide—I invite the Prime Minister to remember—say, after studying all the reports that Whittaker was fit for the position, that his physical fitness was a question which might possibly be demonstrated under section 24.

Now we come to section 24, and I come to the Minister of National Defence. But first I will take the Postmaster General. The other day he stated in his place—I have the Hansard here, but I shall not trouble reading it—that my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Stewart) had attempted to mislead the house because he did not read all the file, and then the Postmaster General produced a little scribbled piece of paper which I have here, and read from that what he said was the opinion of the Justice department. What he read was this:

> If the deputy be reasonably satisfied upon preliminary examination of the person nominated that the latter is unsuitable or not qualified for the duties of the office or employment to which he is assigned, I think he may, if he thinks it advisable, reject him without entrusting him with the charge of any duties.

and so on. The Postmaster General said: This is the opinion of a Tory Minister of Justice, given to a Tory government, and he left the impression on the house that the Tory government had worked up this opinion in 1919 for the purpose of circumventing the statute. What are the facts? We have now, due to the persistence of hon. members on this side of the house in demanding the full report, the letters before us of Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice. This letter is dated November 3, 1922:

> I have the honour to reply to your letter of the 20th ultimo.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Will my hon. friend permit me a question? Does he not know that the opinion that is cited in 1922 is only a repetition of the opinion given in 1919?

Mr. STEVENS: Will the hon. gentleman permit me to read the letter? The letter itself will show.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The opinion was given in 1919.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the hon. gentleman contain himself in peace for a moment?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will try.

Mr. STEVENS: The letters reads:

> I have the honour to reply to your letter of the 20th ultimo, asking to be advised whether under section 13 of the Civil Service Act, 1918, as amended, a deputy head has the right to reject any person assigned or appointed to a position under his control or direction, without giving the said person any trial whatever in the position.
>
> I may say that I considered this question once before in connection with the case of a Mr. Betts, who was selected by the Civil Service Commission for the position of superintendent of the experimental station at Lacombe, Alberta, and I enclose herewith copy of the opinion which I gave Doctor J. H. Grisdale, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, in connection with this case. I think it will be found to answer the question submitted.

The point is that Doctor Grisdale in 1919, for reasons best known to himself, and not as the action of a Tory government—that much we know—made a request of the Deputy Minister of Justice for an opinion, and he got this opinion. Before I read this opinion, I want to draw attention to the use that has been made of it both by the Postmaster General and by the Minister of National Defence, and I want to say this to the Minister of National Defence: He is a counsel, a barrister at law, of ability and wide experience.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friends who say, "Hear, hear," cannot applaud that statement too highly so far as my opinion of the minister is concerned. I want to put to him this, and the very excellence of his standing, thus evidenced by his colleagues, will add weight

to what his answer must be. Supposing he is practising before the courts of any province in this country. He is pleading a case, and in his argument before the court he cites a judgment that had previously been handed down by another court, and in citing that judgment he reads one or two clauses which give to the court a certain viewpoint of that judgment from which he was quoting that was contrary to the whole judgment. In what light would such conduct be considered? Would it not be considered as reprehensible on the part of counsel? Is it not a distinct violation of the ethics of the bar for an eminent counsel to quote one portion of a judgment, which gave an altogether distorted view of the whole judgment? That is a hypothetical question. Now I turn to what the Minister of Defence actually did last night. If I recall rightly he commenced reading:

If the deputy be reasonably satisfied upon preliminary examination of the person nominated—

Mr. RALSTON: That is the place.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister read:

If the deputy be reasonably satisfied upon preliminary examination of the person nominated that the latter is unsuitable or not qualified for the duties of the office or employment to which he is assigned, I think he may, if he think it advisable, reject him without entrusting him with the discharge of any duties; otherwise in conceivable cases considerable prejudice to the public service might ensue.

Mr. RALSTON: Will my hon. friend stop there?

Mr. STEVENS: Just a moment please. Then I intervened and said to the minister, did he think that was a fair interpretation of section 24, and I asked him to read the whole thing. Then he read the following two clauses:

The fact that the man selected is not as good as his predecessor; or in your words, not a man of reputation or outstanding ability, would not, I should think, in the absence of other objections, justify the deputy to reject him, provided he have passable qualifications.

The deputy, of course, like other individuals must yield compliance to the law as justly interpreted no matter what his view may be as to the policy of the law; and it must be realized that the provisions of the Civil Service Act are designed to limit selections for office to those who apply and compete, rather than to enable a deputy minister to obtain the officer who in his opinion is the best available for the position; moreover, even among the competing class, returned soldiers are by law preferred if they obtain sufficient marks to pass the examination.

He stopped there. Now I ask the house to consider this part which he did not read at all, but which is in the same judgment and is Deputy Minister Newcombe's interpretation of section 24. This section I shall also read in a moment.

Mr. RALSTON: Will my hon. friend permit me? If he will refer to Hansard he will find that I read that portion.

Mr. STEVENS: I am doing so.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend said I did not read it. I read every word of what my hon. friend is going to read. The only portion which was not read was the first.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend started where I started.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. My hon. friend is generally courteous in debate, and I ask him to retract what he has just said about my not having read what he is now going to read.

Mr. STEVENS: I am going to read it. If the minister will be patient he will see where I am coming to.

The deputy, of course, like other individuals must yield compliance to the law as justly interpreted—

Then he went on:

—no matter what his view may be as to the policy of the law; and it must be realized that the provisions of the Civil Service Act,—

I am not questioning that he read the balance.

Mr. RALSTON: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I thought he said I stopped there.

Mr. STEVENS: No. He read the balance down to the end. But he did not read what I am now going to give to him. It preceded all this.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEVENS: Why the groan? I want the house to follow this, and I leave it to hon. members to say whether under the opinion of the Justice department as I shall now read it they are justified in taking the stand they have taken:

The question submitted by your letter of the 17th ultimo, with regard to the rejection of Mr. Betts, who was recently selected by the Civil Service Commission for the position of superintendent of the experimental station at Lacombe, Alberta, may be one of some difficulty; but in my view the governing provision, which is section 13 of the Civil Service Act,—

Now section 24.

—although it provides that the deputy minister may at any time time before the expiration of six months reject any person assigned to a position under his control, seems to contemplate that there shall be some period of probation intervening;—

That was the very question I asked the minister. Now, what does section 24 provide?

The deputy head may at any time before the expiration of six months reject any person assigned or appointed to any position under his control or direction, or he may extend the period of probation within which such person may be rejected for another six months; and the cause of rejection, or the reason for extending the period of probation, shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission.

My point in this whole thing is that the Postmaster General through his deputy—and in this case his deputy did it under his instructions—rejected the nominee of the Civil Service Commission without giving that nominee an opportunity for probation at all.

Mr. RALSTON: Will my hon. friend permit me now?

Mr. STEVENS: I do not want to give up my time to the minister.

Mr. RALSTON: If my hon. friend would just point out that the portion which I read, and which I proposed to confine myself to, was the portion which is printed by the Civil Service Commission in their notice of appointment as the rule governing these appointments.

Mr. STEVENS: I can assure the minister that the portion printed on this notice from the Civil Service Commission which was handed to Bowyer does not contain the words he read a moment ago.

Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Speaker, it was Whittaker's certificate I quoted, not Bowyer's.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. STEVENS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not quarrelling with the minister—

Mr. RALSTON: Thank you.

Mr. STEVENS: —about the last part of that clause, but I say that in the light of the words which I read just now, "although it provides that the deputy minister may at any time before the expiration of six months reject any person assigned to a position under his control, seems to contemplate that there shall be some period of probation intervening," entirely vitiate the interpretation put upon the opinion by him.

Mr. RALSTON: Read it all.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read it all.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Read the rest of the sentence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend starting off with one picayune clause—

Mr. RALSTON: No, it is the governing clause.

Mr. STEVENS:—now insists on my reading every word of this simply to occupy my time.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, read the rest of the sentence.

An hon. MEMBER: You did not read the important part.

Mr. STEVENS: I did. My point is that the spirit and letter of the Civil Service Act has not been observed. Under the section the deputy head may reject an appointee, but it is implied here that it shall be during a period of probation, and the only discretion given to the deputy is that such period of probation may be modified or restricted where there is disability of a character that cannot be overcome on the part of the appointee.

Mr. RALSTON: Not at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. STEVENS: This is the gravamen of the whole business, Mr. Speaker. If the government are going to interpret the act in the way that the Postmaster General is interpreting it, I want to say to the Prime Minister that the civil service of Canada will be undermined. This man—after walking up and down the corridor at the request of the minister, to show whether or not he was fit, and the minister saying to him that he felt there was no unreasonable disability, after going through a personal examination by the Civil Service Commission, after passing his examination, after being appointed by them—then under this section I say he was entitled to probation.

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, after being appointed by them.

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. STEVENS: If one cannot read the record and have it accepted by this house—

Mr. ELLIOTT: But you have not read it.

Mr. STEVENS: I have.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. RALSTON: I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. RALSTON: My point of order is that my hon. friend is reading from a written document, and he is not reading the portion which is relevant to the case—

Mr. MANION: That is not a point of order.

Mr. RALSTON: —which says the appointment is subject to physical fitness.

Mr. STEVENS: I just wish to say this, and I will say it briefly to the Prime Minister: I did read those words "subject to physical fitness". I dealt with that, but I have been interrupted again and again, Mr. Speaker. The point of order is a trivial thing. As a matter of fact, my hon. friend said I was reading from a document and did not read it all. What I did read was evidently to his discomfiture.

The gravamen of this whole case rests in the interpretation of section 24. The Justice department has given an interpretation of that, and the interpretation is as I have read it, that it presupposes a period of probation—

Some hon. MEMBERS: It does not.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friends deny that. I will read it again, but in view of the governing provision, which is section 13 of the Civil Service Act, I think it provides that the deputy minister may at any time before the expiration of six months reject any person appointed to the position under his control, which seems to contemplate thereby some period of probation intervening prima facie if rejection follows upon failure to make good in the discharge of the duties of the office, which this man was never allowed to try. And I am disposed to think that the person selected should at least have an opportunity to present himself. I can, however, imagine cases in which the deputy would be justified in rejecting an appointee: Here are the words upon which they now base their rejection. I put it to the Prime Minister. Here is a suppositious case: A man is appointed; he passes the examination but he is an epileptic. Nobody knew it. I have known cases of this kind. He comes into the office; he is subject to those fits. That is a case where he might very properly be rejected. Or a man may be appointed to a position. He is able to pass the examination, as many persons are, and he comes to the office, and it is found that he is diseased, or has a violent temper, or something like that. But that was not so in this case. This was a case where the Civil Service Commission said that this man was qualified in every respect, except—

Some hon. MEMBERS: It did not.

Mr. STEVENS: —except in one respect, that he was a double amputation case. But he had taken the trouble to come to Ottawa personally to interview the Postmaster General and the Postmaster General said this—I am reading now from an affidavit of Mr. Whittaker's:

> While in Ottawa I was introduced to the Hon. Peter J. Veniot, Postmaster General, and, after explaining to him the purpose of my visit to Ottawa, he suggested that we walk together along a corridor of the House of Commons in order that he might be able to judge of my ability to walk about. I complied with his suggestion and he then said that he could not see anything in my condition that would prevent me from discharging the duties of the office for which I applied. He also stated that, as the Civil Service Commission gave a preference to disabled men, I should have an excellent chance of securing the appointment, and I was assured that he had no objection to such appointment.

And that, Mr. Speaker, has been read here several times and not yet contradicated. There is much more argument that one could enter into, but with the interruptions of my hon. friend I have not the time. I want, however, to fasten this thing down. The point the Minister of National Defence made last night was that this man was rejected because of section 24 of the act, which empowered the deputy minister to reject him for physical disability in this case. But, Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: Time is up. Is the house ready for the question?

The house divided on the amendment (Mr Stewart, Leeds), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Halton),	Clark,
Arthurs,	Coote,
Barber,	Cowan,
Bell (Hamilton West),	Dickie,
Bell (St. John-Albert),	Embury,
Black (Yukon),	Ernst,
Black (Halifax),	Esling,
Bowen,	Evans,
Brady,	Fraser,
Cahan,	Gardiner,
Campbell,	Garland (Bow River),
Cantley,	Geary,
Carmichael,	Grimmer,
Casselman,	Guthrie,
Charters,	Hanson,

Harris,
Irvine,
Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria),
Kaiser,
Kellner,
Kennedy,
Ladner,
Lucas,
Luchkovich,
MacDonald (Cape Breton South),
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdonald (Richmond-West Cape Breton),
Macdougall,
MacLaren,
MacNutt,
Macphail (Miss),
McGibbon,
McGregor,
McRae,
Manion,
Matthews,
Maybee,
Perley (Sir George),
Pettit,
Plunkett,
Price,
Quinn,
Rennie,
Ross (Kingston City),
Ryckman,
Ryerson,
Senn,
Short,
Smith (Cumberland),
Speakman,
Spencer,
Stevens,
Stewart (Leeds),
Thompson,
White (London),
Wilson.—71.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead,
Allan,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Benoit,
Bissett,
Blanchard,
Blatchford,
Bock,
Bothwell,
Boucher,
Boulanger,
Bourassa,
Bougeois,
Bradette,
Brown,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Delisle,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Dionne,
Donnelly,
Dubuc,
Duff,
Euler,
Ferland,
Fiset (Sir Eugene),
Forke,
Gershaw,
Gervais,
Glen,
Goulet,
Heaps,
Heenan,
Howard,
Howden,
Ilsley,
Jacobs,
Jelliff,
Jenkins,
Johnston (Long Lake),
Kay,
King (Kootenay East),
Lacombe,
Laflamme,
Lapierre,
Lavigueur,
Letellier,
Lovie,
Macdonald (Glengarry),
MacLean (Prince),
McLean (Melfort),
McDiarmid,
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McMillan,
McPhee,
McPherson,
Malcolm,
Marcil,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Mercier (St. Henri),
Millar,
Milne,
Morin (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville),
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Perras,
Power,
Ralston,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robitaille,
Ross (Moose Jaw),
St-Père,
Sanderson,
Séguin,
Sinclair (Queens),
Smith (Stormont),
Steedsman,
Stewart (Edmonton West),
Sylvestre,
Taylor,
Telford,
Thorson,
Tobin,
Totzke,
Vallance,
Veniot,
Verville,
Ward,
Young (Saskatoon),
Young (Weyburn).—98.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Parent,	Boys,
King, Mackenzie,	Bennett,
Dunning,	Chaplin,
Rutherford,	Gott,
Cahill,	Simpson,
Elliott,	Edwards (Waterloo South),
Langlois,	Tummon,
Foster,	Jones,
Lapointe,	Stirling,
Guérin,	Maloney,
Lacroix,	Rowe,
Prévost,	Stinson,
Hay,	Hubbs,
Cayley,	Smoke,
Morin (Bagot),	Peck,
Raymond,	Bell (St. Antoine),
Fafard,	McQuarrie,
Edwards (Ottawa),	Garland (Carleton),
Hall,	Sinclair (Wellington),
Hepburn,	Spotton,
Gray,	Lawson,
Lang,	Young (Toronto),
Bowman,	Hodgins,
Odette,	Robinson,
Rhéaume,	Church,
Chevrier,	Anderson (High Park),
Fontaine,	Spence,
Dussault,	Cotnam,
Boivin,	Hocken,
Pouliot,	Lennox,
Lanctôt,	White (Mount Royal).

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was paired with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. DUNNING: I was paired with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Edwards). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. GUERIN: I was paired with the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Maloney). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. STINSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Prevost). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. JONES: I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Foster). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Rutherford). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. HUBBS: I was paired with the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hay). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MORIN (Bagot): I was paired with the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Peck). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine): I was paired with the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Raymond). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): I was paired with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Edwards). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ROWE: I was paired with the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Lacroix). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BOYS: I was paired with the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): I was paired with the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Hall). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I was paired with the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Fafard). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

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

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: We will take up item 314, page 71. When this vote was under consideration before, it was agreed that it should be taken item by item.

Outside service—Salaries and allowances, $17,295,464.40.

Mr. KENNEDY: The other night the Postmaster General was replying to my statement with reference to Waterhole and Fairview, and his remarks may be found at page 1730 of Hansard. Perhaps I should have answered him at the time, but I did not catch exactly what he said and was not sure of the words he used until I read them in Hansard. Here is what he said:

> In the first place, it was at an early date that the present postmaster at the first-named office, Waterhole, was appointed and accepted the position under the Civil Service Commission. For the same reason that I cancelled the appointment of Mr. Levesque at Fairview, because of his not being a resident, the Civil Service Commission would cancel the appointment of Mr. Smith to Fairview; because under the act no returned soldier nor anyone else can be considered who is not a resident of the place.

Then the Postmaster General went on to say that in asking that Smith be given the Fairview office I was asking him to break the law. The point is that Smith was in charge of the old office at Waterhole, which office distributed mail to Fairview, and therefore he should have been transferred to the new office. When part of the town was moved to the new location, leaving the old office at Waterhole, I think he should have been considered eligible for the position. If that argument is not conclusive I would quote section 21, subsection 3 of the Civil Service Act:

> Except as to appointments to positions in the headquarters of the several departments and other portions of the civil service at Ottawa, the appointments to any local positions in any province shall, so far as possible, be made from bona fide residents of such locality.

It seems to me that if a man is in charge of a post office serving a particular village, in the nature of things he must be considered a resident of the locality in which that office is located and which it serves. In the case of Mr. Levesque, he resided sixty miles away in the town of Peace River. So I think I was not asking the minister to do anything which was not strictly in accord with the terms of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. LADNER: This item includes an appropriation of some $16,000,000 for mail services—

The CHAIRMAN: We are dealing only with the first item, which was the way the committee decided to deal with this vote.

Mr. McQUARRIE: On April 19 the Postmaster General read a statement which he said had been prepared by the department in reference to the complaint I made with respect to the appointment of a stenographer, grade 2, in the New Westminster post office. This statement appears in Hansard at pages 1727 and 1728, but it does not seem to be very accurate. Some mistakes appear which

may be due to copying and some misstatements of fact are apparent, which no doubt occurred inadvertently. The first line of this statement is as follows:

When Miss K. T. Mawson, the postmistress, requested that a male stenographer be appointed—

Something is wrong there; Miss K. T. Mawson was not postmistress at New Westminster; a postmaster was in charge of that office. Later in the same statement I find the following paragraph:

Subject to Miss K. T. Mawson's resignation in July, 1928—

As a matter of fact Miss Mawson did not resign in 1928, but on July 23, 1925. That is shown by a letter in the file dated November 20, 1925, signed by the postmaster at New Westminster. This is rather important because of certain events which occurred after Miss Mawson's resignation. If we have the right date, namely, July 23, 1925, instead of July, 1928, it makes considerable difference. I think the minister will accept the statement that the resignation was made in July, 1925, instead of July, 1928.

While it is quite true that the Postmaster at New Westminster suggested in 1925 that it would be better to have a male stenographer in his office, his suggestion was questioned by the chief superintendent of post office services. In a letter from the superintendent to the postmaster, dated November 13, 1925, the following statement appears:

However, it is of the opinion—

That is, the department is of the opinion —that suitable work can be found in an office the size of New Westminster which a female stenographer could suitably perform in the time not occupied in stenographic duties. This is the action that is being taken in other offices of the same grade as New Westminster when the postal clerk position requiring a knowledge of stenographic work becomes vacant, and it is found to be working out satisfactorily.

The minister makes another allegation that the request for the appointment of a stenographer at New Westminster was for a male stenographer. I refer to a letter dated June 27, 1928, from the postmaster at New Westminster to the chief superintendent of post office service at Ottawa, and which reads as follows:

Authority having been given for the promotion of Mr. Harold G. Wade, at present employed as stenographer grade 2 in the New Westminster post office, to the position of postal clerk, I would ask that authority be given for the employment of a stenographer in his place.

That is not for a male stenographer at all, but simply for a stenographer. I find also that the advertisement which was issued by the Civil Service Commission in connection with this matter called for a stenographer and not for a male stenographer.

I think the Postmaster General endeavoured to give the impression that there was not very much in this case, that no one could have any real complaint. In that connection I would point out that there are some thirteen ladies in my constituency who believe that they have a complaint, and particularly the young lady, Miss Moore, who was notified by the Civil Service Commission that she had received the appointment and that she should report for duty immediately.

In the British Columbian of November 3, 1928, the following letter from Miss Moore appears:

To the editor:

Perhaps you would be good enough to allow me space in your paper for the following:

A raw deal has been given to some fourteen girl stenographers and myself, all of New Westminster, by the authorities at Ottawa, or rather of New Westminster. I want to let these girls know just what has happened and how we have been so unscrupulously gulled. The examination held on August 31 for a position in the post office was purely camouflage, which is easily seen by the way matters finished up. Three girls passed the examination, but I unfortunately, having the highest marks, was accepted by the civil service secretary and instructed to report to the postmaster immediately for duty. This was on September 28. A few days later the usual credentials as to character, health, etc., were received and duly filled in as required. (I might say that these papers were addressed to me care of the New Westminster post office.) During October I wrote the civil service secretary twice asking why the postmaster was not notified of my appointment, and may say that to date none of my letters have been answered. However, on the 29th I sent a night letter to the secretary peremptorily demanding a reply, which came on the 31st day of October informing me my services were rejected as it was a male stenographer that was required.

Now, by placing yourself in my position, you can understand what my feelings would be and how my Irish did boil. Needless to say, more anathemas than prayers were hurled at the Dominion government in Ottawa together with its satellites in New Westminster.

I would call particular attention to the following:

The only deductions one can make from the above are, that the position was never intended for any of the girl candidates; the department is guilty of extorting money from us girls without any intention of giving a quid pro quo for fees collected; there was outside interference in the course of the civil service department, or why the cancellation of the appointment?

What I would recommend is that candidates before sitting for examinations for government positions be required to show cards of approval from the party executive. That the powers that

be make sure of the candidates' political persuations before blocking appointments. Various other recommendations I can suggest later.

In closing I wish to strongly impress on my fellow candidates the seriousness of the situation. Our liberty is at stake as the perpetrators of an action of this kind are capable of doing anything to gain their ends, so it is up to us to show by our resentment of such treatment that we refuse to countenance such dirty tactics in their arbitrary methods of civil service appointments. I can assure you I will leave no stone unturned to help in any way that is in my power to see that fair play is given civil service candidates.

It may be information to the "big guns" of the party in New Westminster that a promising young Liberal has been the victim of the dirtiest deal their powers could hand out.

I apologize, Mr. Editor, for taking up so much of your valuable space but would ask you to publish this in the interest of justice so that "right not might shall rule mankind and be acknowledged stronger".

Margaret I. Moore.

The suggestion which Miss Moore makes in that letter, namely, that the department never had any intention of giving this appointment to a female candidate, appears to be borne out by the statement made by the minister, because that is the reason stated why Miss Moore was not given the appointment. What is the effect of that? It is that thirteen girls were allowed to sit on this examination, and the successful candidate, who was notified that she was appointed and that she was to report for duty immediately, was not given the place at all. Instead, the position was given temporarily to a boy of seventeen years of age on the nomination of the defeated Liberal candidate in the last election, Mr. C. C. Knight, who now resides and has been residing in the city of Ottawa for most of the time since the last election.

The file shows what happened. It seems that when a request was made for a stenographer in the New Westminster post office, there was no eligible list in the possession of the Civil Service Commission, and the commission therefore authorized the department to suggest an appointee for the position. An appointment would, of course, be only temporary, subject to confirmation, and, I presume, qualification by the person appointed. The department, having been notified to that effect, wrote to Mr. C. C. Knight, the defeated Liberal candidate, asking for his nomination. Mr. Knight nominated this boy Thomas, and at the same time stated that the boy was only seventeen years of age. When that nomination was received by the department, Mr. Knight was told that the boy could not be appointed because he was under age unless no other candidates were available. It appears that other candidates were available because these thirteen young ladies took part in the competitive examination to which I have already referred. It was pointed out by the department that such an appointment might be made temporarily, provided that no others were available, as I stated.

This boy, Thomas, wrote on the same examination, took part in the same competition that the thirteen young ladies took part in; but he failed, he did not pass. He was, however, continued in the position. In March of this year another examination was held, and this boy, who had then reached the age of eighteen years, again took part in the competition, again failed, but is still in the position. He is still acting as stenographer in the New Westminster post office although he failed twice in examinations held by the Civil Service Commission for that particular position. I think the inference is fairly clear that he is held there by reason of the political influence which my good friend, Mr. Knight, has with the department, and that the department has been able, for the purpose of helping Mr. Knight and his friends, to keep this boy in the position notwithstanding, as I say, the fact that he is not qualified for it at all.

I find in the file a memorandum dated 6th October, 1928, from Mr. P. T. Coolican, general superintendent of postal services, in reference to this matter. I am not going to read the whole letter, but there is a side note which reads:

> You need a male clerk steno. Try and keep Thomas. Write to Com.

I suppose that is the commission. That is signed "L.J.G." I suppose those are the initials of the Deputy Postmaster General. Well, they have kept Thomas in the position and he is still there. I do not know whether they are going to have another examination or not or whether they will be able to get some kind of examination that he will be able to pass. But the fact remains that during all this time Thomas is holding the position although he is not qualified to do so, first, because he was under age and second, because after he reached the age of eighteen years, he could not pass the examinations of the Civil Service Commission. It seems to me that that is a disgraceful condition of affairs. It is really a crime to allow thirteen young ladies to take part in an examination and to pay $2 each as the prescribed fee for the examination when it never was the intention of the department to have a female stenographer in the office. In any event the $2 should be refunded to each one of those young ladies.

Mr. VENIOT: The commission should be asked to refund it. The Post Office Department never received it.

Mr. McQUARRIE That is the unfair part of the matter. The commission notified Miss Moore, without any conditions at all, that she had been appointed to the position; that she was to report for duty immediately, and by reason of that notice from the Civil Service Commission Miss Moore resigned the position which she held, and reported for duty. The Postmaster General himself is responsible, if not his department. He says that the matter never came to his attention, but someone in the Post Office Department is surely responsible for the young lady not getting the position. I defy the Postmaster General to show from his own file that the request in this particular instance was for a male stenographer. It was nothing of the kind. No such request was made after 1925 and in this particular case it was not to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Miss Mawson, but to fill the vacancy created by the promotion of Mr. Wade who had been appointed to the service in 1925 or 1926. I cannot blame the Civil Service Commission. The commission carried out the request of the department and made the appointment in due course. It gave the appointment to the candidate who secured the highest marks. The Postmaster General says: Well, you should apply to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not. I said that in regard to the money paid in you should apply to the commission. Stick to what I said.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I say that Miss Moore is quite right when she says that the department took from these thirteen young ladies the sum of $2 each under false pretences.

Mr. VENIOT: One moment, please; there you are again. The department received no money from the applicants. The money goes to the Civil Service Commission, and they handle it. We know nothing at all about it. Therefore the department did not receive the two dollars under false pretences.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Of course, that does not excuse the Postmaster General or the Post Office Department at all, because there was no fault in the Civil Service Commission. This examination was a farce and nothing else, and it was a farce because the department decided to accept the recommendation of a defeated candidate and gave the appointment to this young fellow Thomas, instead of following the law and allowing the appointment to go to the candidate who got the highest marks.

I have pointed out that the letter which I read from the chief superintendent of the postal service at Ottawa, date November 13, 1925, has established the principle that a female stenographer is quite suitable for such an office as New Westminster. After that time there was no request for the appointment of a male stenographer in the New Westminster post office, so the explanation given by the Postmaster General in the statement that he read is not accurate, but is in fact very misleading. I submit that if we are going to have a Civil Service Act and a Civil Service Commission they should mean something, and when a competitive examination is held the successful candidate should get the appointment unless there is some good reason to the contrary. The reason to the contrary which the department produces is that the department decided that a male stenographer was required in the New Westminster post office. I think this condition of affairs should be changed. I quite agree with Miss Moore and the other ladies who wrote on that examination that they have been badly treated, and I think that the Post Office Department as well as other departments of the government should see that some arrangement is made, whereby candidates for civil service positions shall have at least justice and a fair deal.

Mr. VENIOT: Right on this point, I am a little surprised at the hon. gentleman taking up Hansard and reading from it to show where the report which I read to the house the other day does not agree with the file as to the duties and the name of the postmaster, for the hon. gentleman has in his possession, or should have, a copy of what I read to the house.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I got it in Hansard.

Mr. VENIOT: It is not correct in Hansard.

Mr. McQUARRIE: How can you blame me for that?

Mr. VENIOT: I blame the hon. gentleman for not reading from the original. I gave him a copy of the original, and I put a copy on the table here. The hon. gentleman got that copy.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We are entitled to read the statement in Hansard.

Mr. VENIOT: I know you are, but if the hon. gentleman had read from the original he would not have undertaken to prove that

my statement as read in this house was not according to the record. For instance, I am now reading from a copy of the document which I laid on the table and which the hon. gentleman got.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Which one is that?

Mr. VENIOT: My reply in the house the other day.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What is the date of the document?

Mr. VENIOT: April 19, 1929, as reported in Hansard April 19, 1929.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I have not got that document on the file.

Mr. VENIOT: The original which I read to the house, reads:

When Miss K. T. Mawson resigned, the postmaster requested that a male stenographer be appointed in her place.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is not here.

Mr. VENIOT: Hansard says:

When Miss K. T. Mawson, the postmistress, requested that a male stenographer be appointed in her place—

Mr. MANION: It was up to the Postmaster General to correct the error the following day.

Mr. VENIOT: My attention never was drawn to it.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I have pointed out that Miss Mawson resigned in 1925.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman said that this was not according to the record.

Mr. McQUARRIE: No.

Mr. VENIOT: And it is not according to what I submitted to the house. Hansard is in error; I do not know how the error occurred. Here is what I submitted to the house, and placed on the records on the table. This is what I read to the house:

When Miss K. T. Mawson resigned, the postmaster requested that a male stenographer be appointed in her place.

Hansard reads:

When Miss K. T. Mawson, the postmistress, requested that a male stenographer be appointed in her place, in response to her request for a statement of the duties of the position—

Mr. HANSON: Is that request on the file as brought down?

Mr. VENIOT: There is no doubt it is. The next paragraph goes on—I am reading what I read to the house the other day:

Subsequent to Miss Mawson's resignation in July, 1925.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Hansard says:

Subsequent to Miss K. T. Lawson's resignation in July, 1928.

The error is not mine.

Mr. STEVENS: Wade is not the man we are talking about at all.

Mr. VENIOT: My hon. friend read from Hansard to show that Wade was not promoted at the date stated in Hansard, and that therefore my record was wrong. This is what I read, and I want to put it on Hansard, and I will give the exact thing I read to the Hansard reporter so that there will not be any mistake.

Mr. HANSON: Blame Hansard.

Mr. VENIOT: There is no blame at all. I laid the record on the table after I read it just as I am going to read it now.

Mr. STEVENS: Hansard is your words.

Mr. VENIOT: No, not if it does not correctly report what I said.

Mr. STEVENS: Hansard does not contain a record left on the table, but documents read by the minister.

Mr. VENIOT: I read that document which I laid on the table.

Mr. STEVENS: Your quarrel is with Hansard, not with the hon. member.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. member heard me read that statement, and he heard me say that I was placing the record on the table.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Surely the minister would not expect me to remember the whole document.

Mr. VENIOT: No, but you expect me to remember a whole lot, and if I do not remember it all correctly, you try to pull me up very quickly. This is what I read to the house at that time:

When Miss K. T. Mawson resigned, the postmaster requested that a male stenographer be appointed in her place.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That was in July, 1925.

Mr. VENIOT: Will the hon. gentleman let me read this statement?

In response to a request for a statement of the duties of the position, it was stated that stenographic work took up about one-half of the daily period, the other half being occupied in assisting the regular employees in the different departments where required.

Mr. McQUARRIE: When was that?

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. gentleman will let me read the whole letter, he will find out:

The Civil Service Commission reviewed the duties of the position and decided that it should be changed from postal clerk to stenographer grade 2, on account of the fact that the essential duties were stenographic. The postmaster, however, represented that there were certain duties which he would not care to require a female to perform. Subsequent to Miss Mawson's resignation in July, 1925, Mr. Harold Wade was taken on and was appointed to the permanent staff as stenographer grade 2, as from January 29, 1926.

In April, 1928, Mr. Wade was promoted to a postal clerkship and the commission was requested to furnish the name of a male stenographer to replace him. They were unable to do so and gave authority for a local selction.

In consequence Mr. S. W. Thomas was employed temporarily from September 1, 1928.

Subsequently the commission held a competition for stenographers at New Westminster, and on September 28, 1928, they submitted the name of Miss Margaret Isabella Moore, one of the successful candidates, in connection with the filling of the position permanently.

In view of the postmaster's representations, however, the services of Mr. Thomas were retained and Miss Moore was not offered employment. It is understood that the Civil Service Commission advised Miss Moore, in reply to her inquiry, that the reason she had not been accepted by the department was that a male stenographer was necessary.

That is what I read to the house the other day.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Did the postmaster at New Westminster in 1928, after Thomas had been in this position, request that his services be retained? If so, was that representation made in writing, and where is it?

Mr. VENIOT: That would be entirely a matter of administration. I do not know of any case where it ever comes before the minister. It would be done by the superintendent of the Vancouver district—I think New Westminster is in that district—through the local postmaster and inspectors, thence to the chief superintendent of mail service and through him to the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General at Ottawa. So far as I am concerned personally, this is the first time I have heard of the case. When it came up the other day I asked the head officials of the department for a statement. I read to the house the statement as given to me. If any injustice has been done in the matter, after I get through with my estimates—and some days I have not been able to give attention to anything else—I will give attention to the case and see whether any injustice has been done. Further than that I cannot go at the present time. With reference to the hon. gentleman's charge that an injustice has been perpetrated upon the thirteen applicants through the retention of the two-dollar-fee paid by them, that is something with which the Post Office department has absolutely nothing whatever to do. It comes entirely under the Civil Service Commission. I think it is not proper for the Civil Service Commission or any other branch of the government to retain the fees of unsuccessful candidates, and I think the practice should be changed. But, as I say, that is not within my province, it comes entirely under the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. HANSON: If it was the intention to employ only a male stenographer in the New Westminster office, why did not the department request that only candidates of the male persuasion be asked to write on the examination?

Mr. PARENT: The Civil Service Commission again.

Mr. HANSON: No, the department had something to do with it.

Mr. VENIOT: I have no answer to make. It was clearly a matter of administration—not outside my province, it is true, but never submitted to me.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Coolican must have known about it.

Mr. VENIOT: Certainly.

Mr. HANSON: If they did not tell the young ladies that they would be rejected on account of their sex, then the departmental officials are to blame for the injustice done.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The minister has not yet answered my question: Whether the postmaster at New Westminster made a request that Thomas be retained in the position. If so, was that request in writing? And if in writing will he produce it?

Mr. VENIOT: I do not know whether the postmaster made such a request or not, but if he did so in writing I will produce the document.

Mr. McQUARRIE: If he did not do so this statement is rather misleading. It says—

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. member had better wait to see if the postmaster did so or not.

Mr. McQUARRIE: It says:

In view of the postmaster's representations, however, the services of Mr. Thomas were retained—

That can be explained in no other way than that the postmaster at New Westminster re-

quested that Thomas be retained in the position. I challenge the minister on that, and I say no such request was ever made by the postmaster. I should also like to know whether Thomas is going to be retained in the position, notwithstanding the fact that he has been unsuccessful in two examinations, which would go to prove that he is not qualified.

Mr. VENIOT: So long as there is no waiting list established by the Civil Service Commission as a result of examinations held under their discretion, temporary employees can be taken on at any time. The moment the commission establish such a list they forward it to the department, whereupon any temporary employee must be taken off the job and the first in order of merit on the waiting list appointed. That is the practice.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Is it the intention of the department that there shall be a male stenographer in the New Westminster office?

Mr. VENIOT: If the postmaster recommends it, yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: But the postmaster did not so recommend in this case at all, as I pointed out.

Mr. VENIOT: I am not prepared to admit that.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The files show there was no recommendation on the part of the postmaster in this particular case that a male stenographer should be appointed. His request was for a stenographer, without any reference to sex. That request was made in July of last year in the letter I read.

Mr. VENIOT: I am not offering this as an excuse, but simply to point out what may have happened. The information may come to the department through the inspection of the office by officials from Ottawa or from some other section of the service. They would find out the requirements of the office and report thereon when they returned to Ottawa or to their own head office. I will inquire how the request came to the department here for the employment of a male stenographer.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Then I understand the Secretary of State is going to bring down the civil service file in connection with this matter.

Mr. RINFRET: Yes.

[Mr. McQuarrie.]

Mr. VENIOT: To prevent any error, did the Secretary of State make a note of the right name? I thought he wrote down Victoria.

Mr. RINFRET: I made the necessary correction. The return has been ordered and should be available by to-morrow.

Mr. MANION: I have been looking over the salaries of the different post offices and am curious to know upon what basis the salaries are fixed. I will demonstrate my point by taking a few of the offices which appear below the item in the estimates with the respective population as given in the Canadian Almanac of 1929. If there is a mistake in the latter figures, which I presume are for 1928, it must be imputed to the publication. For example, the city of Medicine Hat has a population of 10,500, and the salaries paid are $55,000. The city of Fort William, which I have the honour to represent, had a population of 23,500 in 1928—it is more than that at the present time—and its salaries are $63,000. Medicine Hat, in other words, with less than half the population gets nearly the same amount, within $16,000. And then over on the next page, take Brandon with a population of 17,000 and salaries of $71,000. Take Kingston with a population of 22,000; it has salaries of $97,000. Take New Westminster with a population of 20,500, it gets $93,000 in salaries. Moncton, with 21,000 of a population, gets $118,000 in salaries. Saskatoon, with a population of 40,000 in 1928, gets $181,000 in salaries. And one more; Regina, with a population of 40,000, gets $331,000 in salaries. The population, it is true, jump from 10,500 to 40,000, the highest I have named, but the salaries jump from $55,000 to $331,000, and it just strikes me that probably there is a very good explanation of it. I presume there is practically no increase over last year, but I have been a little puzzled to understand those differences. I can understand it in some cases. I purposely left out such cities as Victoria, Vancouver, Quebec, St. John and Halifax, because while they also demonstrate the point no doubt their salaries would be greatly increased because of incoming overseas mail.

Mr. VENIOT: What page of the estimates are you referring to?

Mr. MANION: Pages 71 and 72. The populations, of course, are not given; I have taken them from the Canadian Almanac for

1929, and I think they are correct. As I say, there is probably an explanation for all this, but at the same time the discrepancies which exist are rather strange.

Mr. VENIOT: Take Moncton, for instance, with a population of about 21,000 and salaries paid $118,000, and compare it with some places that have more population and less salaries paid. Moncton's revenue previous to the establishment there of the Eaton concern was $165,000 a year. Now I think it is close to $400,000, if I am not mistaken; I am just speaking from memory. The hon. member will understand that population is not the basis of salaries at all.

Mr. MANION: I quite understand that.

Mr. VENIOT: I would imagine the same thing obtains in Brandon, and also in Medicine Hat, accounting for the rapid increase of revenues there. In Saskatoon and Regina, as in Moncton, the mail order houses, I think, bring about that abnormal increase in the revenue compared with the population. And the revenue is the factor in conjunction with the volume of mail upon which salaries are based, and on which help is hired; and those salaries are established by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MANION: I quite understand that. Take Regina and my own city, Fort William. Fort William with a population of 23,500 has salaries of $63,000. Regina with a population of 40,000—we will take it as double—has a salary list of $321,000, or practically five times as much. I should like to know the difference in income between Fort William and Regina. Could the minister give me the incomes from those offices?

Mr. VENIOT: The revenue of Regina is $869,000. The Revenue of Fort William is $83,000, or nearly $800,000 more revenue at Regina. As revenue is the factor in conjunction with the volume of mail and business conditions, that can be readily understood.

Mr. MANION: Before we depart from it—perhaps this will demonstrate the minister's point, and I am not criticizing—perhaps he could give me some of the other cities that I mentioned. Take Medicine Hat, what is the revenue there? Its population is 10,500 and its salaries are $55,000.

Mr. VENIOT: Medicine Hat has $39,900.

Mr. MANION: Revenue?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes—$39,993.

Mr. MANION: Just to demonstrate the point that revenue alone does not govern, I wish to point this out: Take Medicine Hat with a population less than half that of Fort William. It has a salary list of $55,000 against a salary list of $63,000 for Fort William, but it has a revenue of much less than half. In other words, its salary list is nearly as great as the salary list at Fort William—it is more than five-sixths—but its revenue is much less than half. Would the minister go further? I would like to get the figures for Saskatoon.

Mr. VENIOT: I may say, while we are looking that up, that Medicine Hat is a large distributing point for mails, and there is a great deal more work done there than the revenue would show. That is a distributing point for different sections.

Mr. MANION: For rural mail routes and that sort of thing?

Mr. VENIOT: Oh, no, for railways as well; a concentration of mail there for distribution to certain points.

Mr. MANION: Would the minister give me Saskatoon on the same basis?

Mr. VENIOT: Saskatoon, $311,000.

Mr. MANION: Well, that bears the argument out better. Would the minister give me one more, Brandon?

Mr. VENIOT: $103,208.

Mr. MANION: I just wish to say that the information given me by the minister is satisfactory. I wished to find out what the reasons were. I presume the same conditions existed in the past, but it looked strange because I knew the populations were not so vastly different. I think the matter is reasonably well explained by the minister. At the same time I find myself wondering if the differences are all just. I am wondering if possibly an investigation along that line might not be very worthy of consideration.

Mr. VENIOT: They are all lined out on a certain principle.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): May I call attention now to the city of Sydney? I find that the city of Sydney has a population about the same as most of those mentioned, and its salary list is very much lower. We have Eaton's establishment there and many other concerns.

Mr. VENIOT: The revenue at Sydney is about $64,000. I can assure hon. gentlemen that these salaries are all based on the work of the office and regulated by the Civil Ser-

vice Commission. Where it is necessary to increase the staff of an office the Civil Service Commission receives recommendations from the department, but those increases are never made until the commission secure all the necessary information and grant us authority. The whole thing is worked out on the basis which I tried to explain to the hon. member for Fort William a short time ago.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): In smaller cities such as Brandon do they have house to house delivery?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. BELL (St. John): I would like to ask the Postmaster General if it is true that Mr. H. Fortier, chief inspector of service at Ottawa, is now in charge of the district superintendent's office at St. John, New Brunswick, and if so why it was found necessary to have him so placed. I would also ask why it was necessary for the chief superintendent of post office service to visit St. John on March 25 last. Rumours are circulating freely in St. John regarding conditions in the post office of that city, and I feel it my duty to ask the minister if he will be good enough to supply the house with this information and to bring down all correspondence in relation thereto.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, I shall be only too glad to furnish the hon. gentleman with that information by bringing down all the correspondence, but I may tell him that Mr. Fortier is not now in charge of the district superintendent's office there. Mr. Fortier and Mr. Underwood were sent to St. John to study conditions in that office and district. Just here I may tell the hon. gentleman who represents St. John and others who come from the province of New Brunswick that there is some serious misunderstanding with regard to the post office administration in that city. I am looking into it now in an endeavour to straighten out the matter. Mr. Fortier and Mr. Underwood, one of them an efficiency man in the matter of financial administration, so to speak, and the other an efficiency man in the matter of operation, were instructed to go and did go to St. John, where they remained for three or four days, and they have made a partial report. Their work is not finished yet, but I hope these two gentlemen may iron out certain difficulties which have arisen in that city in connection with the administration of the office and the discipline of some of the officials under the district superintendent. This is what we are now working on.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. MacLAREN: Who is in charge of that office now, or who is acting as district superintendent?

Mr. VENIOT: There is no acting superintendent; the regular district superintendent, Mr. H. W. Woods, is in charge.

Mr. MacLAREN: Then who is the next senior officer in that department.

Mr. VENIOT: Inspector Emerson.

Mr. MacLAREN: In the absence of the superintendent who takes over his duties?

Mr. VENIOT: There is no strict rule, but generally in the absence from duty a district superintendent, while he remains in the province the senior inspector takes his place. I know the point the hon. gentleman has in mind.

Mr. MacLAREN: I would like to state the point and then the minister can answer it. I understand him to say that he does not necessarily put the next senior man in charge in the absence of the superintendent?

Mr. VENIOT: There is no direct rule.

Mr. MacLAREN: What is the usual practice?

Mr. VENIOT: I was coming to that.

Mr. MacLAREN: You said you were going to answer my question, but as yet I have not put the question.

Mr. VENIOT: I knew what was coming.

Mr. MacLAREN: If the minister will please sit down I will proceed with my question.

Mr. VENIOT: I thought I had answered it.

Mr. MacLAREN: First I wanted to ascertain from the minister the practice followed during the absence of the superintendent, as to who acts in his place.

Mr. VENIOT: Will you allow me to answer that question?

Mr. MacLAREN: No, not just yet. Then the minister said that there is no strict rule, that usually the senior officer takes charge, but evidently there are some exceptions. When the minister answers my question would he please tell us why Mr. Emerson did not act in the absence of the superintendent, although we understand that he was appointed to succeed him, which appointment was countermanded. I would like an explanation on that point.

Mr. VENIOT: In answer to the first part of the question I have already said that there is no fixed rule. There is a practice that when the district superintendent is absent from duty but within the province or within the country, the senior officer is the man who takes his place. I might state the circumstances in connection with the case which has been referred to. The health of Mr. H. W. Woods, the district superintendent of the St. John postal district, had been failing. He had informed me of that fact himself, and I had received the information from others, and noticed it especially when I visited St. John about the end of November or early in December last. When I returned to my office I took up the question of arranging for mail transportation to the West Indies under the new steamship arrangement, to see if we could not work out some scheme to facilitate the handling of the mail. In view of the fact that Mr. Woods' health was failing, I thought that he could be placed in charge of that work and sent to the West Indies. He could take two or three weeks to do this work and at the same time his health might be improved. Mr. Woods received instructions to that effect, and placed the senior postal inspector in charge of the work during his absence. I countermanded that order and instructed that Mr. Griffiths be placed in charge until Mr. Woods returned.

Mr. MacLAREN: I gather that the practice of the Postmaster General is to place the next senior man in charge when the superintendent is absent from his office but still in this country.

Mr. VENIOT: That is not the absolute rule.

Mr. MacLAREN: I understood the minister to say that that was almost the invariable rule.

Mr. VENIOT: It is usually the practice.

Mr. MacLAREN: But when the superintendent leaves the country the junior is put in charge. If anyone can interpret that form of reasoning I shall appreciate it very much.

Mr. VENIOT: I can change that around as I think it necessary in the interest of the service. I thought it was necesary in this case, and I did so.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Will the minister produce the correspondence in connection with the closing of the post office at Homeville, N.S.?

Mr. VENIOT: I will produce that tomorrow.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Will the minister tell us who is next in seniority to the superintendent?

Mr. VENIOT: The superintendent is certainly not senior to anyone in the office; he is junior to every one.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Who is next in order?

Mr. VENIOT: I think I have already stated that the senior is Mr. Emerson.

Mr. JONES: I would ask the Postmaster General to lay the correspondence in connection with the following post offices upon the table of the house: Norton, Beulah, Tooleton, Thornbrook, Jeffry, Gibbon, Head of Millstream, Jordan Mountain, Jemseg, Wickham, Shepody, Cambridge.

Mr. VENIOT: When does the hon. member expect to get those?

Mr. JONES: It is only a matter of form; they could be got together in a few minutes.

Mr. VENIOT: They cannot be laid on the table in the way the hon. member says they can.

Mr. JONES: In that case, I would ask that the correspondence in connection with Norton be laid on the table. I understand the postmaster was dismissed and four returned soldiers, Ira W. Reid, Charles T. Homer, Preston D. Price and George Ward, among six others, applied for this position. I would ask the Postmaster General to table the correspondence regarding this postmastership, along with the correspondence from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. VENIOT: I will do that. It might be interesting to explain to the house just how the documents asked for are produced. The originals are not produced and laid upon the table; copies are made from the originals. I have a list here of thirty-two returns of which notice has been given for production tomorrow. In preparation for those requests, I have had sixteen stenographers at work all day Saturday, a part of Sunday I regret to say, Sunday night, all day yesterday and up to tweleve o'clock last night, and they are working to-day. The return with regard to Norton is among those which have been asked for, and it will be produced to-morrow, but it would take five or six days to supply the information which has been asked for. I would like to ask the hon. members to go over this list and pick out the particular cases they desire laid on the table.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I would like to mention about four or five. There is St. Boniface, Brussels, Macoun, Spruce Lake, Brigden, Waterdown and Lawrencetown.

Mr. VENIOT: That is a new one. It was not asked for in the list, but I will produce it. I do not know whether I can get it to-morrow.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I could not tell whether it was a new one or not, because I did not have the name.

Mr. VENIOT: I have them all before me. I shall be able, I think, to produce most of them to-morrow and if I cannot get the Lawrencetown file ready for to-morrow, I will try to have it ready for Thursday.

Mr. JONES: I did not finish the list. I think Cambridge was the last one I gave. The others are:

Forks in the parish of Brunswick.
Coal Creek in the parish of Chipman.
Upper Greenwich in the parish of Greenwich.
Hillsdale in the parish of Hammond.
The Range.
Pamdenec.
Shanklin.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman cannot expect to get these files to-morrow, but I will do the best I can. I will get stenographers to copy them and submit them to the house as soon as possible.

Mr. JONES: I wish to thank the Postmaster General. I know he will get them out as soon as possible, because I would like to bring some of them before the house.

Mr. COTNAM: I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he would lay on the table the files and correspondence in connection with the Pembroke post office with regard to the two appointments to the postmastership since the death of the late postmaster, Mr. Moffatt; also the files and correspondence with regard to the appointment of a postmaster at Foresters' Falls in the township of Ross; also the files, correspondence and tenders submitted with reference to rural route No. 5, Cobden, Ontario.

Mr. DUFF: I would like to ask the Postmaster General to bring down all the returns in regard to all dismissals from September 15, 1911, to December 17, 1921, and all appointments made during that time.

Mr. VENIOT: I think it is time to draw the line. I have been asked to-day to produce files—and I have no objection to producing them—which mean the work of at least fifteen or twenty stenographers for five or six days or more.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. DUFF: More than that.

Mr. VENIOT: I am not referring to the hon. gentleman's request. To carry out his request I would have to engage probably 100 stenographers for five or six months. Let me ask the committee: Is it fair to ask for all these returns without making them orders of the house? I am prepared to do what I can; I have no objection to producing these returns, but I cannot produce them within the next six or seven days or more.

Mr. STEVENS: There is plenty of time; the session is still young.

Mr. DUFF: There is a saying in Scotland: "There shall be no step-bairns in our family." Certainly if our hon. friends across the way are entitled to information, I am too, and I am going to demand it. If the minister brings down returns with regard to what has been asked by my hon. friends of the opposition, I am entitled to all information from September 15, 1911, to December 17, 1921, and also during the time the "shadow" government were in power from the 1st of July to the middle of October, 1926.

Mr. VENIOT: We will do the best we can.

Mr. GEARY: In regard to the St. John matter which was brought up by my hon. friend a few minutes ago, the minister departed from his usual practice of appointing the senior to take the place of the superintendent who had gone away. I do not know whether my hon. friend asked for the file in that case or not, but I am rather curious about it from what I have heard in the house this afternoon and I should be glad if the Postmaster General would advise the house of the grounds upon which he departed from his usual practice, whether he made a personal investigation or whether he was acting on the advice of his deputy or other officials. Did he act from personal knowledge of a more or less definite kind?

Mr. VENIOT: That is internal business which sometimes it is not well to give out, but I am prepared to assume the responsibility for my action. I felt I was justified, under the conditions existing, to do as I did. I discovered on my initiative what was occurring.

Mr. HANSON: What were the conditions exising that prompted the minister to overrule the appointment of the senior assistant inspector? The minister has said either too much or too little. He ought to tell the house and the country frankly if there is any reason why Mr. Emerson should not be appointed.

Mr. GEARY: To be frank with the committee, the Postmaster General should give us the whole history of this transaction.

Mr. VENIOT: As I said a little while ago, the whole matter is under investigation.

Mr. GEARY: But as to the action that has already been taken.

Mr. VENIOT: My object in taking action was to bring about the investigation which is now under way.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 87, for the relief of Lera Ethel Vallance.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 91, for the relief of Frances Gwendolyn Snow Lott.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 92, for the relief of Edward George Croucher.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 100, for the relief of Mabel Lorene DeClute.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 101, for the relief of Isabell Leach.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 102, for the relief of Emily Munnings.—Mr. Hubbs.

Bill No. 104, for the relief of Alfred Rescorl.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 106, for the relief of Isabella Einboden.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 111, for the relief of Frederick Davenport.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 112, for the relief of William Greig Green.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 118, for the relief of Marjorie Grace Coleman.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 121, for the relief of Sylvester Wilfred Kerr.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 124, for the relief of William Ernest Foulkes.—Mr. Cahan.

Bill No. 129, for the relief of Ernest Carl Bouck.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 137, for the relief of James Lynham.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 139, for the relief of Bessie Stephen Lee.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 143, for the relief of Irene Sagar.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 144, for the relief of Clifford Wilson.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 146, for the relief of Mina Thompson.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill No. 150, for the relief of Frank Arthur LeNoury.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 152, for the relief of Thomas Booker..—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 153, for the relief of Marion Isabel Kemp.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 155, for the relief of Louisa Martha Weston.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 157, for the relief of Elizabeth Crawford Copping.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 155, for the relief of Arthur Alderton.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 163, for the relief of Bella Solnik.—Mr. Lawson.

Motions for second readings agreed to on division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Private bills being exhausted, the remainder of the hour will be devoted to public bills and orders, to be found on page 7 of the order paper.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Public bills?

Mr. SPEAKER: When the first hour from 8 o'clock is not exhausted with private bills the remainder of the time is devoted to public bills.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is that according to the motion?

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. G. R. GEARY (South Toronto) moved the second reading of Bill No. 36, to amend certain provisions of the criminal code respecting the possession of weapons.

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE: Explain.

Mr. GEARY: Mr. Speaker, I explained this bill on its inception. It has been before the house for two or three years. It was introduced by the Hon. Senator Belcourt in another place and has passed the senate, and on two or three occasions has reached the appropriate standing committee of this house. It is rather long. It involves the sale, permit for use, and having in possession of firearms. I think it is directed largely against the sale of revolvers. The hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) spoke to me about it the other day, and I understand he is quite willing that it should go to the committee so that the details of it might be examined there. If the house is of the same opinion I suggest that it should be sent on to the committee, where it can be thoroughly discussed.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): This is a hardy perennial. There has been, so far as I can ascertain, no demand for

legislation of this kind. We are fairly well protected in the various provinces of this Dominion by the present law. This bill, letter B of the senate, if carried out in its entirety would require that every man who had in his possession any ancient weapon as a trophy should take out an annual license for it, and the same for every such weapon in his possession, which would be absolutely foolish. And, if you run through the whole matter, the penalty is excessive. One thousand dollars and costs is the penalty for the first offence.

I do not want to take up unduly the time of the house, but the bill provides that there shall be a record kept of every sale and every transfer. In other words, if a party of hunters go out and trade rifles while on the hunt they are liable to a penalty, if this bill goes through, of $1,000 and costs. The thing is absurd on the face of it. As a matter of fact, the trouble with this country is that we are being over-legislated; we have too many laws, laws about which, in many cases, we know very little; we may be guilty of offences against those laws without any intention of doing wrong. I would therefore move, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be read a second time six months hence.

Mr. GEARY: This motion is debatable, is it not? My hon. friend (Mr. Arthurs) has stated objections to the bill which I think are very sound. A great many persons carry a shot gun or a rifle into the woods on perfectly legitimate business, or for the sake of sport, and they do not want to be embarrassed. But that can be attended to very well in committee. There are one or two other features in this bill, however, that should not be lost sight of. One is the procuring of revolvers by the criminal class. This bill has been endorsed by the police constables' association. I notice a letter here from the chiefs of police of Toronto and Montreal. Toronto and Montreal are centres in which great difficulty has been experienced of late in dealing with criminals, all of whom, apparently, carry firearms. The chiefs of police are officials who have in their hands the ferreting out and prosecuting of criminals, and they think that if there was some way of tracing the weapon with which they are armed when caught it might be of great use.

I am sorry to say that I cannot add much more than that. My friend says there is no demand for such legislation. There certainly is a demand from the police department. If there are details in the bill which have to do, in some way, with the disposal by a shopkeeper of his stock in trade, or a sportsman having in his possession a rifle or a shot gun, I think the committee can very well take care of that. The main purpose of the bill, as I see it, is to restrict the holding of revolvers and arms of that type by people unauthorized to hold them, and to restrict in such a way the purchase of revolvers that they will not get into the hands of people who should not be entrusted with them. That is the principle of the bill. One might speak for an hour on it and get no further than that. I suggest that as the house has had the courtesy to send this to the appropriate committee in other years, where it has rested, unable to get further because of prorogation following soon after, we might do the same with it this year and there defeat it, if we please.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why waste the time?

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): I gathered from my hon. friend (Mr. Geary) that he had discussed this matter with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) and that the minister had no objection to the bill going to committee in order that it might be further examined.

Mr. GEARY: That was it; he expressly stated so.

Mr. DUNNING: I have on numerous occasions in this house voted against killing a bill without adequate discussion, and for the principle of referring bills of this character to committees in order that they might be further inquired into, even though I might oppose the bill itself. For that reason I feel inclined to vote against the six month's hoist before adequate discussion of the measure has taken place. I think it should be discussed and examined before the appropriate committee. That is only fair, and, for that reason, speaking for myself only, of course, I shall vote against this form of closure.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): This bill has been before the house on previous occasions and has been discussed at very great length. The objections, which have been pointed out and which I think are valid, are numerous indeed. One reason why I think this bill should be defeated on its second reading is that its promoters, who, from our previous discussions, can learn something of the sentiment of the house, should take a reasonable time to redraft the bill and bring it before the house in more simplified form so that it may be expected to accomplish the objects which they state they have in view, and eliminate those parts of the bill which seem to be utterly ludicrous.

Hon. LUCIEN CANNON (Solicitor General): Two years ago, if I remember rightly, Mr. Speaker, I was sponsor for the bill introduced at that time in the senate by Senator Belcourt. Numerous objections to the proposed legislation were raised in the house; the bill was referred to a committee and, if my memory is correct, most of the objections to the bill were overcome by changes which were made in that committee and the bill in its new form was far more acceptable than when it was first presented. I feel very much like my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning); instead of killing this bill outright by supporting the amendment of the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) I would suggest that it be referred to a committee where the interested parties might appear.

Mr. ARTHURS: Has my hon. friend read the bill?

Mr. CANNON: I have read the bill. I would not say that I approve of all its provisions but I think it might be sent to a committee before which the interested people could appear, instead of killing it as we will if we support the amendment.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): I think this bill has been before this house five times. On one occasion it was sent to a committee which amended it very considerably, but now it is brought back to the house almost in its original form. I do not see any object in taking up the time of parliament by appointing a special committee; so many committees are meeting now that no one would have time to attend the meetings of such a committee. Let the promoters of this bill revise it and bring it back in a more acceptable form. It has waited five years now, and no injury has been done.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): I think the point of the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) is well taken, and as the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) has indicated, this bill has been discussed on several previous occasions. I remember once when it was absolutely laughed out of the house because it was so ridiculous, so it is hardly an argument for members of the government to suggest that this amendment is a form of closure in connection with this bill.

The facts are that the promoters of this legislation appear never to learn by experience; they come back time after time, almost turning the city of Ottawa into a Canadian Chicago. One would think we were living in that city, to read some of the sections of this bill. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it can be taken seriously. Let me just quote one passage from it:

> Every one is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction thereof to a penalty not exceeding one thousand dollars and costs, or to imprisonment with or without hard labour, not exceeding two years, or to both such penalty and imprisonment, who,—
>
> (a) not having a license therefor from the Minister of Justice or his authorized agent, after the thirty-first day of December, 1929, imports, brings, transports into Canada, or transmits by post, or manufactures, makes or deals in, or sells to, barters with, gives or lends to or repairs for any person, any weapon of the following kinds or of any like or similar kind:—
>
> (i) any cannon, trench-mortar, machine gun, revolver, pistol, air gun, or shot gun or rifle known as sawed-off or riot gun;

That one section is an indication of the hysterical character of this legislation, which I understand comes from the other house. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we might be well advised to send back this bill to their honours in the senate with the suggestion that they go into the matter a little more carefully and not consider Canada another Chicago.

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

Mr. GEARY: May I ask what has become of the well known views on disarmament of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland)?

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka-Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty on this occasion to rise in protest against this infringement on the liberties of the Canadian people. We are not bolshevists—

Mr. HANSON: Too much prohibition.

Mr. McGIBBON: I stand second to no man in this country in upholding our laws, but I think these infringements upon the liberties of our people have gone almost too far. This bill has been before the house some five times; I have opposed it upon each occasion, and I will continue to oppose it because I still have confidence in the common sense, the decency and the honesty of the Canadian people. We are getting too much law; we are infringing too much on the rights of the people. If my memory is correct, in other days no voice was raised more powerfully in this house when this question was discussed than that of the Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon).

Mr. THORSON: May I ask a question?

Mr. McGIBBON: If it is not too hard.

Mr. THORSON: Are we to take it that the hon. gentleman wishes to preserve the right of transmitting trench mortars by post?

Mr. McGIBBON: If we could turn those mortars on some of the members of the government who are supporting this bill I would answer yes. In all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Canadian people I must protest against this bill; it is not the only bill of this character which will come before this house, and I expect to have something to say in connection with the others. However, I think the time has come when we must stand up for our rights in this country. I remember how the Solicitor General voiced his condemnation of this legislation in the past; if I had time I would like to quote the speeches he delivered in this house when we considered similar bills in other years, but I shall not do so. I have very much pleasure in supporting the amendment of the hon. member for Parry Sound.

Amendment (Mr. Arthurs) agreed to on division.

DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS

RIGHT OF MARRIED WOMEN TO ESTABLISH DOMICILE

Mr. W. J. WARD (Dauphin) moved the second reading of Bill No. 75, respecting the domicile of married women in proceedings for divorce.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. WARD: I think at the outset, Mr. Speaker, it would be well if I read the bill, since there appears to be a feeling on the part of some members of the house that the bill has something to do with the divorce laws of Canada. That is not the case; it has no bearing at all upon the laws now governing divorce in this country except that it will enable the women of Canada to enter actions for divorce upon the same grounds as those upon which they are now instituted by the men. The bill provides as follows:

1. This act may be cited as The Divorce Jurisdiction Act, 1929.

2. For the purposes of this act a married woman,

(a) who is judicially or otherwise separate and living separate and apart from her husband; or

(b) who either before or after the passing of this act has been deserted by and lived separate and apart from her husband for a period of two years, and is still living apart from her husband;

may acquire a domicile for herself as though she were a feme sole and may commence an action for divorce praying that her marriage may be dissolved on any grounds that entitle her to such divorce in any court having jurisdiction to grant a divorce a vinculo matrimonii.

The bill, I repeat, has no bearing whatever upon the present divorce laws of Canada. I make that explanation in order to clear the minds of those who think that we are attempting to make divorce easier, or anything of that kind.

It is, I understand, the settled law that in Canada the domicile of a married woman is the domicile of her husband no matter where he happens to be. It is also I understand, the law that the jurisdiction of the provincial courts in provinces where there is provision for divorce, and the jurisdiction of parliament, depend on the question whether the applicant is domiciled, in the one case in the province, and in the other in the Dominion of Canada.

There are many women in Canada whose husbands have deserted them and in some cases remarried and settled in other countries —in this case another province is another dominion or another country—and these women are deprived of the right of obtaining a divorce by reason of this rule of law. I know of three or four such cases in my own riding, and, considering the position which has been given to woman with respect to property, the exercise of the franchise and many other matters, I think it is time that she was put on the same basis as her husband with reference to his important domestic matter. In other words, I believe that the old rule of law making the woman's domicile absolutely dependent upon the domicile of her husband should be altered and that woman should be given the right to establish a domicile of her own, separate and independent from that of the husband. This is only a matter of common sense, reason and fair play. There is no sound reason why an obsolete rule of law should be invoked to deprive women throughout Canada of access to the courts in order to obtain redress in the same way that men can. I am urging it for the consideration of the house simply for this reason.

In my own province and the neighbouring provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia the courts have jurisdiction in divorce. Any man, no matter where his wife lives, can come to any of these four provinces, acquire a domicile and seek redress from the courts by way of divorce. But women who have lived all their lives in these provinces, who are citizens and voters and in many cases large property owners paying taxes and generally carrying out all the honourable demands of society, are denied the right of access to the courts because it happens that their husbands have deserted them and acquired a domicile in some foreign country. It is ridiculous to say that because the woman's husband has deserted her and has gone to

Mexico, Australia or China, her domicile is removed to one of those places. I know women who have never left the province of Manitoba but who have been told that their domicile is in England, South Africa or the United States. For these reasons I have thought fit to bring in this bill and urge it upon the attention of the house.

As I know that this matter involves a great many difficult questions of law and as I am a layman, I am presenting it to the house for consideration in this general way in the hope that a number of the lawyers in the house will join in the debate and express their views on the subject. I know that many hon. members of the legal profession are familiar with the question and can give us a full explanation of the points involved, considered from the standpoint of the law.

Hon. LUCIEN CANNON (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has explained, this bill is for the purpose of establishing the domicile of a woman who wishes to sue for divorce. Speaking for myself personally it is impossible for me to support this bill, as I am against the principle of divorce, and also because I believe this bill would facilitate the procuring of divorces.

Under the laws as at present, if a husband and wife who had been living in Ontario, their last domicile being in that province, separate and the wife goes to reside in Manitoba, then if she desires to sue for divorce she must do so in the province in which she was last domiciled, her legal domicile being her husband's domicile. Manitoba has divorce courts and Ontario has not. The result of this bill would be to enable a woman to take procedure in Manitoba and would only facilitate the granting of divorce. For these reasons I cannot support this legislation.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, I think the bill goes farther than the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon) has stated. This bill applies not only to the province of Alberta but to every province in Canada, and it simply means this: it enables the province of Nova Scotia or Manitoba, or any other province where divorces are granted, to be made into a Reno. Any wife who desires a divorce need only leave her husband and go to Manitoba and establish a domicile there. She could sue for divorce and compel her husband to come from any other province to defend that action.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That privilege is granted to the husband at the present time, is it not?

Mr. CAHAN: I would not put it in just the way the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) has put it; at the present time the wife's domicile is the domicile of her husband.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): In the event of a husband desiring to obtain a divorce he can do what this bill purports to give the wife a right to do.

Mr. CAHAN: Under the present law the wife's domicile is that of her husband; when the husband selects a domicile in some particular province that is his wife's domicile for all purposes, not only for the purpose of divorce but for every purpose in connection with their civil life. This law certainly would override the civil law of the province of Quebec, and would come in direct conflict with the civil law in other provinces of the Dominion. It would make a complete revolution in the civil status of married woman. This matter, therefore, should receive every attention and should not be passed as being something of minor importance.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry indeed to hear the words of the Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon) a few moments ago, because he touched only one remote phase of the question. I would like to submit to the house one type case in which gross injustice is now being done. Take the case of a married couple residing in any given place: the husband deserts his wife—and it is not an unusual thing—he goes away and the wife remains in her home town or locality. That is not her domicile, because her husband has run away and grossly deserted her. She is the victim of his evil propensities. That is undoubtedly an injustice to the decent womanhood which finds itself in that position. I have, for instance, knowledge of a case in a western city where a young couple, both minors, were married. Their parents found the youngsters and they were separated. The young man went away and the woman, who was under age and who was married to him, is living still, as she was then, in the home of her parents. Ten years have passed. They do not know where the young man has gone. He has vanished, and she has no domicile except her husband's unknown domicile, wherever that may be. In regard to what the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) has just said about the question of property and many other rights, they are determined upon the ipse dixit of this chap who has run away.

Heaven knows where. That is not a state of affairs which should be tolerated. I am not saying that the bill in its present form is perfect. I think my hon. friend put his finger upon the weak spot in the bill, but it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. CAHAN: Subclause (b) of section 1 would cover the case my hon. friend mentions.

Mr. STEVENS: We are considering now the question whether the bill should be given its second reading, but I agree with the point my hon. friend has raised that one clause is altogether too wide. By striking out the words "or otherwise separate", we could cure that, but I ask that the matter be given some consideration. I have in my hand the judgment of a judge referring to this, indicating that the discrepancies in the law ought to be considered by parliament. Time is too short to precipitate a full discussion, but I ask either that the bill be allowed to pass its second reading and be sent to a committee for study, or at least that the government should give to it consideration, if the Solicitor General will pardon me for putting it in this way, other than the personal wishes of the Solicitor General.

Mr. CANNON: My hon. friend will remember that I prefaced my remarks by saying that this was just my personal opinion; that I was not speaking for the government.

Mr. STEVENS: But the Solicitor General is speaking as solicitor general of a government and weight is attached to his words not only because of his position, but also because of his great legal learning in regard to these matters.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): There is one observation which I should like to add to the remarks that have been made. It seems to me that there is also in this bill a principle of wide concern and application to the people of Canada, that is, the matter of equal rights of the womanhood of this country in comparison with the rights the men hold. There has been through modern times a strong development in equalizing the social, political and economic rights of the womanhood of this country. This is not a question of the principle of divorce; it is not a question where the convictions of any hon. member should interfere with his sense of justice and duty to the womanhood of Canada with regard to its right to equal treatment with the men of Canada. I am one of those who believe that the time has arrived in our civilization when the women of Canada, and, in fact, of other countries, do not have to regard themselves as having an inferiority complex, or rather, when the men should not regard themselves as possessing a superiority complex. I should like to place before the house the simple thought that underlying this bill is the fact that the attitude of the house will be a declaration whether or not the parliament of Canada, which unfortunately possesses only one woman and a good one at that, will deny to the women the principle of equal treatment in this matter as well as in all social, political and economic matters.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour for private and public bills having expired, the house will resume in committee of supply.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Outside service — salaries and allowances, $17,295,464.40.

Mr. GEARY: When the house rose at six o'clock, I think the Postmaster General was in the midst of an explanation in regard to the St. John post office.

Mr. VENIOT: I had nothing more to say in regard to the St. John post office.

Mr. GEARY: I do not think the hon. gentleman said anything. I do not know that his present attitude is so unusual after all. I am going to ask him categorically whether or not he will take the committee into his confidence at least to the extent of informing it as to the reasons that prompted him to exercise some authority, which I suppose he has, to put an officer of junior rank over the head of the senior in charge of the district about St. John, New Brunswick.

Mr. VENIOT: I have already stated to the committee that for some time I had in view an investigation into the discipline, if I can use that term, in the administration of the office in the city of St. John as well as in the inspectoral district of that section. Certain difficulties had arisen there which were a subject for investigation by two of our expert officials who were sent from Ottawa, expert, first, in financial administration, and, second, in the operation of the office. When the question arose through the absence or leave of absence from Canada of the district superintendent, I felt, from my observation of affairs in St. John in the last year—and I have visited that office fre-

quently and have had occasion to discuss its administration and operation with my head officials—that I was doing what I considered right in placing the gentleman I did place, in charge as acting district superintendent. This I felt would bring matters to a head, and certainly I was not mistaken, for matters are coming to a head. The investigation is still in the air, so to speak, still going on quietly, and until it has been completed and reports have been made to the department by the responsible officials, I feel that the house should not ask me to go any further into the matter.

Mr. CLARK: I would ask the Postmaster General whether he has secured from the Civil Service Commission the file with reference to the post office at Sutton, Quebec.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman should ask the Secretary of State.

Mr. CLARK: On the orders of the day to-day I asked the Postmaster General this question. The Secretary of State was in the house, and he undertook to produce the file.

Mr. VENIOT: I have not got it.

Mr. CLARK: Then I would ask the Postmaster General if he will tell the committee why the postmaster at Sutton was dismissed.

Mr. VENIOT: I think the record will show that. I will have it brought down; I think we have it.

Mr. CLARK: This is a matter which the Postmaster General has known for some days would be brought before the committee, and information with respect to it has been requested on several occasions. I think we might have the information now. I am sure the minister's deputy would be able to give him the information.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not wish to be understood as refusing to give any information. I have nothing to hide in connection with any post office or in connection with my actions respecting any part of my department. I am prepared to give all information possible. I think the file has been asked for and laid on the table; I do not know that I have a copy of it with me. The part that was said to be missing was that part of the file that would be furnished by the Civil Service Commission. That was asked for only this afternoon, and it was impossible for the Secretary of State to obtain it from the commission in time to present it this evening. The best I can do is to call his attention to the matter and have the file completed by the production to-morrow of the papers from the Civil Service Commission. I can assure the hon. gentleman that no matter what item we may be on, he will not be precluded from discussing this matter.

Mr. CLARK: I am quite prepared to accept the undertaking of the Postmaster General to produce that part of the file, but that portion of the file has nothing whatever to do with the question I am now asking, namely, why was the postmaster at Sutton dismissed? He was a man by the name of Olmstead. I am quite convinced that the minister's deputy can give him the information for the benefit of the committee.

Mr. VENIOT: The deputy says that he cannot give it off-hand, and I do not think it is right to expect it.

Mr. CLARK: I would ask the minister if he has any personal memory of having dealt with that post office.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, I have.

Mr. CLARK: I would like the minister to give us his memory of the circumstances.

Mr. VENIOT: No, I shall not undertake to speak from memory for fear that I might be depending upon my memory too much and make a mistake. I will bring down the record to-morrow, if the hon. gentleman is satisfied to accept my word.

Mr. CLARK: Possibly the Postmaster General has that file here.

Mr. VENIOT: I am just looking through my papers now to see if I have it.

Mr. CLARK: We can wait.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not see it here.

Mr. CLARK: In order that there may be no misunderstanding to-morrow, may I ask the Postmaster General whether he will give a statement to the house to-morrow as to the reasons for the dismissal of this official.

Mr. VENIOT: I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. CLARK: And bring down the balance of the file from the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. VENIOT: I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. CLARK: And also make a statement to the committee why the office, which was advertised in October, 1927, has not yet been filled?

Mr. VENIOT: I will give all that information.

Mr. SHORT: I want to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General and of the house a dismissal which took place in my constituency. This is only one of many. I refer to the dismissal of the postmaster at Waterford, Digby county. I asked for the file a few days ago, and as usual, I got only a part of it. From the files that are brought down by the Postmaster General there is always something missing, and from this particular file the most important thing that is missing is a largely signed petition from the residents of that district.

In looking over the file I find first a letter from the defeated candidate in my constituency, Doctor Lovett, asking for the dismissal of the postmaster at Waterford, Digby county. He says in that letter:

> I am asking for the dismissal of George Johnson, postmaster at Waterford, Digby county, Nova Scotia, on the ground that he is a Tory partisan and took an active part in the last federal election in the interests of my opponent, the Tory candidate. I would recommend and urge the appointment of Mr. Leslie Sabean, of Waterford, to fill the vacancy caused by the dismissal of the present postmaster.
>
> Yours respectfully,
>
> (Signed) L. J. Lovett,
> ex-M.P., Digby-Annapolis.

I want to say to the Postmaster General that this man Johnson is not a partisan. He had been postmaster in this district for many, many years; in fact, the post office in this district had been situated in this same house for fifty years, the office having been handed down from father to son. This postmaster took no active part in any political campaign. He is not a partisan. He did vote, I think, for me; I do not know positively, but I have every reason to believe that he did. But is a man to be called a partisan and is he to be deprived of the franchise simply because he holds a little sixty dollar position? Is that the policy of this government? It seems to me that every country postmaster in my constituency who is suspected of being a Conservative has been dismissed. Doctor Lovett, the defeated candidate, whom I had the pleasure of defeating on two occasions, was a member of this house for four years, from 1921 to 1925. During that period he made no dismissals at all, but he is taking his revenge now on these poor country postmasters drawing salaries of sixty dollars, because he could not take it out of anyone else.

The next letter on this file is one from the chief post office superintendent at Ottawa to the district superintendent at Halifax, advising him to appoint Mr. Leslie Sabean as postmaster in the place of Mr. George Johnson. Next is a letter addressed to Doctor Lovett from the Deputy Postmaster General advising him that instructions have been given to dismiss Mr. Johnson and appoint in his place Mr. Leslie Sabean. The next document on this file is a form of transfer signed by the chief superintendent of the post office service. This is followed by a letter from Mr. Sabean, who had been appointed to the office, refusing the appointment. It is dated March 14, 1927, but does not appear to be addressed to anyone. He writes:

> Dear Sir,—
>
> I am unable to accept the position at Waterford as it is my intention to move away from here. Sorry not to have been able to let you know before.

Mr. Sabean never moved away from the district; he is living there yet. On March 21 the Deputy Postmaster General wrote to Doctor Lovett informing him of Mr. Sabean's refusal to accept the position and asking to be given the name of another reliable party. Doctor Lovett never answered this communication, but the Postmaster General was not satisfied to let the matter rest there, and on May 3 he writes Doctor Lovett:

> Permit me to draw your attention to the correspondence relative to the proposed change at Waterford, N.S. As you are aware, the dismissal of the postmaster was authorized by the Postmaster General, but your nominee, Mr. Leslie Sabean, declined the appointment. You were informed of this vacancy on March 21, and I would be pleased to hear from you as soon as possible.

Evidently Doctor Lovett was satisfied to let the matter drop, but the Postmaster General wanted the head of this little sixty-dollar postmaster to go into the basket with the rest of them. Doctor Lovett did not reply until May 31, nearly a month later. Finally he went to Leslie Sabean and then sent this letter to Mr. Gaboury:

> Re Waterford Post Office
>
> Mr. Leslie Sabean has decided to accept the position of postmaster at Waterford. Will you please see that his appointment is made, and oblige.

Evidently they were forcing the appointment on Sabean.

An hon. MEMBER: Did they increase the salary?

Mr. SHORT: Not until they appointed their own Liberal nominee; then they raised it to $100. The correspondence goes to the post office inspector at Halifax with instructions to make the appointment. Again Mr. Sabean

declined. This is the third time that they tried to force the office on him. Then follows a letter signed by the district superintendent at Halifax, addressed to the chief superintendent of the post office service. It is dated June 15, 1927, and is in this form:

With reference to departmental memorandum of the 7th instant, and to previous correspondence regarding the vacancy in the postmastership at Waterford, the district superintendent has to report that Mr. Leslie Sabean on again being notified that the office was to be transferred to him writes as follows, under date of the 14th inst.:

This is what Mr. Sabean says:

"I have decided not to take the post office even for a short time, as I still intend to move away from Waterford,—

And he winds up his letter:

"—and why make unnecessary bother."

That shows how far the Postmaster General goes with these little sixty-dollar offices. Under date of August 11, I find that Mr. Coolican, the Acting Deputy Postmaster General, wrote to Doctor Lovett. It will be noticed that another official has taken up the correspondence—of course at the dictation of the Postmaster General. This is the letter:

Re: POS—Waterford, N.S.

Dear Dr. Lovett,—

Permit me to refer to previous correspondence regarding the vacancy in the above postmastership and to say that I would be glad if you were now in a position to submit a recommendation in this case at your earliest convenience.

As stated in a letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, dated the 22nd June, Mr. Leslie Sabean, whom you had recommended for the position, declined to accept the office.

Now this is the reason why Mr. Sabean declined to accept the office. As I say, this post office was situated practically right in the centre of the district. It had been located in the same house for fifty years under two or three postmasters of the same family. Each of these officials had given entire satisfaction to the community. The last of them was very popular, and as soon as the people heard of his dismissal a petition was circulated and signed by practically every resident. This was sent to the Postmaster General, but it does not appear on the file. That explains why Mr. Sabean would not take the office, and the Postmaster General could not get anyone else in the district to accept the position until along in the latter part of September, the 21st to be precise, when Doctor Lovett write the Postmaster General as follows:

I am now in a position to recommend the appointment of Mr. Wm. Walker for postmaster at Waterford, Digby county, N.S. This appointment would be in the public interest.

Think of it! Mr. Walker's house is not conveniently situated, and many residents declined to have their mail sent to that post office. So the change is not very much in the public interest. I see there is another letter on the file, dated November 2, 1927, from the district superintendent at Halifax, to the chief superintendent at Ottawa, in which he says:

Referring to departmental memorandum of September 28, the district superintendent has to say that the transfer of the Waterford post office to Mr. William Walker was effected on October 20.

The office was moved three hundred yards west but the travel of the mail courier was not affected.

Now, as a matter of fact the district superintendent never was in that locality at all or he would not have made the statement that the office was moved three hundred yards. Really it was moved three-quarters of a mile. That is the kind of service we are getting down in certain sections of Nova Scotia. In the twenty-mile district in which this office is situated there are six other offices, and every one of them has been changed since 1926, and in each case it has resulted in great inconvenience to the locality served. Yet not a charge was laid against any one of these postmasters. The only reason for their dismissal was the recommendation made by the defeated candidate. If he could have his way, every departmental official in my constituency would have to get out—every one of them, because that is the disposition of the defeated candidate. He tried it in the customs last year, and when the matter was investigated they had to appoint the man the Civil Service Commission nominated. Unfortunately, none of these postmasters came under the Civil Service Act. They could not point a finger at Mr. Johnson, as postmaster, unless it was because he was supposed to have voted for the Tory candidate. Is it a crime in this country for a man to vote for a Tory candidate? Are none of those sixty-dollar a year postmasters able to exercise their franchise? That seems to be the disposition of the Post Office department. If Doctor Lovett wanted these removals, he was a member of this house from 1921 to 1925 and all he had to do was to stand up in his place in this house and ask for the dismissal of those postmasters and it would have been granted. He was not so much interested in the men then because he was a member, but since his defeat he wants to take his revenge upon these underpaid country postmasters, and that is the way he does it.

This is only one case of many that I have in my constituency. I could call the Post-

master General's attention to another one in my constituency, in Annapolis county. The post office there had been in the same house for twenty-seven years. They could not get any person in the district to accept the office, and they closed it altogether. That is the condition there. I asked for a rural mail route in that district after that, and I wrote to the Postmaster General regarding it. He said he would make inquiry. He sent the district superintendent down to interview Doctor Lovett and asked him what he thought about this rural mail route in the district, and Doctor Lovett advised against it. Is the Post Office Department going to take the advice of every defeated candidate, as to how our postal department should be run? It seems so in these small country offices. I say it is a disgrace to the postal department of this country. It never occurred under the administration of any other Postmaster General.

Some hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

Mr. SHORT: Never, Never have there been so many petty dismissals in the province of Nova Scotia as have taken place since the present Postmaster General has occupied office. This gentleman that I have reference to here served as postmaster under the Liberal government from 1896 to 1911. He was good enough for them; why is he not good enough for the present government? Now they are scalping, and every man who holds a petty office and who is not one of their faith has got to walk the plank. I am going to tell the Postmaster General, though, that so far as political expediency is concerned he has made a great mistake in this case, because I doubt if a Liberal candidate could go in there at election time and get half a dozen votes where they used to have a majority. And I doubt if Doctor Lovett personally knows this man at all; but he was told by some of the heelers in the constituency that these petty postmasters must go, and that is the reason and the sole reason. I say it is a disgrace to the post office department to think that every country postmaster, simply because he exercises his franchise at election time, is obliged to lose his office.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not want to take up the time of the committee, but I would just direct the hon. gentleman's attention to a comparison I am going to make. If it is a crime for the present Postmaster General to dismiss on the recommendation of friends of the party certain postmasters, what can we call it when we look at the record of Nova Scotia from the 1st of October, 1911, to—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. VENIOT: —to the 30th of September, 1917, when there were 254 postmasters dismissed on the recommendation of defeated and elected candidates.

Mr. SHORT: How many of those postmasters who were dismissed were replaced by rural mail services?

Mr. VENIOT: Since we are on that question, I just want to deal with that. Every postmaster dismissed from 1911 to 1917 was dismissed irrespective of the closing of post offices for the opening of rural routes. The record shows that. Just let me give an example or two to prove it.

Mr. SHORT: How many in Nova Scotia in that time?

Mr. VENIOT: In Nova Scotia there were very few rural routes opened, and there were 254 postmasters dismissed.

Mr. SHORT: That is from 1911 to 1925.

Mr. VENIOT: Let us look at it. In the province of New Brunswick there were 91 dismissals, and there were 32 rural routes opened. Supposing for a moment that the contention is correct, that these dismissals are contingent upon the closing of offices or the opening of rural routes, there still remains a difference of some 60 there.

Mr. HANSON: That does not follow, that one rural route would close several offices.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, but there was not a single dismissal recorded as a dismissal connected with the opening of rural routes. In the province of Saskatchewan there were 57 dismissals and there was not a single rural route opened. Take Manitoba. There were 43 dismissals and there were only 2 rural routes opened. And, as I stated before, every rural route opened which resulted in the closing of an office is not taken into account in the 1,604 or 1,608 postmasters mercilessly dismissed without thought of an investigation by our friends opposite when they were in power. I have dismissed some, it is true. I do not attempt to deny it. I am prepared to take that responsibility as I should take it as the head of a department. I have dismissed some, but I have not dismissed the number that my hon. friends say for political purposes, not anything near that number. And let me say here that not a single post-

master who comes under the Civil Service Commission was dismissed by the present Postmaster General without an investigation first being held under oath in compliance with the order in council referred to the other night.

Mr. SHORT: You could not do otherwise.

Mr. VENIOT: And on the personal certificate of a member representing the county.

Mr. CLARK: Would that investigation appear in the files produced relating to the dismissal of any particular postmaster?

Mr. VENIOT: It certainly would.

Mr. CLARK: The evidence would be there?

Mr. VENIOT: The evidence I think is there.

Mr. CLARK: Well, I will tell the Postmaster General that so far as the file concerning the dismissal of the postmaster at the town of Sutton is concerned there is no such thing in the file. There is no such investigation indicated. The dismissal there is on the personal signature of the Postmaster General, so far as I can ascertain, without any investigation whatever; and there is also the statement in that file that that particular postmastership comes under the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. VENIOT: Does my hon. friend see there a report from an inspector?

Mr. CLARK: Yes, but there is nothing to indicate that an investigation was held under oath.

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. gentleman reads the file he may find in the report of the inspector sufficient to warrant the Postmaster General in taking action on the investigation of one of his own officials.

Mr. CLARK: There is absolutely nothing in this file of that kind and, what is more, the report of the inspector is entirely favourable to the postmaster, in spite of which the Postmaster General dismissed this man. I will undertake to say that no evidence under oath was taken, that there was no proper investigation, and that the statement made by the Postmaster General just now is incorrect.

Mr. VENIOT: That statement is correct, and my hon. friend has no right to say it is not.

Mr. HANSON: I am not so very much concerned about the dismissals in my constituency; so far as I can recall there have been only three. The most important one was at Canterbury Station, and if I were so disposed I might move a vote of thanks to the Postmaster General for having dismissed this gentleman, because I think he will be my very best political worker in that part of the county at the next election. I venture to say that his dismissal will be worth fifty votes to me.

However, that is not my purpose in rising at this time. I regret that I was out of the chamber this afternoon when the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Bell) made a request with regard to the bringing down of certain correspondence having to do with the conditions existing in the office of the district superintendent in the city of St. John. I would like to ask the Postmaster General to supplement what he has promised to bring down by the correspondence from and to his department or any official thereof, addressed to or coming from the district superintendent or any of his assistants in reference to the alleged irregularities of Mr. Griffith, covering a period of two years.

Mr. VENIOT: I said I would bring down the file.

Mr. HANSON: Will the minister bring down the entire file covering a period of two years?

Mr. VENIOT: When I say I will bring down the file does my hon. friend think I should qualify that statement?

Mr. HANSON: I have heard of such things as mental reservations.

Mr. VENIOT: So have I, and the hon. gentleman knows to what I am referring.

Mr. HANSON: I do not know. I do not want any mental reservations in this case; if we can have the complete file it will suit my purpose.

Mr. GEARY: May I ask the minister if it is his usual practice to override the reports of his superintendents?

Mr. VENIOT: Not generally; I do not think it is.

Mr. GEARY: He did it in the Picton case; the direct recommendation was overruled.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would like the attention of the Postmaster General for just a moment.

Mr. VENIOT: I should not be expected to answer everyone at the same time. The Picton case has been brought up and I would like to know if the hon. gentleman wants to discuss it.

M. GEARY: Yes, I would like it discussed.

Mr. VENIOT: Then my hon. friend had better go ahead.

Mr. GEARY: Does the Postmaster General intend to meet the objection I have just raised with regard to the Picton case?

Mr. VENIOT: What was the objection?

Mr. GEARY: Why did you override the very favourable report of the inspector?

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. gentleman will tell the house how that report was overridden I will take up the question.

Mr. GEARY: The district superintendent definitely recommended a man named Way for the appointment, in a very favourable report. The minister wrote a letter to his deputy in which, without assigning any reason, he said, "Reject this man Way." Way had been in the office for some twenty years and was placed at the head of the list by the minister's own official.

Mr. VENIOT: I discussed that question the other evening, as the hon. gentleman will remember; if he wishes to have the discussion gone over again I am prepared to do so.

Mr. GEARY: Very well.

Mr. VENIOT: At that time I drew attention to the fact that, technically speaking, I did not override the recommendation of the qualifying officer, the inspector of the department; I refused to accept the certificate issued by the Civil Service Commission in favour of Mr. Way. This gentleman had been in the office since 1905; he had been there seven years when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in 1911 or 1912. At that time they dismissed the postmaster, or there was a vacancy of some kind, and they refused to recognize the ability and the qualifications of Mr. Way after his service in that office when they appointed another gentleman to the position.

When that office became vacant in 1927 or 1928, after an investigation into what was supposed to be and what later was proved to be the political activities of the postmaster in the handling of mail matter during the election, after which inquiry the postmaster was dismissed, the vacancy was advertised. Mr. Way was an applicant; he, as assistant postmaster, was almost as much to blame as the postmaster for the irregularities which took place, since he looked after the mail in the absence of the postmaster. So, under the evidence which to my mind was sufficient to bring about the dismissal of the postmaster for mishandling the mail, I did not think Mr. Way was a fit and proper person for the position, although he may have had the necessary knowledge to carry on the work of that office.

Mr. GEARY: There are just two points in the explanation of the Postmaster General to which I intend to refer. In 1911 this man Way had been some six years in that office; he was then 22 years of age, a mere boy. He did not apply for the position but he was recognized by the Postmaster Genaral of that time, and was made assistant postmaster. During the investigation to which the minister has referred Way's name was never mentioned.

Mr. VENIOT: No one said it was.

Mr. GEARY: He was the assistant postmaster. We need not go into the evidence again, because the evidence would not justify anyone in making a dismissal.

Mr. VENIOT: The other evening the hon. gentleman went into the evidence and quoted only two or three witnesses. Why did he not quote the other witnesses?

Mr. GEARY: There was not another witness who gave evidence worth listening to.

Mr. VENIOT: I have all the evidence here.

Mr. GEARY: Mr. Way's name is not mentioned in the evidence either directly or indirectly. When the minister instructed his deputy to reject the nomination of Way, if he had a reason for that action why did he not state it as he was supposed to do under the act? He did not even communicate that reason to his deputy but simply instructed him to reject Way's application.

Mr. VENIOT: Because he was not suitable.

Mr. GEARY: The minister did not say a word about his suitability; he did not mention a reason at all, but of course the deputy, knowing the law, had to put in some sort of justification. Was the fact communicated to the deputy that the Postmaster General did not think Way suitable because of the political activities of the office? It does not appear anywhere in the file that he did so, and as a matter of fact he did not. That was not the reason; the reason was that Purtelle and the party behind him at the

very inception had made up this plot to get rid of the existing postmaster and later appoint Purtelle over the heads of everyone else. If the minister had a reason he would have mentioned it, but the minister did not have that reason; there is not a word in the evidence, which was carried to such a length that I do not think it could be considered evidence, to suggest that anyone under the postmaster had anything to do with the alleged irregularities in connection with the mail, and throughout the investigation Way's name was not mentioned. It is idle for the minister to say that he had that in mind; obviously, if you take the history of the case from the beginning, what the minister had in mind was simply to assist the local political ward-heeling association to put the chief ward heeler in office.

Mr. McGIBBON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to detain the committee a few moments while I read some evidence which I have in connection with the case I brought before parliament a few days ago. This matter concerned the dismissal of the postmaster at Uffington, the reason given being that of irregularity. I received an affidavit to-night which I would like to place on Hansard. It is as follows:

Province of Ontario
District of Muskoka.
To wit:

We, Henry and Ada Byham of the township of Draper, district of Muskoka, farmer and married woman, make oath and say:

That on the 5th day of September, 1928, when the post office inspector came to remove the local post office at Uffington we were personally present and in answer to a question by the late postmaster as to the reasons of removal the inspector replied that there were no complaints or irregularities reported. When further pressed the inspector added that the post office had been removed through the political processes of Mr. J. B. Johnson, the defeated Liberal candidate.

I bring this forward only because this man's reputation has been damned in this house and in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. McGIBBON: There is also an affidavit made by the postmaster which states that on the day the inspector called he was $7 short in his accounts; at least there was that much money which was not in the till. He explains that a man had come into the post office for a money order and had promised to bring in the money for it in an hour or two. The postmaster gave him the money order and in the meantime the inspector arrived. That is all the evidence the Postmaster General or his department has been able to resurrect in order to justify the dismissal of this man. Not only has he dismissed, but, as I said a moment ago, his reputation throughout the length and breadth of this country has been damned. I have another affidavit which I would like to read to the house, as follows:

Province of Ontario
District of Muskoka.

I, Henry Buckler, of the township of Draper, in the district of Muskoka, taxidermist, make oath and say:

1st. That on the 9th day of October, 1928, I was in the Orange hall at Uffington, and talking to Mr. Ben Johnson, the defeated Liberal candidate at the last dominion election, about the post office being taken from me and given to Sam Hawn, when Mr. Johnson said, "never mind, Harry, I will fix you up better than you ever were."

2nd. And Mr. Johnson seeing Sam Hawn close by he called him over and said to him "Sam didn't you say you would give Harry Buckler four years' salary?" Sam thought a little while then he said, "I do not think I said four years, I think I said four months' salary, Mr. Johnson."

Is any more evidence needed to show that this whole thing was nothing more or less than a political dismissal without one tittle of evidence to justify it? It is bad enough to dismiss the man, but it is infinitely worse to damn the man's reputation throughout the length and breadth of Canada on the little evidence the department has been able to produce. I bring this matter to the attention of the committee only in the hope that I can clear this man's character in his old age and not have his name go down under the disgrace of having been dismissed because of irregularities in his office.

Mr. ESLING: During last session, in the month of February, I asked the Postmaster General for a return of all correspondence and documents in connection with the dismissal of a postmaster in my district. That return was tabled by order of the house, but I now ask the Postmaster General if he will not lay on the table the missing correspondence in order to make the file complete. We all know the outside operations of these matters, but it is the inside political intrigue which cause us to ask for returns of correspondence.

Mr. VENIOT: Would the hon. member tell me the name of the particular office?

Mr. ESLING: It is Renata post office. I ask for this information because if a man is to be dismissed without a charge, without an investigation, without an inspector's report, or the opportunity for a hearing, then I submit that there is very little security for the average rural postmaster. If there is a covetous partizan—it does not make any differ-

ence to what party he may belong—waiting there to grab his job, and if the minister is permitted to place upon the table of this house a file after stripping it of every evidence of political influence—or perhaps the better term would be political sculduggery, because that is what it is—then I submit that there is not very much protection for the average civil servant.

I would like to relate a few facts in connection with this case, which is different in many respects from the other cases which have been brought to the attention of the house. Renata is a little community on the Arrow lakes in British Columbia. The chief industry is fruit-growing and the only access to the outside world is by water. In January of 1927 the postmaster at that place indicated his intention of retiring, as he was going to leave the district. At that time there were 62 adults receiving mail at this office, and 55 of them signed a petition for the appointment of one Peter Friesen to the position of postmaster. I have the letter from the Deputy Postmaster General acknowledging receipt of that petition and, as is customary, stating that the matter would receive consideration. On February 21, 1927, I went to see the Postmaster General personally. I then wrote him a letter referring to the conversation of that day, reading in part:

> You have a petition bearing 55 names of Liberals and Conservatives alike, who ask that Mr. Peter Friesen succeed Mr. Weive retired. In view of the fact that there are only 50 electors at Renata, you can see that citizens, regardless of party affiliation, have recommended Mr. Friesen, and I trust you may see your way clear to meet their wishes.

The Postmaster General replied that the matter was receiving consideration. On February 25, the district superintendent at Vancouver sent Mr. Friesen a wire stating:

> I beg to inform you that I am in receipt of a telegram from the department to-day, which, for your information is quoted hereunder:—
>
> "Re Renata: P. H. Friesen appointed to postmastership. Proceed with transfer."
>
> (Signed) District Superintendent.

That is a wire from the department at Ottawa to the superintendent at Vancouver, who in turn repeats it to Mr. Friesen. On the 8th of March an official letter, confirming this appointment, was received by Mr. Friesen and he assumed the office on the first of March, 1927. That establishes the fact that Mr. P. H. Friesen was appointed postmaster for this office by the Postmaster General himself after due consideration. But there happened to be in that community a gentleman who for three elections had been the

[Mr. Esling.]

Liberal returning officer and also the Liberal roadmaster, which gave him more or less leverage in the way of votes or influence. He was also the Liberal justice of the peace. I have a letter dated December 13, 1926, stating that the local Liberal whip, as one might call him, made the boast that at any time he chose he could take that post office away from the then incumbent, and that furthermore, he proposed to be the postmaster of that place within a period of six months. We have Mr. Friesen taking over the office on the first of March, 1927, and on the 2nd of May, only two months later, the Postmaster General sends a wire to Mr. Friesen relieving him of his appointment, and appointing the local Liberal whip. Without any charge, without any report from an inspector, without any opportunity on the part of Mr. Friesen to be heard, the Postmaster General tells this new postmaster to turn over his office to his Liberal successor. That notice went forward in the shape of a letter from the Postmaster General and it should be remembered that this was just two months after he had appointed Mr. Friesen. I do not know where he got the inspiration, and there is nothing on the file to suggest why he should make any change. There is nothing on the file by way of an inspector's report, but he writes to the Deputy Postmaster General saying:

> I have since discovered that this post office under Friesen is not situated in such a way as to give the most satisfaction to the public. I therefore authorize you to have W. J. Doherty appointed, and that notice be given to Friesen that he is retired from the service.

Mr. Doherty was the local Liberal whip. The Postmaster General says that some time ago he had a recommendation for the appointment of Mr. Doherty. Then by way of a reason for retiring Mr. Friesen he suggests that he has discovered that the new post office is not in a suitable location, notwithstanding the fact that it was near the wharf where it had always been and that Doherty's location was about half a mile out of town. This "some time ago," to which the minister refers, must necessarily have been a date between Friesen's appointment on March 1 and the appointment of Mr. Doherty on May 2, so that the question is: Who recommended the change? That is a matter which is not on file. The Postmaster General could not be expected to know all applicants for small offices throughout the Dominion, so that somebody must have brought the matter to his attention, and that is what we should like to know about. What was the political influence that suggested to the Postmaster General that Mr. Friesen should be retired,

and what reminded him that Mr. Doherty had been recommended some time ago? The question is: Who recommended him and why should that recommendation, in all fairness, not be included in the file? Another question one would naturally ask, is: How did the Postmaster General discover that this post office was not in a suitable location? He was never in Renata. I have never had the honour of meeting the Postmaster General in my constituency in British Columbia, and yet there is no correspondence.

Mr. VENIOT: I have been in British Columbia. I have been in Victoria.

Mr. ESLING: Its a long trip between Victoria and Renata.

Mr. VENIOT: I have not been in Renata.

Mr. ESLING: When the Postmaster General comes to British Columbia, I shall be glad to take him to Renata just to show him the location which he does not consider suitable. By actual measurement Mr. Friesens' office, in the vicinity of which there had been a post office for many years, was only ten chains from the wharf, whereas the new location was exactly forty-five chains, or something over half a mile. I ask: Who recommended the change? I think what we are mostly interested in is that when a return is brought down we should have it all. Why should the minister be permitted to withhold that portion which has any political bearing on the matter? I should like to ask who complained.

In regard to this matter there was a very peculiar letter which went from perhaps the oldest and most substantial resident of that district, a responsible fruit shipper, to the district superintendent. The district superintendent in turn sent it on to the Postmaster General, and it is acknowledged. The revenue from Renata is less than $200, but at the time the change was made it was more than $200. This citizen writes to the district superintendent, and it appears that there was fear that this Liberal whip, Mr. Doherty, would be appointed to the office. He says:

> Fearing that William Doherty might be appointed Renata postmaster I wrote on January 12—

That would be January 12, 1927.

> —to the Postmaster General asking that a reliable party be sent in here to make inquiry before any appointment was made.

We have had the Postmaster General on several occasions during this discussion state—and he was correct—that any post office with a revenue of less than $400 did not come within the scope of the Civil Service Commission. This correspondent goes on to say:

> I received answer bearing date of January 25 from which I quote.

Then he quotes the Postmaster General as saying:

> This matter is still in abeyance and is in the hands of the Civil Service Commission, who have absolute control of such appointments.

That statement may have been an oversight. I do not expect the Postmaster General to know offhand just what the revenue of each post office is, but he could very easily find that out. The letter goes on:

> Soon after Peter Friesen was appointed, and we felt very thankful that the matter was settled and in a very satisfactory way for the great majority of Renata citizens. Mr. Friesen, with the help of Mr. Wiebe, retiring postmaster, got his office in good shape and in a very convenient place between the wharf and the store. But this week like a "bolt from the blue" notice came that in two days the inspector would be here with orders from Ottawa to transfer the office to William Doherty, whose place is over half a mile from the wharf (45 chains by my blue print).
>
> There surely has been misrepresentation somewhere. Two petitions have gone in to headquarters signed by the great majority of the residents of Renata. William Doherty is roadmaster and by that means he controls a few voters who would not sign the petition. William Doherty is also Justice of the Peace, appointed on the recommendation of one man and in spite of our protest. Now he is made our postmaster and that against almost universal protest—it would be universal if he had no government money to disburse.

When Mr. Friesen was removed, the district superintendent at Vancouver sent word to the office at Renata that an inspector would arrive on the 11th of March to make the transfer. This correspondent writes with respect to that:

> We had hoped the inspector would be sent in to make a report.

The inspector arrived on the 11th of March. The letter continues:

> Now that he has been here he told us that he can make no report to Ottawa as to the situation here unless he is asked for it. Are we condemned without a hearing to deal daily with a man universally disliked?

So we have here, Mr. Chairman, the case of a postmaster being dismissed without any report being made to Ottawa. We have an inspector being sent to that post office to make the transfer, and he is not permitted to make a report to the department unless he is asked for it. But surely some kind of report must have been made by the inspector, and I suggest that that report be included in the

correspondence to be brought down because I think it must have a material bearing on this case.

Here is another phase of the matter. The Postmaster General gave as a reason for making this transfer that he discovered that the location of the post office was not suitable. That hardly agrees with the circumstances and it hardly agrees with the protest which the Postmaster General must have on his file. because I have here a letter dated May 18, 1928, which was sent to the Postmaster General. It is important, but it is not contained on the file. In view of the fact that the Postmaster General assigns as a reason for making this change the unsuitable location of the post office, I submit that this letter has a pronounced bearing on that point.

In the correspondence that has passed between the Postmaster General and the Deputy Postmaster General respecting the Renata post office, the following passage occurs:

> I have since discovered that this post office under Friesen is not situated in such a way as to give the most satisfaction to the public.

This statement is absolutely contrary to the facts of the case, as Mr. Friesen's location close to the wharf is the logical centre of business in that locality, whereas the present location is more than half a mile distant from the wharf and could hardly be more inconvenient, especially during the shipping season. That letter. Mr. Chairman, must be on the minister's file, but it is not on the file brought down, and that indicates some inclination at least to relieve the file of any evidence that the reasons given by the Postmaster General for the change are contradicted by the residents of Renata.

Here is a petition signed by forty-three citizens, and remember that there are only sixty-two people who get their mail at that post office. They say in this petition that the new office is half a mile distant; that Friesen's office was by all odds the most suitable and the most acceptable to shippers and those who had business to do with the boats, and yet the Postmaster General does not include this petition, in the file brought down.

There is nothing on the file to indicate how the Postmaster General discovered that the location was not suitable. There is nothing on the file to indicate who recommended Mr. Doherty for the postmastership at Renata and surely there must have been some correspondence between the date of Friesen's appointment and the date of his dismissal. There is nothing on the file in connection with the inspector's visit on the 11th of May, and he must have made a report to Ottawa. There is nothing on the file regarding the petition of forty-three residents of the locality, protesting against the removal of the postmaster and the removal of the post office. All I ask, Mr. Chairman, is that the Postmaster General please lay on the table to-morrow the missing correspondence in connection with this dismissal and the new appointment, so that those of us in that part of the country may have a better knowledge of just who it is that is conducting this underground political sculduggery, and who is the go-between for the Liberal postmaster at Renata and the Postmaster General. I think we are entitled to have this information, because the people there were perfectly satisfied with their postmaster, and there has been nothing presented to this committee to indicate why the change was made except the statement that the Postmaster General says that Mr. Doherty was recommended some time ago. If he was, why did not the Postmaster General give consideration to appointing Mr. Doherty at the time Friesen was appointed? What was the motive behind the suggestion that Friesen was not the proper man and that the location was a poor one when a great majority of the residents of that district say that the new location is the poorer one by half a mile? I have a letter saying that some people near the old office and near the wharf pay a man to go and get their mail from the post office because they do not want to walk that distance to get it.

I am willing to overlook a great deal in this connection, Mr. Chairman, but, remember. this is a matter of vital interest to that little community, just as much so as the dismissal of a postmaster at some more important point is to another community. All I ask is that the file be completed. I happen to know something of the correspondence that has gone to the Postmaster General, and I ask him to lay it on the table to-morrow Then if it is not the correspondence to which I refer, I shall have to repeat my request.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might be permitted to divert the attention of the committee a little from this tremendous accumulation of evidence of the partisan action of the present Postmaster General in regard to the administration of his office, and to appeal rather to his sympathies, to the softer side of his nature, while I say a word on behalf of those members of his staff who are referred to under the title of postal workers.

A day or two ago the Postmaster General was good enough to give me some information in regard to the number of postal workers who are paid by the Port Office department. The number is rather large. The total, according to the memorandum given to me, is 10,005, subdivided as follows:

Letter carriers	2,710
Postal clerks	3,009
Railway mail clerks	1,364
Postal helpers, postal porters, postal chauffeurs	2,922

Making a grand total of 10,005, comprising that class of the Post Office department known under the general heading of postal workers.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in regard to a very large portion of those ten thousand employees there is but one opinion in this house, and the Postmaster General himself must share it, and that is that they are a very much underpaid part of the service. I am fully aware that a week ago to-day when I made an appeal in this house on behalf of the rural mail carriers I was met by a very definite refusal on the part of the Postmaster General. I well remember, too, that in the appeal which I then made I received no support whatever from the government side of the house; not a single Liberal stood up and offered even a word of sympathy with regard to the remuneration which is now paid to our rural mail carriers. Three individuals did stand up and give as a reason for voting against my proposal that under the Civil Service Act rural mail carriers would have to be between eighteen and thirty-five years of age, and that if my motion carried it would disturb all the old carriers. Some hon. members have a very scrupulous regard for the Civil Service Act when it suits their particular purpose; but it is an act of this parliament, it can be changed in a moment at the will of this parliament, and all that would be necessary in the case I have just quoted would be a section providing that the age limit shall not apply to rural mail carriers; this would clear up the difficulty. But I regret to say I was not very fortunate in my appeal on behalf of the rural mail carriers: every Liberal and every Liberal-Progressive voted down the proposal. I am going to make an effort to-night to convince the minister that he should do something for the postal workers. This matter has been aired every session for the last eight or nine years. This session it was brought up by my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) supported by another of the independent group from Winnipeg, and elaborated and supported by my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens); but never a word during the whole week's discussion from the Liberal benches or the Liberal-Progressive benches to support the proposal that the postal workers should receive a little more money for their services

I suppose the postal workers know, and the people of Canada know, that the only way in which larger remuneration can be granted to them is by action of the government. No individual member in this house can make a proposal to increase the wages or salaries of these postal workers. It rests entirely with the government to make such a proposal, and until the government decides to act nothing can be done. Session after session we have urged upon the government this question of the under-payment of the postal workers. Session after session the government has declined to act, and I cannot recall a single supporter of the government ever saying a word to help these unfortunate postal workers obtain adequate pay to maintain themselves and their families.

Now, the answer which the minister made last week when the appeal was made by the independent members for Winnipeg for an increase in pay was the one which he always makes when it suits his purpose—that he has no power under the law as it now stands to do so, because he says that is a matter which under the Civil Service Act must be arranged by the Board of Civil Service Commissioners. That is very true as the matter stands to-day, Mr. Chairman. The act does provide that those salaries shall be fixed, varied, increased or otherwise dealt with by the Board of Civil Service Commissioners. But the Civil Service Act is not like the law of the Medes and Persians. The Board of Civil Service Commissioners is not above this parliament. The will of parliament must prevail in any case, and if the Postmaster General and the government express any willingness on the subject it will prevail in this parliament. Let the Postmaster General consult with the Minister of Finance on the situation which exists, and which he knows exists, in regard to this matter. Let him lay before the Minister of Finance the real state of affairs in regard to these postal workers. Then what is the answer? It cannot be said that the Board of Civil Service Commissioners can negative the will of this parliament—not for a single moment. I do not know anyone more adept in evading and avoiding and circumventing the Civil Service Act than the Postmaster General. He has done it time and time again. The discussion during the past

week has demonstrated that fact. When he wants to evade, to avoid, to override or to circumvent the act he seems well able to do it. But the act is not a sacred thing. As I said, it is not like the law of the Medes and Persions. Every year certain positions are taken out of the Civil Service Act. Every year there is a return made before the parliament of Canada within the first ten days of the session showing what positions have been taken out of the operation of that act. Every year, according to the will of this house, we make appointments disregarding the Civil Service Commission altogether Not a session passes when we do not in the estimates pass item after item making new appointments, fixing new salaries, without consulting the Civil Service Commission. We do it by including them in the estimates. Take the estimates for last year of the Department of Labour, and take the estimates for last year of the Department of National Revenue; appointment after appointment will be made and has been made, notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act. That is the will of the House of Commons.

If my hon. friend the Postmaster General has any real desire to deal fairly with these postal workers, let him not say that the Civil Service Act prevents his doing so, because such is not the case. If he desires to do it, if he desires to deal fairly with these men, all he has to do is to arrange with the Finance minister to bring in a supplementary estimate and we can pass it, according to law, in five minutes. There is nothing in the act to stop that.

Mr. VENIOT: You know that is not correct.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I know it is correct, and I know we are doing it this year and have done it in other years.

Mr. VENIOT: You are only playing to the gallery.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Just let me point out what I mean. We desired last year to appoint a special secretary to the Prime Minister of Canada. That should have been done by the Civil Service Commission; the salary should have been arranged by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. VENIOT: Not under the act, sir.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This was in the External Affairs department. So we put in the estimates last year an item, which reads "Secretary to the Prime Minister, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act". We have done it time and time again, and if we so desire we can bring in a supplementary estimate, or the Minister of Finance can, voting a sum of money to pay these postal workers anything that we decide they are entitled to. Do not let the minister repeat in this house that he is powerless. Surely parliament is not powerless. Surely we have not appointed a commission that can overawe or override us. Are we not supreme? Then if we are, there is the way out of the difficulty. But is the minister, is the government willing to do it? That is the question. They have shown no willingness, no desire, to take any action in the matter.

Why criticism of this government in regard particularly to the salaries of the civil service of Canada is this: When it comes to the higher grade salaries they are not niggardly, they are fairly generous; when it comes to a question of increasing the salaries of gentlemen of technical or professional knowledge, they take other means of getting round the Civil Service Act. They appoint a royal commission of three or four very distinguished Canadians to inquire into the situation and to report. For those higher officials they are reasonably awake to the situation; they seem quite capable of providing the necessary salaries for technical experts, professional men, or deputy ministers. They do not turn the deaf ear to that class. But when it comes to the men in the lower grades, to the postal workers, "Oh," the minister says, "what can I do? Look at that Civil Service Commission; they will not recommend it." I believe that the lower grades of the civil service in Canada have been very badly treated by this government. The government has pursued a most dilatory course in considering their claims. Up to the present time they have successfully avoided action. They have sent those unfortunate people from pillar to post. The application goes to the government for an increase. "Oh, we cannot do it," they say; "go to the Civil Service Commission." Then some kind of commission is appointed to report on the matter; it is considered, a report is made to parliament, the government pigeonholes the report, and nothing is done. And so from the year 1923 down to this date there has been request after request, consideration promised, consideration delayed. Reports have been made but action has never been taken. I think the civil service of Canada has shown wonderful patience in the matter, but there comes a time when patience becomes absolutely worn out. That time has pretty nearly arrived, I think.

What does the Postmaster General think of a situation like this? Take the case of the

letter carriers. We ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) what the actual cost of living in Canada is, and he says that for the bare necessaries of life for a family of five the cost in the month of January—I am giving January of this year—was $21.55 a week. Now, that is only for food, fuel, and rent. The climate of this country demands that we have warm clothing, but for food, fuel and rent, for a family of five, according to the Minister of Labour—and I fancy his report is pretty accurate—the cost of living is $21.55 per week, or an annual payment of $1,225, without clothing. And do you know that there are any number of postal workers in this country who are receiving $80 a month? A number are receiving $90 a month. Ninety dollars a month would bring a man $1,080 a year, but they deduct, I believe, in the case of letter carriers, 5 per cent for superannuation fund, leaving a net salary of $1,020 per annum; yet the Minister of Labour assures the House of Commons and the people of Canada that for the bare necessaries of life in Canada in January last the cost of living was at the rate of $1,225 per annum. Does not that demonstrate to a conclusion that the department is not paying these men sufficient to enable them to enjoy a decent living? A single man may be able to exist, but we are rather inclined in this country to encourage the married state and the production of large families. We need large families in Canada, yet we have on the one hand the statement of a responsible department that it takes $1,225 per annum to keep a family of five in food, fuel and rent, apart from clothing, and, on the other hand, sitting in the same government a minister who will not pay the men even that amount. Surely one has only to cite these facts to secure the sympathy of the minister, to get his willingness, to act, to have him say, "Yes, I will help out; I will do something for those unfortunate servants in my department who are underpaid." I do not say that the whole 10,005 are underpaid, but I do know that a great many in this class are underpaid according to the standards which the minister's own government has applied to the public generally. Surely, Mr. Chairman, we can appeal to the Postmaster General on a situation of that kind without any accusation of partisanship and succeed in getting not only his sympathy but his action in this matter. My suggestion is that he talk over this matter with his colleagues at once. Do not let this session pass without action; do not put it off until another session; do not wait until the eve of a general election to make the announcement. The Postmaster General will get far more credit for action this session than he will if he delays until next year; it will be more genuine if it comes during this session than if he waits until the eve of a general election. Why can we not get some support for this application from Liberal members opposite? Why can not we get some backing from the Liberal Progressives in this house Why have they remained silent during five days of this discussion?

Mr. POWER: They have not had a chance to speak.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They will have a chance in a few moments. I believe that if any considerable number will back my proposal we will succeed this session in righting this wrong, because it is a wrong.

This government cannot say that they cannot afford it; after the budget speech we know they can afford it. The 2,700 letter carriers in Canada could each be paid $200 a year more for the amount of money spent last year on motor cars, according to the Auditor General's report; you could pay them $200 a year each for the $500,000 you wasted for a house in Washington; you could pay them another large amount for the tens of thousands of dollars you have been wasting in North Bruce in order to elect a minister of the crown at the next general election. A minister of finance who comes to parliament and closes his financial year on April 1 with a surplus of $60,000,000 in his treasury can pay every one of these 10,000 postal workers an additional $250 this year; that will take $2,500,000 of his surplus and still leave him $57,500,000 to play around with. Do not say the country cannot afford it this year. This is the year to make the application, the year in which we have the surplus that has been referred to, while men are receiving from this government a rate of pay which will not enable them to maintain their families in decency.

Surely this is a situation which must be remedied. Year after year the request is made; year after year I fancy ministers are deluged with requests, of which I suppose every member of the house receives copies. But whether the government are too careless about it, whether they are too much occupied with other matters, whether the time of the Postmaster General is too much occupied in dismissing postmasters and hunting up new men for these offices, I know not. I feel like advising the postal workers to take what satisfaction they may out of that parable of our Lord in respect to the unjust judge.

I do not suppose in this committee anyone but myself and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) will recognize the reference, but if the postal workers will look up the eighteenth chaper of St. Luke they will find that in a certain city there was a judge who feared not God nor regarded man. There was also a widow in that city who came unto him asking him to avenge her of her enemy and he would not for a while, but afterwards said, "Though I fear not God, nor regard man, yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me." Now I think we had better tell the underpaid officials in the Post Office department to keep up their requests until they succeed in wearying the Postmaster General and worrying this government, and on the principle expounded in the parable of the unjust judge perhaps some day they may succeed. However, I can assure them that in any event they have not very long to wait; soon there will be in power in this country a government which will listen to their appeals and which will be prepared to satisfy promptly every just and reasonable demand.

I hope I have not said anything harsh to the Postmaster General; I realize that he received a very doubtful compliment this afternoon when he obtained a majority of only twenty-seven on the vote on the amendement and his feelings at the moment may be a little ruffled. I am trying to appeal to his sense of justice and of fair play. Here is the opportunity; here is the grievance; here is the government with a surplus of $60,000,000, a government which at times can be wildly extravagant. Surely we can get a little additional salary for the letter carriers, the postal workers, the postal porters and all the others included in those 10,005 men now working day in and day out for the Post Office department, a great many of whom are not being paid enough money to keep body and soul together.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to find that my hon. friend has been driven to such an extremity that he quotes sacred history in order to plead the case of the postal workers, or perhaps I should say he was appealing to the galleries in order to cover up the inconsistencies of which he and his party were guilty when the postal workers appealed to them when they were in power in 1919 and again in 1921. At that time they asked for bread and were given a stone.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They were given more than they are getting now. They were given a bonus then, which they are not getting now.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. VENIOT: When the postal workers of the country appealed to the government of that day they were referred to the Griffenhagen commission, and through that commission they were placed under the Civil Service Commission as it is now constituted. From that day to this they have been under that commission; that was the response given by the Tory party to the appeals made by the postal workers of that day.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We gave them the bonus.

Mr. VENIOT: There has been no necessity for the postal workers of Canada to be afraid to appeal to the Liberal government on any occasion, at least since I have had the honour of being Postmaster General. The postal workers will testify that on all occasions, at all times and in every possible way they have received my sympathetic support and that on different occasions I have strongly recommended to the Civil Service Commission that they consider the situation of the poorly paid postal workers of Canada. I guaranteed to the Civil Service Commission that the government was prepared to place in the estimates an amount sufficient to cover the higher classification and the increased wages they might recommend for the postal workers, the postal clerks, the postal helpers and the railway mail clerks of Canada. I have failed in my efforts as far as the postal helpers, postal workers and postal clerks are concerned. I have partly succeeded with regard to the railway mail clerks, and in the estimates this year there is an amount to cover increases in salary to the railway mail clerks as recommended by the Civil Service Commission.

My hon. friend says there is an easy way of accomplishing this end; according to him all we have to do is place in the supplementary estimates an amount of money sufficient to meet the increases to which we consider these postal workers entitled. Why, Mr. Chairman, last night I was roundly denounced by the hon. gentleman's leader because I was not living up to the spirit and the letter of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I grant that, but—

Mr. VENIOT: I did not interrupt my hon. friend when he was speaking. To-night I am asked by the first lieutenant of the leader of the opposition to ignore completely the Civil Service Act and place this amount in the supplementary estimates, while as an old parliamentarian my hon. friend knows that cannot be done without an amendment to the Civil Service Act as it stands to-day.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is parliament supreme?

Mr. VENIOT: If a supplementary estimate is brought down and voted by parliament contrary to the statute, the Auditor General would refuse to recognize it. Everyone knows that he is supreme in these matters, and no one knows it better than the hon. gentleman who is now leading the opposition in the absence of his leader. They talk about the poor postal helpers, the small pay they are receiving, and such things, but talking to the galleries in this house is quite cheap.

An hon. MEMBER: Who is looking for the spotlight now?

Mr. VENIOT: I would like to give the house once more the evidence of what this government has attempted to do to encourage the Civil Service Commission in recognizing the just claims of those who are classified as postal workers, postal helpers and postal clerks. I would like to read the last communication I sent to the Civil Service Commission after they had refused point blank to consider the recommendation made by myself that an increase be made in the salaries of these men. This matter had been under consideration for nearly one year and I had written to them pointing out that the estimates had to be arranged for the coming year and that it was the intention to place sufficient in the general estimates to meet an increase in salary to the postal helpers, postal workers and postal clerks, provided the commission would do its duty and recommend such an increase. They replied on March 9, refusing to comply with my request, and on March 11 I wrote as follows:

> I note you say that the matter has been placed before the board of commissioners and that after full consideration of the subject matter contained in my letter the commissioners have decided to confirm their decision of May 2, 1928, which was that further increase in the compensation of these classes is not justified.

That is the decision of the very body which the hon. members contended last night I should follow in every respect. That is their answer, and they are the only ones qualified to give an answer. The letter continued:

> I wish to thank you for the information but at the same time I regret that your commission has not seen fit to accept the recommendation of the department in favour of the postal clerks, letter carriers and mail porters, because I am convinced that they are deserving of better pay than they are now receiving.

That is the policy laid down by myself with the full authority of the government. When that was placed before the Civil Service Commission they refused absolutely to take advantage of the power given them under the statute to grant an increase, and they say the increase is not justified. The hon. gentleman may appeal to every kind of feeling and prejudice, but the fact remains that that commission, placed there by them when the postal workers were appealing for a living wage, and when they were in a position to grant it without any reference to the commission, refused to grant such an increase. Hon. members may pound their desks—we know exactly what that means—but the fact still remains that when the hon. members opposite had the power to increase the salaries of these men they ignored that opportunity and placed the power in the hands of the very commission which is saying today that they are not justified in accepting a recommendation that these poorly paid employees of the government should receive an increase in salary.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to think that the Postmaster General misconceives the actual situation. He says that we on this side of the house expect him to live up to the letter and the spirit of the Civil Service Act—we certainly do, and in every particular. We expect the government to do the same thing. But how can it be said that parliament is bound by its own creature? Is this Civil Service Cimmission an autocracy? Are they above the will of the people as expressed in parliament? It is nonsense to say that they are.

Mr. VENIOT: Change the act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The power that created it can change or destroy it. I do not advocate its destruction, but I say that the minister is not blocked, nor is this government blocked if it desires to bring in an estimate containing the words "notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act." That action would be perfectly valid; it is constitutional it is the will of parliament which is supreme. The minister is not supreme; he is bound by not only the letter but the spirit of the act. So is this government bound by the act, and we expect them to live up to it. I am pointing out to them a way out of the difficulty. The minister says that he realizes that these men are underpaid. He says, "I have made a plea to the commission and the commission will not grant it; I know their case is a just one, but the commission will not consider it." The position has only to be stated to reveal its absurdity. My complaint is that the Postmaster General has not shown any willingness to grant these men a living wage. A government which can

squander millions of dollars and still have $60,000,000 of a surplus in the treasury, surely can find a way to pay a living wage to men who, as everybody in Canada knows, are not receiving such a wage.

Mr. VENIOT: To prove to the house that the hon. gentleman is not interpreting the opinion of the postal workers, in a part of Canada at least, I would like to read to the house a telegram which I received this morning. This telegram is dated at Toronto, which is not exactly a Liberal stronghold, and is addressed to the Postmaster General at Ottawa. It reads:

> We, the postal workers of the department in Toronto, desire to go on record as strongly opposing the tactics being used to discredit you and your efforts in promoting the improvement you have and are inaugurating in the service.

That is sent on behalf of some three or four thousand postal workers in the city of Toronto. The telegram is signed by E. J. Purvis.

An hon. MEMBER: Who is he?

Mr. VENIOT: He is one of the head executives.

Mr. HEAPS: I have received letters from the city of Toronto within the past few days which ask for the very things which have been recommended by the hon. member for South Wellington. I have one letter signed by A. McMordie, the national president of the organization.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have received letters also.

Mr. HEAPS: I would like to deal for a moment with the remarks of the Postmaster General. It seems to me an extraordinary position that we find ourselves in at the present time. We have the Liberal party, through the Postmaster General, saying that they are in favour of giving to the postal employees an increase in their pay; we have the Conservative party also committeed to the same principle, and I am sure I can speak for all those who sit in this corner of the house that we are also in favour of giving to the postal workers an increase in their present remuneration. Therefore the house is practically unanimous on a certain course of action, and there are three individuals who stand in the way of that action being consummated. If the government were anxious to put into operation the increase in the salaries of the postal workers, I believe, they could very easily find ways and means of doing so.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: We will do it if you give us a chance.

Mr. HEAPS: Yes. When the Postmaster General spoke a few moments ago he said, I think, that he had advised his colleagues in the cabinet that he was prepared that they should grant an increase to the postal employees. I hope I am not doing an injustice to him, because I could not hear very well what he had to say. I jotted it down as he spoke, and I understood him to say that he could not convince his colleagues in the cabinet.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not. I would not say that.

Mr. HEAPS: I said: I hope I am not doing him an injustice. I understood him to say that he could not convince his colleagues to insert in the estimates an item for an increase in salary to the postal employees.

Mr. VENIOT: No. Take it back .

Mr. HEAPS: If he did not say that, I absolutely withdraw that statement. I could not hear him very well. Did he convince his colleagues to that effect?

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. member will allow me, I said that in communicating with the commission and asking them to grant the increases we recommended, I wanted it done because it was the intention to place the item in the estimates for this year. I was doing it with the consent of the government, and therefore I was laying down the government policy.

Mr. HEAPS: What is there at the present juncture to prevent the placing in the estimates of an amount that will take care of the increases to the postal workers? I understand the question was raised that the Auditor General might object to such an item being placed in the estimates. I think the government can do in that respect exactly as they have done in many others. If there is any doubt on the question, they can say something like this: "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act," this item goes into the estimates. Then we overcome the difficulty so far as the Civil Service Act is concerned. For instance, the Washington item for $100,000 in the estimates reads:

> Representation, including salaries and allowances for minister plenipotentiary, secretaries and staff, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, or any of its amendments.

If this appears so many times in the estimates for 1930, there is no reason why the same thing should not apply in regard to the postal workers.

Let me go a little further. The Postmaster General referred to the question of observing the letter of the act, stating that by not granting to the postal employees the increase proposed, he was not overruling the Civil Service Commission. He knows as well as I do, and as well as any other hon. member does, that within the past few days the government have overridden a decision of the Civil Service Commission in regard to salaries. I am referring to the question of the salaries of the technical employees. The Civil Service Commission made a recommendation to the government. It makes no difference whether they recommended an increase or anything else; the fact is they made a recommendation to the government, but the government refused to accept it. The government have also refused to accept the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission in connection with the salaries of the postal employees. Why should there be a difference between the higher paid men and the lower paid men of the service to the disadvantage of the latter? If the government were to show any consideration in this particular question, it should be to the lower paid men in its service. They have appointed a commission. This commission was constituted by order in council, so that the whole government were responsible for its appointment. The other day I asked the Postmaster General to do exactly with the lower paid postal employees as the government did with the technical employees who may be receiving anything up to $7,000 or $8,000 a year. The postal employees have appealed to the minister; they have appealed to the Civil Service Commission; they have appealed to parliament, and they have been turned down in every case. What are they to do? If they went on strike, we would hear a howl from one end of the country to the other. What does the Postmaster General expect these low paid postal workers to do at the present juncture in order to obtain redress? If he can answer that question, I shall be satisfied.

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot answer that question.

Mr. HEAPS: I want that question answered, and yet the minister sits in his place and says that he is unable to answer it. I know it is a difficult question; but will he answer this one: How does he expect a government employee and his family to live on $85 a month? I know he cannot answer that question. We as members of the house have some responsibility in this matter because they are employees of the government, and as was pointed out by the hon. member for South Toronto, we ought at least to be model employers in regard to those who work for the government. I do not think there is in the house anyone who will say that $85 or $100 a month is anything like an adequate living wage.

Let me come to other cases where the government are able to grant increases. In regard to the deputy ministers they grant them increases amounting to $1,000 and $2,000 per annum and the question of the Civil Service Commission does not enter into the matter at all; but when the question is one of the lower paid employees, there always seems to be an obstacle in the way of giving them that to which I believe they are absolutely entitled.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—PROCEDURE

RESUMING ON THURSDAY OR FRIDAY DEBATE ON AMENDMENT—RULING OF MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the house, may I be allowed to give the ruling I promised yesterday?

On Wednesday, April 17, Mr. Robb moved that Mr. Speaker leave the chair for the house to go into committee of supply.

Mr. Stewart (Leeds) moved in amendment that all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

In the opinion of this house, the Postmaster General has acted in a most arbitrary manner and in utter disregard of the letter and the spirit of the Civil Service Act in connection with the recent appointment of a postmaster at the town of Simcoe.

Debate thereon was interrupted on Wednesday at six o'clock by the adjournment of the house under standing order 6; and on Thursday, the 18th, when the order was called for the house to resolve itself into committee of supply, I had to leave the chair without question put, under standing order 28. This rule which does away with a motion for the house to go in supply on Thursday and Friday was passed in 1913. The revision of 1927 did not deal with this matter.

The leader of the house having agreed that debate continue on Mr. Stewart's amendment, there was no necessity to give a ruling, but the house requested that I render a decision in order to settle the practice which should be followed in the future under the same circumstances.

I have listened with great interest to the able argument set forth by several prominent members and I have carefully compared our standing orders with those of Great Britain. Standing orders 6, 7 and 28 must be construed together in accordance with the broad statement laid down by Lord Mansfield, namely:

> Where there are different statutes in pari materia, though made at different times, or even expired and not referring to each other, they shall be taken and construed together, as one system and as explanatory of each other.

I have come to the conclusion that if debate on the amendment to the motion for leaving the chair is interrupted by the eleven o'clock adjournment, as was the case last year, the procedure is not annihilated but suspended by the operation of standing order 28, because standing order 7 provides that:

> All business not disposed of at the termination of the sitting shall stand over until the next sitting day when it will be taken up at the same stage where its progress was interrupted.

It is well established under our practice that the expression "next sitting," "next sitting day" and "next sitting of the house" when used to state the time until which a question is ordered to stand over do not mean the following calendar day, but rather the next day on which it will be convenient to resume the proceedings on that question. It seems, therefore, that if debate is interrupted at eleven o'clock under standing order 7, the question is not superseded or lapsed, but it can be resumed without a motion to that effect on the first occasion that motion is made for the Speaker to leave the chair for supply, which may be on any of the three first sitting days of the following week. Sir Erskine May's comments on this point do not entirely apply to our House of Commons because the eleven o'clock rule at Westminster is not the same as ours. I am of the opinion that no motion is necessary for the resumption of this debate when it is interrupted at eleven o'clock.

But the situation is different if the interruption is caused by adjournment of the debate at any time or by the adjournment of the house at six o'clock on Wednesday. Standing order 27 provides that the question then under consideration shall stand in a certain precedence on the order paper, but no order is therein given to proceed with it. In that case, I am of the opinion that May's comments, as found at page 527 of the 13th edition, will apply. The procedure on the amendment lapses. But can it be revived?

The answer must be given from the broadest point of view possible. It must not be forgotten that when the house passed standing order 7 compelling adjournment at eleven o'clock, it very materially curtailed the length of debate in such cases as the one under consideration.

Formerly an amendment involving want of confidence could be discussed from Monday until Wednesday at six o'clock in the afternoon without interruption and the question could be exhausted in that time, but now with only six hours' sittings on Monday and Tuesday and three hours on Wednesday, it seems that the minority or, as it is called, the opposition, is at a great disadvantage, as Thursday may be reached before all the members who wish to speak have had an opportunity to do so.

If the question lapses, an expression of opinion cannot be given by the house on what may be a most important grievance. The government's policy can neither be vindicated nor challenged. I do not think such a situation was ever contemplated by the authors of standing order 28 or by the committee which recommended standing order 7 in 1927. It is a well-known principle in parliamentary law that the House of Commons can rescind its own decisions, suspend its own orders or revive any superseded motion.

No notice is necessary in Great Britain for a motion to revive an order of the day which has been dropped or set aside by abrupt adjournments or any other procedure. But our standing order 45 leaves no room for doubt. Every resolution of the house, and that means every decision, must be preceded by a notice.

I think I am on safe ground in ruling that when an amendment like Mr. Stewart's is removed from the order paper by the operation of standing order 28, the question itself does not lapse, but the procedure thereon is suspended over Thursday and Friday, and a motion to resume (I say advisedly "resume" and not revive) may be made after notice, but this resumption must take place the first time that the ministry moves the house into supply, and by neglecting to do so on that occasion, the mover waives his right to bring up his amendment at a later date.

In giving a decision which will settle our parliamentary jurisprudence for the future, I must not lose sight of the principle that the

right of the commons to challenge the administration of public affairs should be fully preserved.

This house,

as Lord Palmerston said,

is the mouthpiece of the nation, the organ by which all opinions, all complaints, all notices of grievances, all hopes and expectations, all wishes and suggestions which may arise among the people at large, may be brought to an expression, may be discussed, examined, answered, rejected or redressed.

In the present case, Mr. Stewart (Leeds) should have moved after due notice that the debate be resumed on his amendment as soon as the government made the motion that I leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of supply.

Last year, debate could have been resumed automatically and without a special motion on Doctor Tolmie's amendment which had been interrupted at eleven o'clock by the operation of standing order 7.

Two different situations arise in the premises because the application of standing order 28 depends upon the interpretation of standing orders 7 and 27.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, April 24, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

BANKING AND COMMERCE

Sixth report of the select standing committee on banking and commerce.—Mr. Hay.

On motion of Mr. F. W. Hay (North Perth) the sixth report of the select standing committee on banking and commerce was concurred in.

CIVIL SERVANTS UNDER $100 PER MONTH

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I desire to lay on the table the return with regard to the number of permanent servants of the male sex employed in full time occupations and receiving less than $100 per month, which was referred to yesterday by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer).

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

DREDGING SERVICES

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. How many different departments of the government support the establishment and equipment of dredging services?

2. What is the cost of same in each department?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Three.

2. Department of Marine and Fisheries, Marine branch—1927-28. Ship channel, staff salaries, $27,643; dredging—fleet, wages, $557,-829.61; dredging—fleet, operating expenses and repairs, $1,336,429.95; maintenance and operation, Sorel shipyard, $95,561.83.

Department of Railways and Canals:

Department of Railways and Canals maintains dredging services in connection with the operation of canals and the development of Fort Churchill harbour. Approximate cost of dredging equipment on canals, $278,400; approximate annual cost of operation of dredging plant on canals, $68,963; cost of dredging equipment at Fort Churchill, $1,120,306; cost of operation of Churchill dredging equipment not ascertainable until close of season's operations.

Department of Public Works:

$1,225,658.26 (1928-1929).

ARMED BOATS ON GREAT LAKES

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. Is the government aware that a gun boat from the United States lately approached the Canadian shore of one of the great lakes?

2. Is there any agreement between the present government and the government of the United States as to permission for use of armed boats on the great lakes?

3. Does the government know how many armed boats are now or have been employed by the United States on the great lakes since the war of 1812-15?

4. Are any of these armed boats employed by the United States for training purposes?

5. Has the government of Canada any armed boats on the great lakes?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. No information.
2. Rush-Bagot agreement.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. No.

CONSTRUCTION WORK AT BEDFORD BASIN

Mr. ERNST:

1. Are any sums of money payable to A. S. McMillan and C. A. MacNearney in respect to construction work at Bedford basin in the county of Halifax, during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1928, and in respect to which a payment of $100,000 appears at page Q-70, volume 2, Auditor General's report, 1928?

2. If so, what is the total amount payable to, or claimed by the contractor in addition to the sum already named?

3. How much of such amount, if any, is claimed as extras and how much as balance due under the original contract price?

Mr. RALSTON:

1. No.
2. Answered by 1.
3. Answered by 1.

DISTILLERY EXPORT TRADE

Mr. STEVENS:

What amount of duty was received from the duty paid export trade of the distilleries of Canada during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1929?

Mr. EULER: $7,807,679.58.

IMMIGRATION INVESTIGATING OFFICERS

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton):

1. Have appointments been made by the Civil Service Commission as a result of a recent examination for immigration investigating officers, grade 1 (female)?
2. Are the persons selected graduates of standard Canadian hospitals? If not, from what hospitals have they been graduated?
3. How many of those selected were holding positions in the Immigration department?
4. Was special consideration given to nurses who had served overseas during the Great War, and what special consideration was given?
5. Were the questions for examination prepared by someone holding a position in the Immigration department; did the same person correct the answers, and was such person a graduate of a standard Canadian hospital?
6. How many investigating officers were selected?
7. What are the duties pertaining to the office, and what is the remuneration given per year?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. No. The competition has not yet been completed.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

4. The usual preference will be given as authorized by section 29 sub-section 4 of the Civil Service Act.

5. The examination papers were prepared and examined by an officer of the examination branch of the Civil Service Commission in collaboration with an officer of the Department of Immigration and Colonization. Neither is a graduate of a standard Canadian hospital.

6. Answered by No. 1.

7. (a) Under direction to conduct investigations relating to the satisfactory settlement, in Canada, of women from the British Isles and other countries who enter Canada to take up domestic employment; to deal with difficulties in connection with such settlement; to adjust complaints; to prepare reports; handle office work and correspondence; and to perform other related work as required. (b) $1,500-$1,800 per annum. Annual increase, $60.

[Mr. Ernst.]

SERVICES OF P. MONETTE

Mr. FRASER:

What is the detail of the services rendered by P. Monette, Montreal, $11,215.82, vote 62, Health department, Auditor General's report, 1927-8, page GG-6?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): These are legal services on account of prosecutions under the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act. All accounts rendered by P. Monette were taxed by the Justice department before payment.

SOLDIERS' ADVISER AT CALGARY

Mr. COOTE:

1. What is the nature of service rendered by the soldiers' adviser at Calgary?
2. Does he give his full time to this work?
3. What remuneration does he receive?
4. What amount, if any, is allowed him for rent of office?
5. What amount, if any, is allowed him for stenographic assistance?

Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. Generally to advise and assist ex-members of the forces in matters pertaining to reestablishment, treatment and pension, and to perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the minister.

2. His employment calls for part time only.

3. $2,400.

4. There is no allowance for office rent, as this is presumed to be included in the salary paid.

5. $480 per annum.

PENSIONS ARISING FROM GREAT WAR

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

What was the total number of pensions arising from the Great War 1914-18, paid in each of the nine provinces for the year ending: (a) 31st December, 1927; (b) 31st December, 1928?

Mr. KING (Kootenay):

Province	At 31-12-27	At 31-12-28
Quebec	5,118	5,302
*Nova Scotia and P.E.I.	3,872	4,290
Ontario	21,990	23,465
Manitoba	6,104	6,535
Saskatchewan	3,688	3,836
Alberta	4,714	4,019
British Columbia	7,892	8,304
New Brunswick	2,002	2,189
	55,380	58,940

*The statistics compiled in this office show these two provinces as combined.

CHEQUES FOR PENSIONS

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. How many cheques for pensions arising from the Great War 1914-18 were mailed by the department during the month of February, 1929?

2. How many cheques for pensions arising from the Great War 1914-18 were mailed to addresses in Canada during the month of February, 1929?

3. How many cheques for pensions arising from the Great War 1914-18 were mailed to addresses in the United States during the month of February, 1929?

4. How many cheques for pensions arising from the Great War 1914-18 were mailed to countries other than Canada and the United States during the month of February, 1929?

Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. 74,643.
2. 59,881.
3. 6,633.
4. 8,129.

FISH AND GAME WARDENS

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings):

1. What are the names of the fish and game wardens in the province of Prince Edward Island?

2. What territory do they look after, and how much salary is paid to each respectively?

Mr. CARDIN:

1 and 2. There are no employees that are so-called. The attached list shows the special fishery guardians that were employed during 1928-29.

The following is a List of the Persons employed as Fishery Guardians in the Province of Prince Edward Island during the 1928-29 Season

Fishery Guardians—Queens County

Name and Address	Position	District	Total Amount paid 1928-29
			$
George Brown, New Glasgow	Fishery Guardian	New Glasgow—Trib. to Rustico Bay	45 00
Augustine Crane, Vernon	" "	Vernon, Seal and Orwell rivers	90 00
Earl Henry, Starley Bridge	" "	New London bay and vicinity	20 00
Bruce McCormack, Mount Stewart Replaced by	" "	East river	44 04
Geo. R. Clark, Mount Stewart	" "	East river	44 05
John Hughes, Clarktown	" "	Pisquid river west tributary to East river	20 00
A. Jenkins, Pownal	" "	Pownal bay	45 00
R. A. McDonald, Pisquid	" "	Mount Stewart—head of East river	20 00
A. F. McNeill, Long Creek	" "	West river and tributaries	90 00
J. F. Murphy, Vernon Bridge	" "	Vernon, Seal and Orwell rivers	60 00
Temple Murphy, French Village	" "	East river and tributaries	213 00
D. P. O'Keefe, Vernon River	" "	O'Keefe's lake	60 00
Joseph Weir, Scotchport	" "	Scotchport and Mills creeks	15 00

Fishery Guardians—Prince County

W. F. Blanchard, Bloomfield	Fishery Guardian	Little and Big Pierre Jacques	45 00
E. Bradshaw, Freetown	" "	Dunk R. from Dunk R. bridge to Roger's mill	15 00
Bruce Burns, Freetown	" "	Dunk R. from Smith's farm–McIvor's farm	15 00
Thos. Croken, Kinkora	" "	Dunk R. from Dunk R. bridge to Roger's mill	15 00
S. Crossman, Bedeque	" "	Dunk river	20 00
Levi Dyment, Tyne Valley	" "	Head of Tyne valley and Mill creek	20 00
W. Enman, Enmore River	" "	Enmore river	50 00
R. Johnston, Kinkora	" "	Dunk R. from Smith's farm–McIvor's farm	15 00
Jonah Lewis, Freetown	" "	Dunk R. from Wall's bridge–Monaghan bridge	15 00
Fred Luxton, Coleman	" "	Cains and Beaton's streams	100 00
G. H. Mills, Mills Point	" "	From Mill's point to Darnley	20 00
J. J. Peters, Duvar	" "	McAusland's stream	30 00
P. M. Tucker, Summerside	" "	Dunk R. from Ross Corner Byrnes Rock	15 00
N. Bulger, Glenwood	" "	West Point (Lobster protection)	151 61

Fishery Guardians—Kings County

Name and Address	Position	District	Total Amount paid 1928-1929
Richard Betts, Bangor	Fishery Guardian	Morell R. from Dan Grant's to Red bridge	$ 45 00
M. Cullen, Morell	" "	Morell R. from Red bridge to mouth of river	45 00
A. E. James, Midgell	" "	Midgell river	45 00
P. A. McDonald, Peakes Road	" "	Morell river between Dan Grants' and Laird's mill	45 00
Chas. Steele, Gaspereaux	" "	Gaspereaux, St. Mary's bay and Murray harbour	90 00

STEAMSHIP LAKEVIEW

Mr. MACDOUGALL:

1. What officers does the Department of Marine require the steamship Lakeview, a passenger boat plying between Sydney and Baddeck and other ports, to have?
2. What kind of certificates are required of each one of such officers?
3. What certificates did such officers hold in the years 1926, 1927, and 1928?
4. What are the requirements for life saving equipment on this boat?
5. What life equipment did this boat have in 1926, 1927 and 1928?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. The Canada Shipping Act requires the steamer Lakeview to have both a properly certificated master and engineer.

2. Master: Certificate as master passenger coasting; engineer: certificate as second class engineer.

3. 1926: Master: certificate No. 8409. Master passenger steamer coasting. Engineer: certificate No. 10115. Second class engineer.

1927: Master: certificate No. 9658. Master passenger tugboat coasting. Engineer: certificate No. 10376. Second class engineer.

1928: Master: certificate No. 9658. Master passenger tugboat coasting. Engineer: certificate No. 10376. Second class engineer.

4. The Lakeview on this route carries a crew of ten and is certificated to carry nineteen passengers. She requires two lifeboats aggregating at least 300 cubic feet capacity, or lifeboats for total number of persons carried, passengers and crew, minimum size of lifeboat 125 cubic feet.

One lifejacket for each person on board.

Four lifebuoys.

5. 1926: Two lifeboats aggregating 306 cubic feet; 89 lifejackets; 4 lifebuoys.

1927: Two lifeboats aggregating 306 cubic feet; 30 lifejackets; 4 lifebuoys.

1928: Two lifeboats aggregating 306 cubic feet; 40 lifejackets; 4 lifebuoys.

COLLECTION OF CUSTOMS AND EXCISE TAXES

Mr. ODETTE:

What steps have been taken to effect collection of the amounts mentioned in the report of the royal commission on customs and excise stated to be owing the Department of National Revenue?

Mr. EULER:

Amount collected		$2,370,783 51
Amount in Litigation:		
Brewers and distillers	$3,158,456 75	
Guarantee companies re bonds on liquor shipments	2,030,260 00	
Other cases	363,496 20	
		5,552,212 95
Payments arranged for		1,400,357 31
Amount owing by companies in liquidation or having no apparent assets (including four cases where judgment obtained by default)		303,990 29
Amount being collected through ordinary channels		79,688 92

It will be noted the total amount remaining unpaid is $7,336,249.47 in place of $7,114,-492.33 as presented in a return dated 16th April, 1929. Two or three small amounts were omitted in the amount shown on the above mentioned return and an amended return being presented accordingly.

AUSTIN PETERSON

Mr. ERNST:

1. Has Austin Peterson, of Lockeport, in the county of Shelbourne, been employed as a preventive officer of the Customs department at any time within the past two years?
2. Is he in such employ at the present time?
3. If so, is he a whole or part time officer?
4. What salary does he receive, and how much did he receive during the calendar year 1928 (a) as salary; (b) expenses?

Mr. EULER:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Whole time.
4. Present salary $1,320 per annum; (a) $1,260; (b) $20.

MRS. MARY ELLEN SMITH

Mr. SINCLAIR (North Wellington):

Has Mrs. Mary Ellen Smith been appointed to represent in any capacity the Dominion of Canada or the Canadian government at Geneva at a meeting of the League of Nations, or the council or any committee thereof?

Mr. HEENAN: Mrs. Mary Ellen Smith has been appointed as one of the delegates to represent the government of Canada at the twelfth session of the international labour conference (League of Nations) to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, commencing May 30th, 1929.

IMPORTATION OF BUTTER, MILK AND EGGS

Mr. SENN:

1. How many pounds of butter were imported into Canada each month between January 1, 1928, and March 31, 1929; from: (a) New Zealand; (b) United States; (c) British Isles?
2. How many pounds of milk have been produced in Canada during each fiscal year from 1923 to 1928, inclusive?
3. How many dozen eggs were imported into Canada each year from 1925 to 1928, inclusive. and for each month of 1929 to date; from: (a) United States; (b) China; (c) other sources?

Mr. MALCOLM: See table.

Estimated production of Milk in Canada, Calendar Years 1923 to 1928, inclusive—

	Pounds
1923	Not available
1924	12,318,538,000
1925	12,651,308,000
1926	13,407,340,000
1927	13,060,242,000
1928	Not available

1. Canada's imports of Butter from (a) New Zealand; (b) United States; (c) United Kingdom.

(By months—January 1, 1928, to March 31, 1929)

Months	(a) New Zealand		(b) United States		(c) United Kingdom	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
1928	Pounds	$	Pounds	$	Pounds	$
January	3,183,289	1,126,291	2,016	1,071	.....	.....
February	3,052,311	1,097,875	957	463	.....	.....
March	2,676,492	943,895	2,565	1,303	.....	.....
April	1,005,199	340,243	11,041	3,827	.....	.....
May	1,063,408	363,155	6,177	2,856	7,000	2,541
June	352,631	117,285	3,334	1,681	.....	.....
July	37,816	12,346	1,376	696	.....	.....
August	192,776	57,013	3,009	1,509	300	90
September	348,780	128,993	1,109	570	1,382	486
October	769,197	275,340	3,210	1,664	.....	.....
November	1,006,795	354,186	1,240	620	.....	.....
December	2,435,947	856,716	2,318	1,110	.....	.....
1929						
January	7,660,681	2,710,988	2,065	1,111	.....	.....
February	6,598,476	2,319,566	3,117	1,590	.....	.....
March	3,259,145	1,149,426	8,685	4,240	601,888	225,395

3. Canada's Imports of Eggs from (1) United States; (b) China; (c) Other Countries.

(Calendar Years 1925 to 1928, and January, February and March, 1929)

	(a) United States		(b) China		(c) Other Countries	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
	Dozen	$	Dozen	$	Dozen	$
Eggs in the shell:						
Calendar Years—						
1925	2,577,400	922,059	79,174	15,501	65,032	20,220
1926	3,506,579	1,036,051	2,440	725	51,345	16,797
1927	3,171,116	1,382,516	125	35	55,404	21,613
1928	932,452	403,740	833	164	63,595	21,101
January, 1929	3,626	1,694	333	52	8,104	2,204
February, 1929	22,673	8,923	83	12	7,869	2,154
March, 1929	593,525	194,844	250	84	5,287	1,425
	Pounds	$	Pounds	$	Pounds	$
Eggs, n.o.p.:						
Calendar Years—						
1925	54,390	15,333	1,342,692	218,118	109,975	17,058
1926	263,120	62,206	1,115,659	203,225	397	183
1927	728,918	177,862	1,224,927	267,153	71,194	17,882
1928	548,700	138,735	1,754,692	426,280	726,341	122,000
January, 1929	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
February, 1929	36	33	.....	.....	.....	.....
March, 1929	38,746	18,996	.....	.....	.....	.....

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

RAIL AND RIVER COAL COMPANY

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland):

1. Is the Rail and River Coal Company, Cleveland, Ohio, owned by the Canadian National Railways?

2. Is it operated by said railways? If not, by whom, what are the particulars as to contract, management, etc., under which it is leased or operated?

3. How many mines are included in the Rail and River Coal Company property?

4. Where are same located?

5. How many men are engaged at the present time by the Rail and River Coal Company?

6. Is union or non-union labour employed?

7. What is the capital stock of said company?

8. What was the total production of coal from these mines in each of the years 1928, 1927, 1926 and 1925?

9. How much of the output from said company was taken by the Canadian National Railways, and what price was paid per ton in the years above mentioned?

10. Where was the balance, if any, sold, and what price was received for it?

11. What amount does the Canadian National Railways pay annually for interest on bonds, maintenance and other charges in any way connected with said company?

12. Is there a contract between the Canadian National Railways and the Rail and River Coal Company to supply coal to the said railways? If so what are the terms of said contract?

13. Have the mines of the Rail and River Coal Company been idle during certain periods of the years 1925, 1926, 1927 and 1928? If so, on what dates in each of the said years?

14. What has been the cost to the Canadian National Railways per month to maintain said mines during the periods of idleness in the past four years?

15. Has the Canadian National Railways purchased coal from the West Virginia coal fields and elsewhere in the United States during the periods of idleness in the Rail and River Coal Mines? If so, what quantities, where purchased, and at what price per ton?

16. Did the Canadian National Railways transfer their orders for coal from the Rail and River Coal Company at certain periods in the past four years when union labour was engaged by said company, to non-union fields in the United States? If so, when and for what quantities?

17. What has been the cost per year in 1928, 1927, 1926 and 1925 to the Canadian National Railways to keep the Rail and River Coal Company operating? State particulars.

18. What is the policy of the Canadian National Railways with regard to its coal areas in the United States?

19. How much coal was used in 1928 on Canadian National lines owned in the United States, where was said coal mined, from whom was said coal purchased, what price per ton was paid for it?

20. What was the total amount of coal purchased in the United States for use on the Canadian National railway lines in Canada and the United States during the year 1928?

21. What was the total quantity of coal used on all lines of the Canadian National Railways in 1928?

22. How much was used in Canada on the Canadian National railway lines in 1928?

23. Where was said coal purchased, by provinces and states of the union of the United States of America, and what price per ton was paid for same in every instance?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

REFUND OF INCOME TAX

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

For a return showing: 1. The names of persons to whom refunds of not less than $500, under the Income Tax Act, have been made in the past five years, and the amount of such refund in each case.

2. The names of all persons or corporations in arrears or default of income tax, during each of the past five years, and the amount involved in each case.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Dropped.

Motion dropped.

OUTSTANDING SURVEY ACCOUNTS

Mr. FRASER:

For a copy of all correspondence and documents relating to the following payment in the Auditor General's report, 1927-8, Part K-31:

Outstanding survey accounts of previous years, for particulars see Auditor General's report, 1922-23, and correspondence in Auditor General's report, 1908-9, page K-151-155. $22,-743.55.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): With the permission of the hon. gentleman I would like this motion to stand until next day.

Motion stands.

WINNIPEG POST OFFICE

Mr. DICKIE:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents in the possession of the government, in connection with the Winnipeg post office from the 1st February, 1928, to date.

Mr. VENIOT: I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me exactly what he wants. Does he refer to the post office generally or to the postmastership?

Mr. DICKIE: One of the officials in the department has taken up the matter with me and I have told him my reference is to the postmastership.

Mr. VENIOT: Then it is understood that the motion is to be taken in that way.

DOMINION ARSENAL, LINDSAY—PAYMENTS TO E. A. MCPHEE

Mr. PECK:

1. For a copy of all pay lists furnished by E. A. McPhee for wages for the work done at Dominion arsenal, Lindsay, at dates and for amounts following, namely: (a) December, 1926, $508.30; (b) November, 1925, $761.80.

2. For a copy of the evidence furnished to the department that the fair wage provisions in the contract with E. A. McPhee, dated 26th September, 1927, for work at the Dominion arsenal, Lindsay, were complied with.

3. For a statement in detail of the wages paid by said McPhee in connnection with said contract.

Mr. RALSTON: I would call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the department would not have a detailed statement of the wages paid; subject to that being on the file, I have no objection to the resolution.

INVERNESS TOWN, N.S. POSTMASTER

Mr. MACDOUGALL:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, petitions and other documents, relating to the dismissal of W. L. Blair, postmaster at Inverness Town, Nova Scotia.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—APPOINTMENTS

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence, memoranda, recommendations or communications of any nature on file in the Post Office Department or the Civil Service Commission in any way relating to the rejection or refusal by the Postmaster General or his deputy or his department of the 32 recommendations or appointments of the Civil Service Commission referred to in the answer of the Postmaster General and reported on page 1074 of Hansard.

Mr. VENIOT: Last evening the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart), specified some ten or twelve different post offices out of the thirty-two. I expect to be able to lay upon the table this afternoon the files in connection with those specified by the hon. gentleman last evening, and if there are any others which he would like to have I will continue to work on them and table them at a later date.

REPORTED STATEMENT OF MR. ODETTE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ECCLES J. GOTT (South Essex): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb), tc an article which appeared in the Border Cities Star of Saturday, April 20, which reads as follows:

> Robb's next budget promises a surplus of one hundred million dollars and a record of a period of prosperity the greatest in the history of the nation, Mr. Odette declared.

I would like to ask the minister if his departmental officers are working upon the next budget, when we may expect that it will be brought down, and what surplus there will be.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman should put that in the form of a notice.

ARCTIC REGIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. FRASER (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) when he will table the report of Porsild Brothers on the Arctic regions. I notice there is a vote in the estimates which I presume is based upon that report, and I think it would be very instructive to the members to have the report when they are considering that particular vote.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): If the hon. member will make a formal request for the report I will be glad to table it.

Mr. FRASER: I make that request now.

PORT COLBORNE ELEVATORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. PETTIT (Welland): Mr. Speaker, in view of the limited capacity of the government elevators at Port Colborne, the serious grain congestion which is occurring and the consequent diversion of the grain to Buffalo, I would ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Dunning) whether the government contemplates the enlargement of the elevators at Port Colborne. The capacity of these elevators is only 2,000,000 bushels, and a great number of vessels are tied up there and other vessels are being diverted to the port of Buffalo.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): As hon. members know, that port is used as a transfer point in order to transfer cargoes from the large lake vessels to the smaller St. Lawrence river boats. The problem to be solved is the shortage of the small boats in relation to the number of the large boats arriving at the elevator. Subject to further study, I would say that an increase in the storage facilities would not be a solution of the problem. Last year, and for several years past, the elevator has handled more grain than any other elevator in Canada, handling over 70,000,000 bushels of grain last year. I shall be glad to ask my departmental officers to give attention to the point raised by the hon. member, and if there is anything that can be done I can assure him that the government will give it favourable consideration.

PRIVILEGE—HON. R. B. BENNETT

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think I am within the judgment of the house when I say that I rarely refer to newspaper criticism of myself. I realize that one of the incidents of the position which I occupy is that I must be criticized. The other evening I had occasion to direct attention to an editorial which appeared in Le Droit, and it has been alleged that I did not correctly interpret or translate the sense of that editorial. The editorial appeared in the issue of April 20, and I am sure that hon. members will realize that I am conscious of my imperfections in pronunciation when I do not endeavour to read it in the original. I have asked the Clerk of the House if it would be possible to provide me with a translation made by an official translator, and in order that there may be no misapprehension as to what this article contains, I will read the translation I have received. It is as follows:

[Mr. Speaker.]

These Accusations

Attack on the Postmaster General—Political favouritism—The rights of the Ministers —Fanaticism and Bilingualism

The Postmaster General, Mr. Veniot, has been this week and will continue to be for several days more, the object of the attacks of the Conservative opposition, so long as the house has not passed the estimates of his department.

These attacks hardly surprise us, since Mr. Veniot himself has done all he could to provoke them. It is a crime for certain people to see that the constitution is respected, to see that the two official languages are on a footing of equality and that the field of action of the French language is enlarged a little. We do not fear to say that certain people object to the father of the bilingual postage stamp more than to the minister who is charged with favouritism.

And these charges of favouritism, what do they amount to? We are not silly enough to ignore that notwithstanding the existence of the Civil Service Commission, political colour has something to do in the choice and appointment of a candidate, to whatever position he may aspire. Political patronage is still being exercised. The government endeavours to appoint as many of its own supporters as it can, and this is quite human. Should it be asked, perchance, to practise self-abnegation to the extent of giving the preference to its opponents? No, and this is why it may be said without danger of error, that under the present administration a Liberal has a better chance of entering the civil service than a Conservative. And should Mr. Bennett become Prime Minister to-morrow, it is quite probable that the Conservatives would have easier access to public office. And so, Mr. Veniot stands at good advantage in the present debate. All he has to do to defend his case, is to admit himself guilty of all the charges laid against him, while stating vigorously that his political opponents did much worse when they were in office.

But the minister has no need of using this argument ad hominem. He has already given the number of postmasters dismissed under his administration and stated in each case, the reason for such dismissal.

It is also alleged as a crime against Mr. Veniot that he has not always accepted the

candidates recommended by the Civil Service Commission, and the case of Mr. Whittaker is mentioned with the contention that the minister did not want this man as postmaster at Simcoe. The commission itself had declared this returned soldier unable to fill the job and Mr. Veniot had another returned man appointed in his place.

According to the Civil Service Act, the ministers have the right to reject the candidates of the commission. And this is practised in every department. Thus, during the last three years, sixty-one candidates were rejected in this way: four in the Department of Agriculture, five in the Department of Finance, nine in the Department of National Revenue, twenty-three in the Post Office Department, five in the Department of Public Works, one in the Department of Justice, etc. If one takes into consideration the fact that the Post Office Department employs nearly eleven thousand hands, it is evident that Mr. Veniot has not taken advantage of this privilege any more than his colleagues, but even less, due allowance being made for the number of employees.

And so, there is no reason to feel uneasy with regard to Mr. Veniot. The administration of his department is as good as in the past if not better, and the postal service has not retrograded as far as we know. All this noise around certain appointments or dismissals is like a tempest in a tea-pot; it is the madness of fanaticism against a minister who is convinced that the sun shines for everybody and acts accordingly. A minister who, like Mr. Veniot, tries to put in practice the letter as well as the spirit of the constitution, deserves the support of all political and national elements.

That is the article which I shall now place on Hansard with the original. The following is the original:

Ces accusations

Une offensive contre le ministre des Postes.—Favoritisme politique.—Les droits des ministres.—Fanatisme et bilinguisme.

M. Véniot, ministre des Postes, a été cette semaine le point de mire des attaques de l'opposition conservatrice, et il le sera encore pendant plusieurs jours, tant que les crédits de son ministère n'auront pas été votés.

Ces attaques ne nous étonnent guère, puisque M. Véniot lui-même a tout fait pour les provoquer. C'est un crime, pour certaines gens, que de faire respecter la Constitution, que de placer réellement les deux langues officielles sur un pied d'égalité, que d'élargir un peu le champ de rayonnement de la langue française. Nous ne craignons pas d'affirmer que l'on en veut plus au père du timbre bilingue qu'au ministre soupçonné de favoritisme.

Que valent d'ailleurs ces accusations de favoritisme? Nous ne sommes pas assez naïfs pour ignorer que, malgré l'existence de la commission du service civil, la couleur politique a quelque chose à faire dans le choix et la nomination d'un candidat, à quelque poste qu'il aspire. Le patronage politique continue de s'exercer. Le gouvernement s'efforce de nommer le plus possible de ses partisans, et c'est très humain. Faudrait-il, par hasard, lui demander de pousser l'abnégation jusqu'à donner la préférence à ses adversaires? Non, et c'est pourquoi on peut admettre, sans courir le risque de se tromper, que, sous l'administration actuelle, un libéral a plus de chance d'entrer dans le service civil qu'un conservateur. Et si jamais M. Bennett était demain premier ministre il est assez probable que les conservateurs auraient un accès plus facile aux fonctions administratives. Aussi, M. Véniot a-t-il beau jeu dans la discussion actuelle. Pour les fins de son argumentation, il n'a qu'à se reconnaître coupable de tout ce dont on l'accuse tout en criant bien fort que ses adversaires politiques avaient fait pire lorsqu'ils étaient au pouvoir.

Mais le ministre des Postes n'a pas besoin d'user de cet argument *ad hominem*. Il a déjà fait connaître le nombre des maîtres de poste congédiés sous son administration et donné, pour chaque cas, la raison du renvoi.

On fait également un crime à M. Véniot de ne pas avoir toujours accepté les candidats présentés par la commission du service civil, et l'on cite le cas de M. Whittaker dont le ministre n'aurait pas voulu comme maître de poste de Simcoe. Ce vétéran avait été reconnu par la commission elle-même incapable de remplir ses fonctions et M. Véniot fit nommer à sa place un autre vétéran.

D'après la loi du service civil, les ministres ont le droit de rejeter les candidats de la commission. Et cela se pratique dans tous les ministères. Ainsi au cours des trois dernières années, il y a eu soixante et un refus de la sorte: 4 au ministère de l'Agriculture, 5 aux Finances, 9 au Revenu national, 23 aux Postes, 5 aux Travaux publics, un au ministère de la Justice, etc. Si l'on tient compte du fait qu'il y a au ministère des Postes près de onze mille employés, il faut en venir à la conclusion que M. Véniot n'a pas usé de ce privilège plus que ses collègues et même que, toutes proportions gardées, il en a usé moins.

Il n'y a donc pas lieu de s'alarmer sur le compte de M. Véniot. Son ministère est aussi bien administré que par le passé, sinon mieux, et le service des postes n'a pas, que l'on sache, rétrogradé. Tout ce tapage autour de certaines nominations ou démissions, c'est une tempête dans un verre d'eau, c'est la rage du fanatisme contre un ministre qui est convaincu que le soleil brille pour tout le monde et qui agit en conséquence. Un ministre qui, comme M. Véniot, s'efforce de faire passer dans la pratique la lettre et l'esprit de la constitution, mérite l'appuie de tous les éléments politiques et nationaux.

Charles Gautier.

Yesterday morning I received from the director in chief of the newspaper, a communication which was in the sense that his attention had been directed to what appeared in the paper, and that apparently I had been misinformed. I will therefore give merely the sense of that letter and not endeavour again to impose my bad pronunciation upon the house but I will ask the permission of the house to put the original on Hansard:

Ottawa, le 23 avril 1929.

L'honorable M. R. B. Bennett,
Chambre des communes,
Ottawa.

Monsieur,

Je vois dans les journaux de ce matin que vous avez accusé le *Droit* d'avoir insinué que l'opposition conservatrice en voulait à M. Véniot

parce que celui-ci était de lignée acadienne. Le *Droit* n'a fait une telle insinuation, ni dans l'article auquel vous faites allusion, ni ailleurs. Il n'a même pas songé un seul moment à la faire. Vous aurez été sans doute mal informé.

Etant donné la violence avec laquelle vous avez attaqué le *Droit* à ce sujet, je vous demanderais de lire cette lettre à la prochaine séance de la Chambre des communes.

Veuillez croire, monsieur, à ma parfaite considération.

Le rédacteur en chef,

Charles Gautier.

I will refer further to what appeared in the paper yesterday as translated by the official translator. This is the translation of what appeared:

Parliamentary News

An unjust attack. The Conservative opposition keeps up its obstruction of the Postmaster General's estimates

(By Charles Michaud)

The leader of the opposition stated yesterday that "Le Droit" had accused the Conservatives of making war on the Postmaster General because the latter is an Acadian and consequently of French descent. "Le Droit" has never said anything of the kind. The question is who could have so misinformed Mr. Bennett. Accordingly, the editor in chief of this newspaper immediately wrote, this morning, the following letter to the leader of the opposition:

Hon. R. B. Bennett,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I see by this morning's newspapers that you have accused "Le Droit" of having insinuated that the Conservative opposition bore ill-will to Mr. Veniot on account of his Acadian parentage. "Le Droit" has made no such insinuation, either in the article to which you allude or elsewhere, and has never even thought for a moment of doing so. You have doubtless been misinformed.

In view of the violence with which you have attacked "Le Droit" in this matter, I would ask you to read this letter at the next sitting of the House of Comons.

Believe me, etc.

Let us not forget that this Mr. Bennett who unjustly attacks "Le Droit" is the same Mr. Bennett who, Thursday last, in the House of Commons, awarded the following certificate to Mr. Edwards, who had just been called away by death:

"No man could point to a single observation that he had ever made in which he attacked any man's religion or denied to anyone of his fellow-citizens the right to worship his own God under his own vine and fig-tree. He had that tolerance which sometimes was denied to him."

The Grand Master of the Orange Order of Ontario, author of "The Wedge", a book which bears on its cover the picture of a priest, armed with an axe, destroying British institutions, must have smiled in his grave on hearing such praise. We, who know better, find the author of the lines just above quoted rather ill-acquainted with the deeds of the deceased member of parliament.

I did not deal with this matter yesterday because I was in the chamber but a very few minutes, but I received the letter yesterday morning and had I been in the house a sufficient length of time to hear the orders of the day called, I would have dealt with the matter. I desire merely to say that when I read from the translation of the original article which I produce, I did so in good faith believing that it correctly interpreted what was stated. The official translators have confirmed that translation. I shall not in any sense traverse the articles to which I have alluded. I merely desire to say that in any discussions in this house, my voice shall at all times be raised to promote harmony and unity amongst the races which comprise this Dominion.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS

SUTTON POSTMASTER—NEW WESTMINSTER POST OFFICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Vancouver-Burrard): Yesterday the Secretary of State undertook to lay on the table the Civil Service Commission file relating to the post office at Sutton, Quebec.

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I have been in communication with the Civil Service Commisison on this matter. I am informed that the return was tabled last year on the 29th May, I think it was, and it contained all letters on file with the Civil Service Commission at the time. The Civil Service Commission is now at work copying this file, and it may be available at any time. As soon as it is handed to me, it will be tabled.

At the same time I might refer to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) whose request was of a similar nature, but for a complete file, because it was a new request concerning the appointment of a stenographer in New Westminster. I have seen the file which is a very extensive one. It will also be copied, but it may be a few days before I am able to procure it from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CLARK: I should like to draw the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that, since the return of last year was tabled, a supplementary file has been tabled by the Postmaster General, containing certain letters and documents from the Civil Service Commission. That file is not complete and it does not contain certain documents which are obviously in existence. All that I am asking now is that those documents should be

produced. I am quite satisfied, if the Secretary of State will get the Civil Service Commission file, he will find the missing documents and they can be laid on the table of the house in an hour's time.

Mr. RINFRET: I fully agree with my hon. friend that he is entitled to all these documents. If a new return had been asked for this year in the ordinary way, a complete return would have been tabled in due course. But my hon. friend made a request during a debate on the Post Office estimates; the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) tabled what he had in his department, and it was only yesterday he drew my attention to the fact that other letters were with the Civil Service Commission. I may say on behalf of the commission that the demand for returns this year has been exceptionally heavy and it was only to-day they were able to complete a return for the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer). They are working now on the very thing my hon. friend is asking for.

SUPPLY—ST. JOHN POST OFFICE

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, I desire to make one or two observations. I was not present during the discussion yesterday in connection with the Post Office estimates; but I have been visited by a gentleman whom I regard as being a highly reliable person and I ascertained from him that in the city of St. John a situation exists of the gravest character. I have consulted with members who represent that constituency in the house, and I have been advised that rumours are very prevalent in the streets of that city and elsewhere in New Brunswick about that situation. I refer to the situation in connection with the district office, that is, the office responsible for the conduct of the postal business in that province. I observe, from looking at the debate, that reference was made to three gentlemen: Mr. Woods, who is the chief; Mr. Emerson, and Mr. Griffiths. It is apparently a common rumour on the streets of St. John that the junior inspector had very grossly insulted his senior officer; that everyone knows of the matter; that officers have been sent from Ottawa to take charge of the office; that grave irregularities have been discovered; that reports have been made to the Postmaster General or his deputy—my informant is not quite certain as to which—and they disclosed a situation that is very serious from the public standpoint.

I suggest to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) who is temporarily leading the house, that it will serve no useful purpose to precipitate further discussion upon the Post Office estimates, thereby wasting public time, until we have before us the files connected with the matters to which I have referred. The gentleman to whom I referred at the outset came to me saying he felt it was my duty to bring these matters to the attention of the house, and I would be derelict in my duty did I not stand in my place and state the position which I now take. It is my desire and the desire of those who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, not to impede public business, not to take up time for the sake of doing so, and I suggest that if the minister would provide that the files dealing with this situation be made available, possibly in one of the rooms of the house, with one of the members of his staff present, it might enable us to ascertain to what extent these reports are justified; for according to the information which I have received, Mr. Speaker, in the manner I have indicated, the minister has received very definite information touching the conduct of at least one of the inspectors involving very serious allegations regarding honesty and the dealing with and payment of moneys. All these are matters which we should not permit longer to continue to float as rumours vague and undefined about the streets of a great city, but rather we should get to the bottom of the matter, and if there is anything in it, we should deal with it at once. If there is nothing in it, that is the end of it, and the rumours are disposed of.

I gave my promise that I would endeavour to have this matter brought up at the earliest possible moment, and in the very earnest desire to expedite rather than impede the transaction of public business, I make the suggestion that the post office estimates be held over until such time as we shall have had an opportunity to investigate the matters to which I have referred, and then having obtained the information, instead of wasting the time of the house trying to get the information piecemeal here, we should be able to precipitate a discussion around the concrete matter to which I have referred. In that event there would be no delay, no waste of time, and no opportunity for its being said that we had in any sense delayed rather than assisted in the conduct of public business. When I say "we", I mean any of the members of the house who seek information in this way; because I realize, as you must realize, Mr.

Speaker, having occupied the office of postmaster general, how impossible it is for a minister to get copies of all the files prepared at one time. But we might be able to deal with the situation as I have indicated, and in that way precipitate a discussion that would be concrete and directly connected with the matters we have been discussing.

There are a number of files that have been mentioned that we might thus be able to deal with; I do not recall what they were, but they were mentioned yesterday. As the Minister of Finance has stated that it is proposed to deal with the estimates of the Public Works department for the moment, we can deal with them in committee, and if there is any other business we might dispose of that to-day, and then to-morrow morning we ask that the opportunity be afforded to the members on this side of the house, with the minister's official present, to inspect the files to which I have referred to see whether or not these reports are warranted and what they disclose in connection with the post office situation in the district of New Brunswick, the headquarters being the city of St. John.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the observations made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) are not at all unreasonable; indeed, on behalf of the government I desire to say that they are most reasonable, and I speak as one who has been in opposition. I am sure that my colleague the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) will be prepared to view the suggestion made by the hon. leader of the opposition in the spirit in which it is offered, and to regard the request that he made on behalf of the opposition as a most reasonable one. I will leave my hon. friend the Postmaster General to deal with that.

It is the intention of the government to-day to go into supply on Public Works, and if we make sufficient progress there are some bills on the order paper standing in the name of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Dunning) that we might advance.

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): I would like to say a word before we go into supply. I feel that the request of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) is a very reasonable one. So much did I feel that such a request, if made, would be a reasonable one, that when the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) yesterday asked me about that matter, after I had attempted in some way to explain the situation although without going fully into it, and he interjected the question whether I would lay the correspondence on the table, I immediately said yes; but after due consideration, and in view of the fact that the investigation into some of these difficulties is now going on, I was going to suggest to the hon. member for York-Sunbury to-day, if I went into supply, that the correspondence be not laid on the table, but that he have an opportunity with me or with one of my officials to go fully into the correspondence, because I felt that while we were carrying on this investigation and endeavouring to discover the foundation of the difficulties in the St. John district it might not be right to lay all this information on the table. I am therefore pleased indeed to accept the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition that the original file in the possession of an official of the department be placed in the hands, say, of the hon. member for York-Sunbury and whomever he wishes to have associated with him, so that he can go over the whole thing.

Let me say, to correct what is perhaps a wrong impression that grave irregularities were discovered at the time the two gentlemen mentioned yesterday had visited the post office at St. John—

Mr. BENNETT: I desire to assure my hon. friend the Postmaster General that I was simply trying to indicate to him the information that had been conveyed to me, and I thought it was in the public interest that the matter should be cleared up. I was not indicating whether I believed it or did not believe it, but merely stating that such rumors were prevalent.

Mr. VENIOT: It is not quite consistent with what really took place. What took place was this: There were charges made of irregularities, and charges of want of discipline. There was the report of this fight, if I may use the word, between the chief of the district, Mr. Woods, and one of the subordinate officers.

Mr. BENNETT: Which one was that?

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Griffiths. When I heard of this, and knowing, previous to that, that there was some lack of discipline in that office, I sent to St. John two men who we consider are experts, one in operation and the other in financial administration, not at that time to go into any charges made, but to start an investigation into the disciplinary end and discuss with these two fighting fellows, if I may use the term, the cause of

this lack of discipline and lack of respect on the part of an inspector for his superior officer, the superintendent. They went into that, and they brought back to the office here in Ottawa statements of charges touching financial affairs. Those are on file, and that part of the investigation is to be continued. I shall be only too pleased to submit these papers.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps I might ask my hon. friend a further question, with his permission. My informant had been advised that these two gentlemen—one of them, I think, was Fortier and the other Underwood —had gone down there and that the minister himself had visited St. John during the Easter recess and was thoroughly familiar with the situation that developed. That was the information given to me, and it might enable the minister to make a statement in regard to it.

Mr. VENIOT: I was in St. John at the opening of the airport there—no, it was the Easter recess; my hon. friend is right. I think these two men were there before I got there. I knew they had been in St. John, but I did not know they were there at the time. I visited St. John for two days and I found these gentlemen there. They had been there two days. I met them in the hotel. I knew what they were there for, because instructions had been issued from Ottawa. They remained another day, and then came back to Ottawa. They made me familiar with the disciplinary end of this fracas between the officials, but I told them I did not want to hear further about any irregularities until I got back to the office.

Mr. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The offer made by the Postmaster General is very satisfactory so far as it goes, but it does seem to me to be a little narrow. He said we are to have an opportunity of examining the original file, but I failed to hear him say that we would have the privilege of making copies of any of the documents we might require. I should like to have that incorporated in the offer.

Mr. VENIOT: I may say to the hon. gentleman that in view of what took place yesterday I have had copies of the file made, so there will be no difficulty in that regard.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Since the house appears to be in a very friendly mood at the moment, and as the minister is apparently dealing courteously with members on this side of the house—

Mr. DUNNING: He always does.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): There have been occasions when that has been in question, and such occasions may again arise. I wish to direct the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that although the matter of increase in salaries of our postal workers has been raised, and although he has protested again and again that he made recommendations to the Civil Service Commission in this regard, no statement as to the character of those recommendations has yet been laid on the table of the house, and I would ask him to be prepared to table a copy of any recommendations made by him to the Civil Service Commission in relation to postal salaries.

Mr. VENIOT: I laid those on the table over a week ago, and I referred to them yesterday. They are in the possession of the house.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I refer to the minister's personal recommendations to the commission.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 119, page 31 of the estimates.

PUBLIC WORKS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME

Public Buildings

Nova Scotia

Halifax—immigration building—payment to Department of Railways and Canals for accommodation—$25,000.

Halifax quarantine station—improvements, repairs, etc.—$15,000.

Halifax naval and ordnance establishment—new buildings—$50,000.

Halifax—repairs to buildings and wharfs at R.C.N. barracks and H.M.C. dockyard—$46,000.

Halifax—tractor for postal purposes—$1,300.

Hantsport—public building—$15,000.

North Sydney public building—addition—$4,500.

Pictou public building — improvements, repairs, etc.—$5,500.

Sherbrooke—public building—$15,000.

Truro public building—addition—$8,000—Total—$185,300.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) for a declaration of the policy of the government with reference to the ever-recurring question of the erection of public buildings in the various provinces. I notice in this vote an item of $15,000 for a public building at Hantsport. If my geography is

not astray, that is in the constituency of Hants-Kings. There is also an item of $15,000 for a public building at Sherbrooke, which I understand is in the constituency of Antigonish-Guysborough. Those two constituencies are represented in this house by supporters of the government. Other much larger communities, many of them in need of public buildings, are entirely ignored by the minister. I think we ought to have a statement from him informing us under what circumstances these two votes are in the estimates and what is the policy of the government. I remember last session trying to extract this information from the minister, but he very skilfully declined to be drawn. I now return to the question because later on when we come to the province of New Brunswick I desire to revert to it. There is no doubt that many places are seeking the erection of public buildings, places where the revenue must be much greater than the revenue at Hantsport or at Sherbrooke. I am not seeking to belittle either of these two important places in the province of Nova Scotia, but I do submit that they are both rather small communities, with correspondingly small revenues. I should like to know what justification there is for this expenditure in these two places, because I think we all realize that next session we shall be asked to supplement the present vote by an amount equally as large if not larger. Therefore I invite the minister at the very outset of his estimates to give to the house a statement of the policy of the government in respect to this matter.

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, it is rather interesting to hear my hon. friend repeat the question which for two years I have endeavoured to answer to the effect that the policy of the government was as far as possible to erect public buildings only in places where the service was such that they were urgently required. It is rather interesting also to note—and I may say to my hon. friends on this side of the house that I rather hesitate to refer to this fact—that of the vote for public buildings in the province of Nova Scotia amounting to $185,300, the expeditures in constituencies represented by government members of the house total only $30,000, if the glance I have taken over them is correct.

Mr. HANSON: And none at all in the other constituencies represented by Conservatives.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Of the total vote, $155,000 is to be expended in constituencies represented by gentlemen on the other side of the house. The total expenditures in constituencies represented by gentlemen on this side are the two items of $15,000 each for the erection of post office buildings which are urgently required. The $15,000 for Hantsport is a start, the total for building, fittings, grading, sidewalks and contingencies being placed at $24,500. The $15,000 for Sherbrooke is to provide a site and commence a building, the total cost of which will be $28,500. So that the total expenditures contemplated by these two items are just in the vicinity of $50,000.

Mr. HANSON: What is the total cost of the Hantsport building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: For building, fittings, sidewalks, clerk of works and contingencies, $24,500. I should hardly expect my hon. friend to think that we could spend $185,300 in the province without spending something in some Liberal constituency.

Mr. HANSON: I should be astonished if it were otherwise, knowing the minister as well as I do and the operations of his mind. But let us outline the situation as he has given it. He says that the buildings are to be placed only where urgently required. He goes on to tell us that out of that $185,000 all but $30,000 is to be spent in constituencies represented by Conservative members. Let us take the very first item, $25,000, for the Halifax immigration building. That is merely a bookkeeping entry, representing an amount paid by one department of government to another; it is paid by the Public Works department to the Department of Railways and Canals, and no money at all will be passed, although they may go through the form of issuing a cheque. So that as regards that item at all events the minister's assertion is not carried out. You are renting accommodation from another department of government; that is all that means. And with respect to every other item in the total for Nova Scotia, of $185,300, they are all simply repairs or additions to existing buildings. But that is not what I asked the minister about at all. What I asked him was to give us a statement as to the policy of the government with respect to the erection of public buildings, now that that policy has been resumed since the war. He has told us that buildings are to be erected where they are urgently required. May I ask him whether there are any other points in Nova Scotia, outside Hantsport and Sherbrooke, where public buildings are urgently required. An analysis of the vote does not bear out the situation as he has described it to the house.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know my hon. friend wants to be fair, and I take it—if I may put

it this way without seeming to be impolite—that he has read over the facts in regard to which he speaks. He need only go to the third item, with reference to the establishment of new buildings, Halifax naval and ordnance, to realize that we are spending there, not for repairs as he has stated, but in the erection of a new building in that riding, which I am sure he will not argue is represented by any of the Liberal members, the sum of $50,000. That quite contradicts the statement he has made. As I say, I know he made it unintentionally and in good faith; but it proves that he has suspicions which are absolutely unfounded. That is the situation in that one riding alone, and I doubt very much whether the new construction there is more urgently required than new buildings in any other place. But we are spending there, as I have stated, $50,000.

Mr. HANSON: Have tenders been called for in connection with these buildings? I admit at once that I overlooked the new ordnance building.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know it was unintentional.

Mr. HANSON: I did not wish to be unfair to the minister. But I would point out that this $50,000 is purely a departmental matter; it is not for a building to be put up in the interests of the general public. It will never be a public utility such as the building at Hantsport or Sherbrooke. It has no doubt been asked for by the technical officers of the Department of National Defence, and so far as the public are concerned they will never be allowed inside it. Will these buildings be put up by tender and, if so, will Mr. A. S. MacMillan be the successful tenderer?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Mr. MacMillan may construct these buildings if he is the lowest tenderer.

Mr. SHORT: I presume your department will see that he is the lowest tenderer, because he seems to get all contracts let by the department in Nova Scotia.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend does not mean that. He is another gentleman who I know wants to be fair, even in spite of that almost suspicious mind of his. And I can satisfy him by going over the tenders in connection with various works in this country, from one coast to the other, that a great proportion of those who are the lowest tenderers are not supporters of this government.

Mr. SHORT: Not in our province.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not believe that either my hon. friend or any other hon. gentleman will get up and say that the men who have tendered for public works in Canada, whether it be buildings or harbours or anything else, have not been judged on the sole question as to whether or not their tenders were the lowest. That is the test, and if Mr. MacMillan is the lowest tenderer he will get the contract. If he is not the lowest tenderer, and if some friend of the hon. gentleman is—unless he is on the black books by reason of having fallen down on some contract before—he will get the contract if he puts up 10 per cent of the cost. I can assure my hon. friend that this is the policy of the department.

Mr. HANSON: What is the population of Hantsport, what is the public revenue, and what departments of government are intended to be housed in the building here? The same with reference to Sherbrooke.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The proposed building at Hantsport will be a one and a half storey brick structure and will provide accommodation for the post office, with living quarters for the caretaker. The post office is at present located in a section of the ground floor of a large building. The floor area is only 429 square feet, of which 156 feet consists of lobby, the remaining 273 feet providing working space. These quarters—and I wish to direct attention to the fact that this is the communication we have received from the Post Office department in this matter—are not adequate for either lobby or working space, and it is recommended that a post office building be erected. In regard to the other one—

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the revenue?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I want to call attention to this, because it will appeal to my hon. friend that this site is a place where a public building is really needed. An order in council was passed on January 7, 1914. Bear in mind the date—January 7, 1914. It granted authority to purchase from Mr. Whitman, for the sum of $1,000, a piece of land situated on William street, Hantsport, Nova Scotia, having a frontage of 93.9 feet by a depth of 100 feet. The land in question is required as the site for the proposed public building at that place. My hon. friend will be one of the last to argue that sites were selected in 1914 for public buildings which were not required for the public service; he will remember that those sites were selected by his friends. This site was purchased in 1914, and I think perhaps that will allay the suspicion he seems to have that this is not necessary

Mr. HANSON: I have not said anything of the kind; I do not intend to oppose the vote but I am asking the government for a declaration of policy which will cover the whole Dominion. I am not opposing this vote but it is up to the minister to justify and explain it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the postal revenue?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The revenue for 1927-28 was $2,767.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And the population?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The population was 683.

Mr. HANSON: And what about Sherbrooke?

Mr. STEVENS: What is the building to cost?

Mr. ELLIOTT: As I told my hon. friend, the total is expected to be about $24,500. The site has been already provided.

Mr. CHAPLIN: There are many other cases of that kind in which the minister is not acting.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, but we are getting along, making some progress; we cannot do it all in a year.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What will be the total cost of the Sherbrooke building

Mr. ELLIOTT: I gave it before, but I shall be glad to repeat it. It is expected that the total cost, including the site, which has not been provided, will be $28,500, of which $1,500 is set apart for the site.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the population?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Very much the same as the other town; about 700.

Mr. HANSON: Is the minister sure of that? My information is that it is very much less.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My information is that according to the census of 1921 the population was 679, and it is greater at present.

Mr. ERNST: What was the revenue?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The revenue was $3,291.

Mr. SHORT: I do not wish to oppose either of these votes; in fact I am very much in favour of them. I am glad the minister has listened to the advice of the members for those districts and given post offices to these towns, because I believe these smaller places are entitled to public buildings. However, I must direct his attention to the fact that he has not provided one building in any constituency with the exception of these two which are represented by friends of the government.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. SHORT: My hon. friend says hear, hear. He is living in the dark ages, when the spoils system was in effect. If that is the policy in the province of Quebec I want to tell my hon. friend that in Nova Scotia we are above that sort of thing. My hon. friend belongs to the last generation; the spoils system is out of date not only in this country but in every civilized country throughout the world.

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. SHORT: Because we should be treated equally. We are entitled to some consideration; we pay the same revenue.

Now I am going to turn my attention to the minister for a moment. I am glad to see that at last he has decided to make a start in these two towns. A few moments ago we were told that the site for the Hantsport building was purchased in 1914, so it is time the building was constructed. But I want to direct the minister's attention to another town nearly twice as large as this and with three times the revenue. I refer to the town of Bridgetown in Nova Scotia. In 1925, when this government was in power, the then Minister of Public Works visited Bridgetown and was so impressed with the need for a public building that he decided to purchase a site, for which $5,000 was paid. When Doctor King was there he said it was disgraceful that the post office in a town as large as Bridgetown should be in such a condition, and he repeated that statement in this house when these estimates were up the first year the present minister was in office. I have repeatedly made application for a grant for a public building in that town; the people of Bridgetown have petitioned this government for that appropriation; the board of trade passed a resolution praying that this building should be constructed, but nothing has been done.

I brought up this matter last year; the minister is quite familiar with it, but no action has been taken in that regard. The town of Hantsport, however, with about one-half the population and one-third the revenue, is able to secure an appropriation of $15,000 for the construction of a public building. Does the minister consider that fair play to

the people of Nova Scotia? Why should not my constituency be entitled to the same consideration shown the constituency of Hants-Kings or that of Shelburne-Yarmouth? If we were all treated fairly we would have no comments to make on these estimates, but you do not listen to our requests, so you must expect us to criticize these votes. We want to know why partiality is shown.

I would like to have some explanation from the minister as to why this building at Bridgetown has not been constructed, when in 1925, before the election of that year, the then Minister of Public Works considered the post office in that town a disgrace to the department and thought the public of Bridgetown entitled to much better accommodation. A site was purchased, and during the election campaign of 1926 my opponent promised the people of Bridgetown that a public building would be erected there in the near future if he were elected. Nothing has been done as yet and I say that in fairness to these other towns the minister should bring down in the supplementary estimates sufficient sums to provide public buildings in these other places.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would like to have the opportunity of making an explanation which I am quite sure will be satisfactory to the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr Short). I recall very well the pleas which he has made for a building in this particular town, and he always makes those pleas in a manner which would be very hard to resist were the money available and were it possible to meet with his wishes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Another case of being almost persuaded.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) knows that it is not sufficient to have me persuaded; I must persuade the treasury board, and I am glad the Minister of Finance is present. I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of the house will agree that in all probability his generosity is not anything like the generosity of the Minister of Public Works.

An hon. MEMBER: He is the villain in the piece.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If it were I would have a much easier time. The hon. member (Mr. Short) failed to hear what I said before, or he has overlooked the fact that we are not omitting the providing of buildings in Conservative ridings in his province of Nova Scotia. The third vote on the list is for $50,000 for a new building at Halifax.

Mr. SHORT: That has nothing to do with the minister's department. It is only a case of paying the bills; the obligation is upon the Department of National Defence. That has nothing to do with this case whatever.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know my hon. friend thinks that that is a perfectly good argument, but I have told him already that the reports we have received from the Post Office Department state that they require the accommodation, just as do the departmental requisitions made in regard to that building.

Mr. SHORT: I must take exception to that. The minister can get the Post Office Department to agree that they need every building; he can get them to agree to anything he wants them to.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think the hon. member overrates the amiability of the Post Office Department.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh, no.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Because they would not agree to that as easily as he thinks. I think every department of the government has asked for and suggested that we erect buildings, but where the treasury board have found that we could not put up the buildings we have been forced to erect the ones which seemed the most necessary.

Mr. BENNETT: From a political standpoint.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Oh, no.

Mr. SHORT: That is rather inconsistent.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) says that that is done from a political standpoint. I want to appeal to the fairmindedness of my hon. friends, and ask them if they will not be courageous enough to admit—in spite of what they would like to do on behalf of the various constituencies that they are appealing to—that when we spend $185,300 in the province of Nova Scotia, and only $30,000 in Liberal ridings, they are being treated pretty fairly.

Mr. QUINN: How many ridings are there?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There are not as many as we hope there will be another time. However, they are very well represented.

Mr. QUINN: They would need to be.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Upon the invitation of some hon. members of the house I had the great pleasure of visiting that province last summer. It is partly my knowing the fine sensibilities of the people of that province that accounts for the great care which has

been taken to see that they get absolute fair play in the preparation of these estimates. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that there has been generous treatment of the ridings represented by the hon. members opposite. The various departments are very generous in recommending further buildings, but we must go over those recommendations and pick out the ones which seem the most urgent, and do the best we can with the money provided for the different services.

With regard to the particular case mentioned by the hon. member, the facilities there are not so bad but that they can carry on for a short time. Like a great many other places, a building could be put up but it does not seem as urgent as at other places. The erection of this building at Hantsport has been under consideration for the last fifteen or sixteen years.

Mr. HANSON: There was the little matter of a war intervening.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is no doubt that that had a great deal to do with it.

Mr. SHORT: I must take exception to the remarks of the minister when he calls the attention of the house to the $185,300 for Nova Scotia. He wants to lead this house to believe that that amount is being distributed among the different ridings in Nova Scotia. But when we look at the vote we find that the first item is $25,000 for an immigration building at Halifax. That building is for the Department of Railways and Canals, and this item is purely a matter of bookkeeping. The next item is $15,000 for a quarantine station at Halifax.

Mr. HANSON: That is for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. SHORT: That has nothing whatever to do with the port of Halifax; it is absolutely necessary to have that quarantine station there. The next item is $50,000 for naval and ordnance establishment at Halifax. That is not for the advantage of Nova Scotia; that is for the general advantage of Canada, asked for by the Department of National Defence. Another item is for $46,000, repairs to buildings and wharves at R.C.M. barracks and H.M.C. dockyard. The minister is trying to leave the impression that this $185,300 is being distributed through the different constituencies of Nova Scotia. Let us see what the estimates disclose. The only two ridings for which an appropriation for public buildings is being made are both represented by friends of the government. Three ridings out of the total of fourteen are represented by government supporters, and for two ridings out of the three a public building is being provided. There are eleven other constituencies for which nothing has been done.

As I say, I have no fault to find with these items because I believe they are needed, but I would point out to the minister that there is much better accommodation at Hantsport than there is at Bridgetown, a town twice the size. I am glad to see the vote for Sherbrooke, but we are finding fault with the fact that nothing has been provided for our constituency and we are going to continue to find that fault until we finally get something. I am very glad to see that the previous Minister of Public Works (Mr. King), is in his seat, because he may tell us about the condition in which he found the Bridgetown post office when he visited there three years ago.

Mr. HANSON: Just before the 1925 election.

Mr. SHORT: Yes, when he purchased a lot in the town. The then Minister of Public Works considered the post office there such a disgraceful place that he immediately gave instructions for the purchase of one of the best lots in the town for a new site. I commend him very much for that, and had he remained minister of public works we would have had a new building there long before this. I have no fault to find with my hon. friend who occupies the position of Minister of Public Works at the present time. While he has never given me a new appropriation, he has certainly listened to some of my applications in reference to repairs.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The hon. member has fared pretty well.

Mr. SHORT: The government have looked after their own properties which they already have there. In some instances the minister has done remarkably well; in others he has not done so well.

Mr. ELLIOTT: All I can say is that I hope I shall be able to do better in the future.

Mr. VENIOT: I know this is not quite regular, but when the Speaker was in the chair I promised that certain returns asked for would be tabled. If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I wish to state to the committee that the reports that I said would be tabled before six o'clock will be placed in the hands of the clerk as tabled this afternoon, so that the members can inspect them.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): I trust the Minister of Public Works will

listen to a plea that I am going to make this year. Last year I made a plea to him on behalf of the post office at New Waterford, in the county of Cape Breton South. Since that time we have had a visit from the Minister of Public Works and we have also had a visit from the Postmaster General. I did not see the Postmaster General, but I saw the Minister of Public Works, and we were all delighted to have both of those hon. gentlemen visit us. With regard to that particular post office, I want to say, on behalf of the town of New Waterford, that it is an incorporated town with a population about six times as great as that of the two towns of Hantsport and Sherbrooke put together. It is an incorporated town with all civic advantages such as water, sewer, concrete sidewalks and everything of that sort, but the post office accommodation is very much inferior to what they have in either Hantsport or Sherbrooke. The Postmaster General saw the post office there last year, and if I am correctly informed he said that we must have a new post office. Why is that town deprived of proper post office facilities? The minister is perfectly frank in saying that political considerations must have some weight. I quite agree with that; but there is a limit to which political considerations should go, and in such a place as New Waterford, where the post office and customs revenues and population call for a decent service and a decent service is not available, I think, in all fairness, the minister should give some consideration to the matter. Last year the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough was generous enough to give the matter support, and I want him to join with me this year.

Mr. HANSON: Make him minister of fisheries and the hon. member will get it.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): We on this side of the house would welcome the appointment of that hon. gentleman. I hope he is going to join with me this year in insisting that a vote be inserted in the supplementary estimates for a post office in New Waterford.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know something about the needs of New Waterford. They were brought up before; in fact, they have been brought up from time to time. This is one of the many places where, as I said before, they could do very well with a public building if the funds were available and could be secured without an expenditure that my hon. friends opposite and my hon. friends on this side of the house would think was not justified at the present time; because it must be remembered that all these buildings cannot be provided for in the same year. It has been considered that, in view of the facilities which New Waterford has, some of the others were more urgent. I hope the treasury board and the government will become more liberal later on and that we shall receive further grants for this particular department. But may I point out to my hon. friend that, even as economical as we have been in this department, we receive criticism from the other side of the house that we are spending too much money at the present time.

Mr. SHORT: The minister does not spend it in the right locations.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Let me say to my hon. friends: You cannot get it all in your ridings at the one time. New Waterford, however, is a place that is under consideration and I have no doubt it will come in its regular turn according to urgency.

Mr. CANTLEY: I want again to bring to the attention of the Minister of Public Works the matter of the extension of the New Glasgow post office. What is he going to do in regard to that matter during the present year? Does he contemplate carrying out the arrangement that we discussed and which, I think, he promised to carry out two years ago?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The hon. member will hardly go that far.

Mr. CANTLEY: I know my hon. friend disputes that, but at the same time he does so with some little mental reservation. He remarked, in regard to the erection of public buildings in Nova Scotia and elswhere, that such must depend upon the urgency with which they were required. He is thoroughly familiar, I take it, with all the circumstances surrounding the New Glasgow post office, and it should not be necessary again to remind him of them. Will he be good enough to say what he proposes to do in regard to the matter?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think I can say anything more than I have said to my hon. friend in conversation a short time ago, except that I am not going to get into an argument with him as to whether I promised at any time to put up a public building there. He will realize perfectly well that I could not make a promise of that kind, because in the first place a great many things that I recommend to the treasury board are cut out by that board. If I made a promise to my hon. friend, which I did not do, I may tell

him frankly that he is the only man I ever promised anything to, because I realize as well as anybody else how impossible it is for a minister to make a promise that anything will be put in the estimates, because you do not know whether or not the item is going to be in after the estimates have been considered by council, and even after they have passed the treasury board you cannot be sure. I do not think it would help my hon. friend for me to express an opinion. The matter has been receiving consideration, is still receiving consideration, and I hope we shall be able to meet the desires of my hon. friend some time in the not far distant future. That is the best I can say.

Mr. BENNETT: It will be met anyway after the next election.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend is unduly optimistic.

Mr. CANTLEY: "Some time" is a long way off. This matter has been before the house for five successive years. The building we have is nearly fifty years old. The office has produced in the last fifteen years a revenue of over half a million dollars, or over one thousand dollars a day. The floor space is not anything like sufficient for the staff that is attempting to operate in the building. Conditions are entirely unsatisfactory; plaster is falling down and has been falling down for some time, and the building has been in disrepair for a very considerable period.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is an addition to the present building that my hon. friend is requesting.

Mr. CANTLEY: Exactly. I think the minister will remember the situation. Plans were prepared some years ago for an extension to that building to provide the necessary accommodation, but the amount was thought to be excessive, and after some consultation with the minister revised plans were prepared which reduced the cost very considerably, about twenty-five per cent. The situation is unsatisfactory in the extreme, as I think the minister will admit if he recalls all the circumstances. How long is such a condition of affairs to be allowed to continue in the town of New Glasgow, which is a large and growing town, with office accommodation entirely inadequate for serving about twelve thousand people, an office which is distributing mail to a large number of rural routes, handling from sixty to seventy-five bags of mail every day, and dealing with the mail coming in and going out on ten or twelve trains daily, an office where the floor space does not provide in the busy season for handling mails ten square feet of space to each postal operative? That is a condition of affairs which I think cannot be duplicated in any part of this country east of the city of Montreal. The matter has been brought to the minister's attention by the Liberal candidate in the last election, and by the Liberal candidate in the election before the last, and they write that they have exhausted all their resources and all their patience in bringing the matter to the attention of the minister. Now I ask the minister and I ask this house, is it fair that that condition of affairs should prevail over a long period of years, and particularly during the last five years? It is useless for the minister to tell me that after he has prepared his estimates they have to run the gauntlet of council, the Minister of Finance, the house and all the rest. That does not answer the question at all, because the minister can get $15,000 or $20,000 for other buildings in places where the conditions are nothing like as onerous, and he knows it. I would like to know what he is going to do about it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I hope my hon. friend will not be too imperative in his demands.

Mr. CANTLEY: Too what?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Imperative.

Mr. CANTLEY: I am, and in this matter have been, the most long-suffering man in this house.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend's plea when he sees me privately is much stronger than the one he makes in this house, because in private conversation he never accuses me of the things that he is now suggesting. However, there is no question about it. This is one of the many places that are receiving consideration at the present time, and I have no doubt that it will be dealt with in the not far distant future. That is all I can say. I am not for a moment attempting to argue with my hon. friend that an addition to the accommodation at the place he mentions is not required. I have the place very clearly in mind and all the conditions. It is not a question of a new building, but a question of an addition to the present premises, and I have no doubt that that addition will come in due course.

Mr. CANTLEY: May I ask the minister if he has decided that nothing will be done this year? Will he tell me that?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is pretty hard to say.

Mr. ADSHEAD: May I ask the minister a question that will relate to all the public buildings in these estimates? Will there be a fair wage clause satisfactory to the Minister of Labour inserted in all the contracts which the government lets, and will union labour be employed?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am glad that some hon. member asks me a question that is easy to answer. There is no question that a fair wage clause is and will be inserted.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Satisfactory to the Minister of Labour?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I asked because the last clause I saw was impractical.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Without attempting to place upon the shoulders of my esteemed colleague the Minister of Labour anything that I should bear, he furnishes all the fair wage clauses that are put in our contracts.

Mr. ADSHEAD: And with respect to union labour?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not know about union labour. I do not think you could always get that.

Mr. MacNUTT: I do not rise for the purpose of offering any criticism of the vote for public buildings in Nova Scotia. I wish first to congratulate the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough and the hon. member for Hants-Kings on being successful in securing a vote for these necessary public buildings. I had the pleasure of living some seven years in the little town of Sherbrooke, and I can vouch for the necessity of a public building there. While the population as stated is somewhat small, Sherbrooke is a very large distributing centre for that portion of the county, and I am very glad that the people there have at last received recognition of their claims for a better public building. I hope the hon. member for Hants-Kings, having secured the ear of the government, will endeavour at the next session to get a vote for a public building at the other end of the county in the little town of Shubenacadie and in the sister town of Stewiacke where I have the honour to reside. Both these towns are much larger than Sherbrooke and yield a greater revenue to the government. In both cases lots were purchased years ago for these long-hoped-for public buildings.

I notice in this vote an item of $8,000 for an addition to the Truro post office. At the time this vote was up last session I pointed out that the government architect reported that it was impossible to make the necessary repairs and additions in such a way as to render the building suitable for the use of a town of the size of Truro. He advised a new building, The Postmaster General—I regret he is not in his seat—replied that he considered the addition to be placed in the rear would make it as good as a new building. Now we have $8,000 added to $24,000 voted last year, a total of $32,000, or almost the cost of the new building which was asked for and for which a suitable lot had been purchased. This I think bears out my contention at that time that a new building would cost very little more than the repairs to the old one.

However, my purpose in rising was to refer more particularly to a remark made by the Minister of Public Works. A few moments ago he said the policy of the government was to accept the lowest tender regardless of party affiliations of the tenderer. I direct his attention to the now famous Bedford Basin magazine contract, which has been in the public eye for some time.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does my hon. friend say that that is a contract in the Department of Public Works?

Mr. MacNUTT: It may have been in the Department of National Defence.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I was speaking about the rule in my own department. I cannot speak for other departments.

Mr. MacNUTT: At the time tenders were invited the Standard Construction Company of Halifax was the lowest tenderer. Several other firms tendered and their deposits were returned to them, but the department retained the deposit of the Standard Construction Company. It was charged that I had an interest in the company, and word came to Ottawa that the tender of the Standard Construction Company must not be accepted. For months and months the deposit was held at Ottawa until finally new tenders were called for. The Standard Construction Company again submitted the same figure.

Mr. ELLIOTT: May I interrupt my hon. friend?—because I know he desires to be fair about the matter. There are certain reasons applying in other departments that do not apply in the Department of Public Works with regard to accepting the lowest tender. Where the work is of a technical character it may not be as easy to follow the practice of my department, and I want to say it is not always easy to do it here. The case to which

my hon. friend refers must be subject to some such conditions. I would take it that it would be more advantageous to deal with this matter when the minister of the department is present. It is something I know nothing about.

Mr. HANSON: He is here now.

Mr. MacNUTT: I understood the minister to say the policy of the government in every case was to accept the lowest tender.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I said that was the policy in the Department of Public Works.

Mr. MacNUTT: Since I have made reference to the matter I may as well conclude my observations in regard to it. At the time when the new tenders were called for the figures of the original tenders were public property. The Standard Construction Company tendered again at the same figure they had submitted on the first occasion. The result was that Mr. MacMillan—who by the way is a personal friend of mine—knowing the figures submitted by the Standard Construction Company in their original tender placed his figure a little lower and secured the contract. Now, I am sorry if I have cast any reflections on the Minister of Public Works, but I merely wished to refer to this matter.

Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Chairman, there is a rule which perhaps my hon. friend overlooked, that matters under discussion before a standing committee should not be discussed in this committee. Further, the matter which he has brought up is not relevant to these estimates. But I do feel that I might be permitted just a moment in brief reply, although I shall be glad indeed to go into the transaction fully when my own estimates are up. I have not the file here nor the dates. I think he is under some misapprehension in connection with certain of the statements he made. Public advertisements were inserted for tenders. Several tenders were received. I think they were on three different bases, that is, according to the work being done in three alternative ways. All the tenders were very much above the estimate of the department. The Standard Construction Company submitted the lowest tender on, let us say, plan A. Mr. MacMillan, I think, was second. The one tender was $109,000 odd, and the other $116,000 odd. Both these tenders were regarded by the officers of the department as high. If my hon. friend looks at the file he will see that the deputy minister himself recommended that both these tenderers be asked if they could not quote lower prices in view of the fact that their tenders were considerably above the amount voted and the departmental estimate. Both firms were written exactly the same letter at the same time. The Standard Construction Company replied that they could not reduce their figure. Mr. MacMillan replied submitting a figure of $107,000 odd, and he was awarded the contract. Let me say to my hon. friend that so far as I am concerned, and I am sure so far as the officers of the department are concerned, nobody had any idea that he was interested in the Standard Construction Company, and I can assure him it would not have made any difference if they had. I know enough of Nova Scotia affairs to be aware that he had been out of the Standard Construction Company for some years. I know also that Mr. Gould happens to be a good Liberal, as is also Mr. MacMillan; so there is no question on that score. It results that the deputy minister of the department got the work done for one or two thousand dollars less than would have been the case if the original tender had been accepted. I want to assure my hon. friend that he has not heard the last of this case, and he will have ample opportunity to discuss it when the estimates of the Department of National Defence are before the committee.

Mr. ERNST: The matter is scarcely relevant, but the Minister of National Defence has said either too much or not enough. If he wants to give a complete explanation he might have added that the Standard Construction Company when they put in their tender a second time expressly stated that the amount of their first tender was public property on the streets of Halifax.

Mr. RALSTON: Certainly. The fact that the first tender was public property did not affect the case one way or the other.

Mr. ERNST: It affected the department.

Mr. RALSTON: Not at all. This was after the tenders were opened. I have no doubt you will find that Mr. Gould discussed the matter of his tender, that he did not keep the amount secret after the time was up—

Mr. ERNST: Are you sure it was not Mr. MacMillan?

Mr. RALSTON: That is a remark hardly worthy of my hon. friend, but perhaps it is typical of the sort of remarks he makes. I do not know, and I do not believe that Mr. MacMillan was here in connection with the tender, but the hon. gentleman will have full opportunity to inquire into the matter. I

very distinctly repudiate, however, any suggestion that from the department, either directly or indirectly, Mr. MacMillan got the slightest suggestion as to the amount of Mr. Gould's tender.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): We accept, of course, the statement of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), but at the same time it is a very remarkable coincidence that when these tenders were received they were considered not satisfactory. The gentleman who performed the work paid a visit to Ottawa with the result that new tenders were asked for, and that gentleman or his firm, or one of his firms, because he has a great number that get all government work down our way under one name or the other—that gentleman got the contract at a couple of thousand less than his previous tender, knowing the price named by the Standard Construction Company. I would ask the minister, how much in excess of the tender of Mr. MacMillan was the actual cost?

Mr. RALSTON: I never thought of the matter coming up, but my hon. friend will have the fullest information. The matter is before the public accounts committee and he will have full opportunity to find out. But I suggest this is one contract he did not delay.

Mr. QUINN: Injustice has been done another tenderer.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I rise to a point of order. I submit that the present discussion is out of order. We are discussing Public Works estimates, and other estimates not before the committee have been gone into. We should confine ourselves to the business before the committee.

Mr. HANSON: I think the point well taken; but by the same token I want to ask the minister, who was former minister of public works, whether he did publicly promise the people of Bridgetown in 1925 that a new post office would be erected, as stated on the floor of the house to-day.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. HANSON: And whether he did not in furtherance of that promise authorize the purchase of a lot in 1925. I should like to know why the post office was not built.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I had the pleasure of visiting this town in Nova Scotia and I did recommend to council the purchase of a lot. The property was purchased. I am not minister of public works, and whatever recommendations were made have been considered by council and acted upon.

Mr. SHORT: Did the minister state to the people there that he considered they were entitled to a post office and that the present one was a disgrace as a public structure? And did he not make pretty nearly the same statement on the floor of the house when the estimates of the present Minister of Public Works were under consideration in 1927?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, I did not make a statement of that kind. I did probably indicate to the people there that it would be desirable to have a public building, but that was all right. And that was all, I think.

Mr. HANSON: What was the point of spending $5,000 for the purchase of a lot in the town of Bridgetown in 1925 on the recommendation and at the instance of the hon. gentleman who was then Minister of Public Works, if the then minister did not intend to build a post office? Why buy the lot? Were you farming it out for pasturage, or what? I submit that the Minister of Pensions and National Health must have gone as far as it is alleged on this side of the house that he did go, namely, that when he received authority and spent money for the purchase of a lot he must have promised the people of that community that he would build a post office there, where the people are suffering from lack of accommodation. If that is true, how can the government square themselves with their lack of performance? That is the gravamen of the charge against the administration, not particularly against the present incumbent of the office but against the whole administration. They either impliedly or expressly made a promise to the people of Bridgetown which promise they have not carried out. What is the justification? They have spent millions elsewhere in public works. The reason of course is apparent to me: the county voted wrong from the standpoint of the government, both at the election of 1925 and at the succeeding election of 1926. And I want to point out that that county will continue to vote wrong, from the government's standpoint, so long as they fail to implement their promises to the public of that community.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont): You admit they voted wrong?

Mr. HANSON: From your standpoint. I do not admit anything of the kind you imply. There is no reason why the hon. member for Stormont should take that view.

Mr. ELLIOTT: As regards the preparation of the estimates now before the committee,

and with reference to the question whether the site was purchased in 1925, or 1914, or whenever it was, we have to consider a number of cases where sites are already owned by the government. So far as I am concerned we have not gone into an analysis with respect to the time at which any site was purchased. I have endeavoured to make clear to my hon. friend that it was a question as to just what the accommodation is at the present time and what were the possibilities of the people getting along, for another year at any rate, without a new public building in that place. I am quite frank in saying that a number of buildings have been stricken off the list where we could very well have justified their erection.

Mr. HANSON: Where were they?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have before me only the list in the estimates but I am satisfied that my hon. friend will not find in the estimates buildings that have been put up in any place where they were not extremely urgent.

Mr. SHORT: The point my hon. friend (Mr. Hanson) wants to make is that the Minister of Pensions and National Health considered that it was very urgent that a post office or a public building should be put up at Bridgetown, and a lot was purchased for $5,000. There was a building on that lot and they went so far as to tear it down, leading the people to believe that a public building would be erected immediately. There was an old hotel on the lot, which is one of the best business sites in the town, and I do not think the price was exorbitant. Certainly the then Minister of Public Works, when he visited Bridgetown, led the people to believe that a public building would be erected there; there is no question about it. Why did he purchase the lot if he did not intend to put up the building? The Minister of Public Works says that public buildings are being built only where the need is really urgent. Well, the town of Hantsport is not half as important as Bridgetown. The people in Hantsport have better accommodation today than have the people of Bridgetown, although the revenue of their post office is three times less than the revenue of the Bridgetown office. And the population is only half. You cannot justify expenditures on those grounds. I am perfectly in accord with the vote for Hantsport and Sherbrooke, but the same treatment should be meted out to these other towns; and unless the government does that we are going to take exception to these votes.

Mr. QUINN: I just want to point out to the Minister of Public Works the niggardly and miserly way in which he is treating the province of Nova Scotia. If we look at the first four items in this vote we find first an item of $25,000, which is an annual vote for the immigration building. This is simply transferring money from one pocket to the other, robbing Peter to pay Paul; the Immigration department pays the Railway department $25,000 and that money is charged to the province of Nova Scotia. The next item is $15,000 for the Halifax quarantine station, which is a national expenditure. That building is maintained for the reception of immigrants coming to this country, but they do not come to Nova Scotia. We get no foreign immigrants; the immigration policy of this government has not reached us yet. We do not receive any benefit from this item; these immigrants all go to the west but we have to maintain a quarantine station for which we are charged $15,000.

The next item is $50,000 for a naval and ordnance establishment. What for? Are you going to build a nest to encourage the birds to come there? We have no navy in Canada; we have only two little borrowed tin ships, but Nova Scotia is charged $50,000 for a naval establishment. That should not be charged against the constituency of Halifax; it should be charged to the Department of National Defence. The next item is for $46,000 for repairs to buildings and wharfs at the R.C.N. barracks and the H.M.C. dockyard. This is also a national expenditure which brings no benefit to the city of Halifax.

If we total these four items we find that $136,000 of the $185,300 devoted to Nova Scotia is included therein, so we have left the magnificent sum of $49,000 for the whole province, which contributes much more to the revenues of Canada than it has ever received. Of that $49,000 which will be spent in Nova Scotia $30,000 goes to the two Liberal constituencies which have been mentioned, so the eleven constituencies represented by hon. gentlemen on this side of the house get $19,000.

Mr. HANSON: Shame.

Mr. QUINN: You may well say "shame." I say this is miserly, niggardly treatment of the little province of Nova Scotia which has done so much for this country and which played such a prominent part in confederation.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. QUINN: I thank hon. gentlemen for the cheers; I am proud to hear them ac-

knowledge what Nova Scotia has done. I do not take those cheers as derision or ridicule, because I challenge any hon. member on that side of the house—

Mr. DENIS: Oh, oh.

Mr. QUINN: Yes, any hon. gentleman opposite; I challenge anyone to dispute the fact that Nova Scotia played a prominent part in Canadian confederation. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that we are being treated in a niggardly, miserly way.

Mr. DENIS: Oh, oh.

Mr. QUINN: My hon. friend should not be so fresh. The story is told that when Sir Charles Fitzpatrick sat in this house a young fellow like yourself, sitting on that side of the house, upon being rebuked for interrupting, excused himself as being a young member, but Sir Charles said, "No, not young but fresh." That should keep you quiet.

As I have already stated, $19,000 is spread over eleven constituencies in Nova Scotia. In Halifax we get $1,300 for a tractor for postal purposes, and I think even that is a revote from last year. On the other hand Hantsport, represented by my hon. friend from Hants-Kings, is given $15,000 for a public building. I do not criticize the Minister of Public Works on that account, but I do ask him why we should not all be placed on an equal basis. The hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. MacDonald) has drawn to the attention of the Minister of Public Works on several occasions the need for a public building in New Waterford, but no attention has been paid to that request. Sherbrooke, however, springs up like a mushroom, just as Kensington did a couple of years ago; Sherbrooke, a little village of 500 people, is given $15,000 while New Waterford must wait. I suppose it will have to wait until the government changes.

Mr. POWER: Or the member.

Mr. QUINN: Now let me direct the attention of the minister to something else. I have been looking over the figures as to the money given the other provinces. To be exact, $49,000 goes to Nova Scotia; New Brunswick, the majority of whose members sit on this side of the house, is given $115,500; Quebec gets $937,200; Ontario is given $1,683,600; Manitoba receives $433,600; Saskatchewan, with which province the government is flirting, is given $842,000; Alberta, with which it is also flirting, gets $596,700, but poor British Columbia, where there was a change of government a few months ago, gets only $160,500. They suffer with Nova Scotia.

If this is the business administration of which there is so much boastful talk why is it that such important parts of this Dominion as the extreme east and the extreme west are neglected simply because they do not send a majority of members to support the government? If the government wish to maintain a business administration every province throughout Canada should be placed on an equal basis, and if the government wishes to win some votes in Nova Scotia it had better play up to that province much more than it is doing at present. In the general estimates I see a vote of $75,000 for the county of Antigonish and nearly $100,000 for Yarmouth, together with almost $30,000 for Hants-Kings. That is not the way for the government to win the people of Nova Scotia. You must deal more generously with them; the representatives on this side of the house from Nova Scotia were sent here because that province has been neglected in the past, not only by Liberal governments but by Conservative governments as well. That is why hon. gentlemen on this side advocate maritime rights. We are not getting justice from this government and I tell the Minister of Public Works that if this is the treatment he is going to accord the people of Nova Scotia the government will soon obtain the answer of the people of that province.

Item agreed to.

Public Works—Charlottetown public building —improvements and repairs—$2,500.

Mr. HANSON: I would like to ask the minister why he is so niggardly with the province of Prince Edward Island. Are there no more Kensingtons there? Is there no place in that province where a public improvement is urgently required? I am sure if you ask the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Macdonald) he will tell you of many places in Prince Edward Island which in the public interest urgently require a substantial allotment of money for public buildings. Why overlook this little island? I am sure the minister must have some reason to offer.

Mr. POWER: It is the three Liberal members.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If any idea remains in the minds of my hon. friends that these estimates are arranged for political purposes, this vote must convince them that the idea is

not correct. The improvements and repairs to the public building at Charlottetown were things which seemed more urgent than other things which had to be omitted in other provinces.

Item agreed to.

Buctouche—public building; Forest City—building for immigration and customs-excise purposes; Ste. Croix—building for customs-excise and immigration purposes at international bridge; St. John quarantine station—Partridge island—new pipe line; St. John quarantine station—Partridge island—water supply; St. John quarantine station—Partridge island—improvements, repairs, etc.—$115,500.

Mr. HANSON: I would like to ask the minister why he has neglected to provide accommodation at McAdam which I have been asking for for the last five years. A vote was provided last year, and there is a revote this year for a building at Forest City. This was not asked for by any public body, although it has probably been asked for by the customs service or the immigration service, and to that I take no exception. The town of McAdam has a revenue of nearly $50,000 per annum, of which $4,600 is derived from the post office. Buildings are being rented for the customs department, the immigration service, and the health of animals branch of the Department of Agriculture. I made it my business to write a letter to the minister some months ago with regard to this situation. I pointed out to him that this building was required and that I had urged it upon his predecessor without success. I described the character of the town, which is a railroad town with a population of about 2,500, all being very highly paid and skilled mechanics.

The post office accommodation there is a disgrace to the government of Canada. They use a little wood box owned by the postmaster, for which I believe they pay a rental of $80 per year, which is too much for the accommodation given. It is out of keeping altogether with the size and importance of the town and with the amount of public revenue derived from that point.

A customs house is required as well, with floor space for the Department of Immigration, which maintains three offices at that point. Accommodation should be given to the health of animals branch of the Department of Agriculture, because they maintain a veterinary surgeon at that point, it being one of the principal ports of entry from the United States.

There is no excuse for the government failing to provide this accommodation, especially when they can provide $25,000 for a public ouilding at Buctouche. This place is the headquarter for all the big bootleggers in New Brunswick, and they pay no customs revenue on their liquor importations. This is the principal port for the illicit smuggling of liquor from St. Pierre-Miquelon and all down the Caraquet coast. The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) knows very well that the bootlegging business in New Brunswick is located in Buctouche. I know attempts are being made to stop this traffic, and I give due credit to his department for the efforts they have made.

I would mention also the city of Moncton, which provides a postal revenue of nearly $300,000. When the member for West Kootenay (Mr. King), the present Minister of National Health was Minister of Public Works, that department paid about $50,000 for a site in that city. This purchase was made after the election of 1921 to fulfil a pledge made by the then member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp). This government has not done a single thing to implement the promises which were made to the people of Moncton at that time, and yet it can find funds to erect a building at Buctouche, where I venture to say the per capita revenue is not one-tenth or even one-twentieth of the revenue received from Moncton.

I would like to point out to the minister the situation prevailing in the town of St. Stephen. This is one of the most progressive towns in the province, the seat of some of the largest manufacturing establishments in the maritime provinces. For years the postal accommodation here has been wholly inadequate. I understand that plans were prepared and prices asked for, but the town has consistently voted against the Liberal party—I will be frank and tell the house that it will continue to do so—and as a result of the political attitude of the inhabitants of that town their requirements have been ignored by the Department of Public Works.

Referring again to McAdam. The minister cannot say that the accommodation there is ample. The customs house is located in the Canadian Pacific railway station, and is wholly inadequate to the requirements of the port. There are seven or eight customs officers at that port and the men are herded into one little room, while the collector has a little congested room as his own private office. It is not too late for the minister to take care of this great public necessity, but I will say to him quite frankly that no candidate of his party will ever carry McAdam; he will get no

return in votes, but he will be performing a duty to a very important community in the province of New Brunswick.

I notice the government is always able to take care of the requirements at Saint John. I am not finding any fault with that, but I would ask the minister to realize that that city is not the whole province as has been said on many occasions. I presume that the new pipe line is necessary, although it will be an expensive undertaking due to the physical conditions which exist, but I want to tell the minister that we are not satisfied with the attitude of his department with respect to these questions. As far as I am concerned, I intend to see that a public building is built in the town of McAdam; if I do not get it from the minister I will get it from the government which I support.

Mr. MacLAREN: Mr. Chairman, no one can accuse the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) of being extravagant with his estimates for New Brunswick. He is practising great economy. There are six items altogether, and five of them have to do with immigration. As the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn) has said, the main portion of the immigration work is the passing of people through to the western part of the Dominion. When we exclude the items for immigration there is only the one item for Buctouche remaining. I would ask the minister in the future, provided he is in position to deal with it, to scrutinize carefully the requirements of the province and determine upon such new buildings and such new work in order of urgency. That he should say that the erection of buildings should be spread over a period of years, is correct, but it does not follow that a building such as the one in Buctouche should be the one which should be selected. On the contrary, the building for Buctouche would come well down on the list. There should be a list in accordance with the needs. We have heard something about the need, which is unquestionable, for a new building in Moncton and the minister cannot go on without paying some attention to that railway city of the maritimes, an enterprising and growing town. I know that the other instances just given by the hon. member for York-Sunbury are equally correct. The minister is now having a building erected in Buctouche. I do not know whether that is needed or not; but supposing, for argument's sake, it is, it does not, in my opinion, come on the list for this year. There are other appropriations which are much more needed, and which would serve much more useful purposes were they placed in the estimates, rather than what I might call almost the one estimate for the province of New Brunswick, because immigration work is general for the whole Dominion and we benefit in it to an infinitesimal degree.

Mr. PRICE: Referring to this item, I wish to say a word or two with regard to the necessity for a new post office in the city of Moncton, and I propose reading the reports of the deputy minister and other officials in that regard, and making a few observations on the situation as it exists there to-day. The city of Moncton is a railway centre for the maritime provinces generally, and there is great need for more public buildings there. As has been stated by the hon. member for York-Sunbury, the present Minister of Public Works purchased a site a few years ago. I have no fault to find with the site; I think it is a very good one, but they paid an exorbitant price, $49,000, for a site which is assessed in the city of Moncton for about $30,000. The fact, however, is that a political partisan desired to dispose of a site, and that is what took place. The sum of $1,000 was paid for legal fees and advertising in connection with the matter. The department has rented the premises for $40 a month and I think at the present time we are receiving something like $45. It has been pointed out that the present building, which accommodates the post office and the customs, together with the additions which I shall mention later, has been in existence for forty-five years. At the time that building was erected, no doubt it was properly placed, having regard to the situation in that city. But the city has grown since then when it had a population of about 5,000, until to-day it has a population of about 22,000. The following is a memorandum dated December 1, 1923, from Mr. P. T. Coolican, general superintendent of the postal services branch:

> With reference to the Deputy Postmaster General's letter of the 6th April, 1922, and previous correspondence, in regard to the question of the erection of a public building at Moncton, N.B., I would be glad if this matter could receive special consideration, and, if possible, an item placed in the estimates to provide for this building.

This is another memorandum submitted by Mr. Coolican under date of December 27, 1923:

> With reference to my communication of the first instant, in regard to the question of the erection of a public building at Moncton, N.B., I wish to inform you that an officer of this department recently visited Moncton and he

is strongly of the opinion that something will have to be done without delay to provide suitable accommodation at this point.

The Deputy Postmaster General reported upon this matter on May 30, 1921, as follows:

I beg leave to direct your attention to the inadequate postal accommodation at the above named place. Representations have repeatedly been made to your department in this regard, but on account of the financial stringency, no action, with the exception of the rental of space in the Harris building, has been taken.

The Moncton office is congested to an almost unworkable degree. This is due largely to the fact that the present post office was built about the year 1885, when the population was only 5,000 whereas the population is now about 22,000. The city has built up west and northwest of the present site, and consequently, the present building is in the southeasterly section of the city, thus making it inconvenient for possibly 75 per cent of the inhabitants.

Then he goes on to state what the revenue has been in the past. He says:

The revenue of the Moncton office has increased from $69,333.31 in 1919 to $323,273.38 for the year ended March 31, 1921.

Those figures have risen until last year the gross revenue was $482,578.82. The total expenditure, including contingencies of $1,741.13 was $116,300.98, leaving a net revenue from the Moncton Post office of $366,277.84 per annum. I would think that under those conditions, and in view of the innumerable inconveniences, it is pretty nearly time the government took steps to build a decent post office in the city of Moncton, and if necessary utilize the old post office as a customs house. Something simply has to be done. The locality is very difficult for postal deliveries, and it is very inconvenient for anyone to get service at that office. The post office also has to rent additional premises for the mail order business, for the air mail service, and so forth.

I also wish to make reference to the customs accommodation. At the present time the customs department is paying an exorbitant rent for the quarters which it occupies. George A. Robertson, who was previously a merchant in the city of Moncton, and is now retired, rents to the provincial government a store at the corner of Main and Duke streets, on the opposite corner from where the present quarters of the cutsoms department are situated, floor space covering an area of 4,800 square feet for $125 per month. together with the use of a basement. The building occupied by the customs department was offered for rental at $65 per month or $780 per annum. To-day a middleman gets the difference between $65 and $166.66 per month, or a rake-off of $101.66 per month. The customs department has a two-year lease on this property, which expires I think in August of this year. That is a condition of affairs that should not exist. The excuse was made in connection with a former property owner from whom the department rented that his prices were excessive. A man by the name of Wilbur got 81 cents per square foot for the rental of his premises. Mr. Ryan, who at present rents to the Customs department, gets $1.05 per square foot, or 24 cents per square foot more than the price at which the Robertson store rents to the New Brunswick liquor commission.

As is well known, the department have been carrying on under difficulties at Moncton. The premises are not suitable. I have repeatedly called the attention of the former minister of public works, Hon. Mr. King, and of the present minister to the situation at Moncton during the last three or four years, and I have heard the minister in his statement this afternoon point to the many different places throughout the Dominion, all of which he said could not be served at one time. There is no question about that, but if it takes four years to convince the minister of the necessity of building an extension to the breakwater at Cape Bald, it is going to take one hundred and sixty years to convince him of the necessity of building a post office at Moncton at an expenditure of some $400,000. I would ask him if he thinks it is a fair deal to the people of the locality for which I am speaking at the present time, that they should not have a decent, respectable building. Moncton is one of the finest and most up-to-date cities in Canada, with its paved streets, many miles of cement sidewalks, beautiful parks and beautiful churches; but the post office is a disgrace. If a man wants to go through it he has to traverse a labyrinth of canals to reach it. It is also in an insanitary condition. I would urge the minister and the government to have this situation at Moncton cleared up. Previous to the last election a large hole was dug on the post office site, and the rumour was prevalent that a post office was going to be built. In fact, tenders have been called for repeatedly, but absolutely nothing has been done. I think if the Minister of National Revenue would look into this matter I mention, where a rake-off is being taken by a middleman amounting to $100 a month, he would put a stop to it. I regret very much that an item for a public building in Moncton has not been included in the main estimates, but I hope that when the supplementary estimates are brought down they will include a vote of five or six hundred thousand dollars, which is just a little over the net receipts per annum from the Moncton post

office, for the building of a decent and respectable public building in that city, because the building at the present time is a disgrace.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In reply to my hon. friend, I do know something about the situation at Moncton. Anything that may have occurred in connection with the renting of the building to which he refers does not belong to the Department of National Revenue but to the Department of Public Works, for which I am responsible.

Mr. HANSON: Then we will pass it on to you.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, and I take it freely. The situation is this. I quite agree with what the hon. member has said, that we are not very well situated in the city of Moncton at the present time so far as the facilities for carrying on the various departments of the government's business are concerned. That has been the situation for some years With regard to the rentals of which my hon. friend spoke, I regret that I have here only the details relating to places for which there is an estimate, but I do know something about that particular matter. In the year 1927 we were renting premises in the city of Moncton at approximately $2,400—I am not going to bind myself to a dollar or so. The landlord sought to raise the rent by $600, which would have made it necessary for us to pay a rental of $3,000. We made diligent inquiry to see if there were not other premises which could be rented at an amount which we thought was reasonable. The premises referred to by my hon. friend were then under lease to a man by the name of Ryan, I think. At the time he had been in possession for about two years under a four year renewable lease.

Mr. PRICE: Wilbur, I think, is the name.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We left the Wilbur premises and went into the Ryan premises at a rental of $2,000 a year.

Mr. PRICE: But with less space.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is not quite as satisfactory as the larger space, but we were able to save $1,000 a year in rent. What our lessor is paying to the original lessor I am not exactly able to say, but I do not quarrel at all with my hon. friend's statement that it is considerably less than the rent we are paying him. But I think he will be fair enough to bear in mind that our lessor leased the premises in 1925 when property in Moncton was not nearly as much in demand as it was later, and a good deal of that time the premises were vacant. He did considerable repairs to the property and leased it to us for a term of two years, which expires I think this coming August, with the right to us to renew our lease. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that under the circumstances we could get no better accommodation at the time for the rent we are paying, and I think he will further agree with me that we have effected a saving of $1,000 in the rental as compared with the arrangement made by our predecessors.

I do not find fault with my friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) for his criticisms, but I would call his attention to the fact that the items in the New Brunswick vote, with the exception of one for $25,000, are for public works in ridings represented by members on the other side of the house. It has been asked why Buctouche was selected for this expenditure. Let me state that the order in council providing for the purchase of the site was passed on August 6, 1913, and in the intervening years we have owned the land and received nothing from it. It is another of the cases which was thought to be more urgent than any of the others mentioned by my hon. friend's friends when they were in power. I think they were correct. In my view it is one of the most urgent cases in the province. Having held the site for sixteen years without getting a cent of revenue from it, we now propose to utilize it. I thank my hon. friends for the fairness of their criticism in connection with these various items.

Mr. PRICE: Of course, during the war years the administration of which the minister speaks was not in a position to embark on expenditure for a new public building in Moncton; every available dollar was required for other purposes.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Quite so.

Mr. PRICE: Is not the minister convinced from what he finds on his file and from what I have said that a new building is absolutely required at Moncton to accommodate both the customs and the post office? I can assure him that the file contains reports from Mr. Gaboury, from the architect, the present postmaster and his predecessor, stating that a new building is a necessity.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Whether a new building is a necessity or not depends to a large extent upon how much it is going to cost and what your present premises are costing. Undoubtedly the government offices would be better housed in a half-million dollar building than in the premises for which we are paying a rental of $2,000.

Mr. PRICE: In addition to that you own the post office.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. There is no question that it would be infinitely more expensive to build new premises. Financially, we can do better by remaining tenants. But I do not think my hon. friend can complain that we have selected Buctouche instead of Moncton for expenditure on a new building in view of the fact that the party which he supports evidently thought it more urgent to provide accommodation at Buctouche than at Moncton or they would not have purchased a site in the former place.

Mr. PRICE: I have mentioned nothing about the Buctouche one.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, but my hon. friend is not the only member of his party from New Brunswick.

Mr. PRICE: Is the new building at Buctouche for a post office or for a customs house?

Mr. ELLIOTT: For both.

Mr. PRICE: Will the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) say whether or not it is correct that within the last three or four years the customs house in Kent county has been closed and the people there obliged to go to Shediac to transact their business? Shediac is in my constituency. Will he say, further, whether or not an order has been issued for the closing of the customs house at the latter place on May 1, with the result that the residents will then have to go to the city of Montcon in connection with their customs business?

Mr. EULER: We have closed some two hundred offices throughout the country. I do not remember the names of them all, but it is quite possible, and perhaps probable, that what my hon. friend states is the fact. I cannot say without looking up the files.

Mr. HANSON: The Minister of Public Works has dealt with the situation at Moncton, I presume because he realizes how serious it is. But he does not undertake to do anything to remedy that serious condition. That is the quarrel I have with him at the moment. He admits all the charges made against the deficiencies of the present lay-out.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Is not that doing pretty well?

Mr. HANSON: I should like to get in behind him and galvanize him into action. What we want is action, not palaver about this, that and the other thing.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: We shall be very glad to have my hon. friend get in behind us. I understand that a number of other hon. gentlemen on this side of the house contemplate the same course, and we will welcome them.

Mr. HANSON: I will get in behind the minister if he will propose a vote of half a million dollars for a post office at Moncton, or of $25,000 for a public building at McAdam, or of a substantial sum to extend the accommodation at St. Stephen; if he will do this I will get in behind him. It will not do to admit these matters and then do nothing. Public opinion will demand this accommodation. The minister is not spending his own money; the Minister of Finance is not spending his own money. It is public money and the public have a right to demand this accommodation. I wish to tell the Minister of Public Works and, quite frankly, the Minister of Finance as well, that we will continue to drive at these things until action is taken. I do not wish to hold up the estimates; I am quite satisfied to let this vote go through. But I warn the minister that we must have some action from himself and his department. He cannot play favourites; if he does we will check him up. There is no question about this: the reason he has given for the public building at Buctouche is not the controlling reason. The fact that the government bought a site there in 1913, when someone had power or influence enough with them to get them to buy the site, is not the reason why the building was put up there. The minister knows that; he knows he has done it to please his follower from Kent; and I congratulate his follower from Kent upon getting a public building in his native town, the town where he resides. But at the same time we will not have the public service neglected in other places, and I say candidly that it is being neglected in St. Stephen, in McAdam and in the city of Moncton.

Mr. SHORT: The Minister of Public Works has spoken about a number of lots purchased in 1913 and 1914 and has advanced the argument that it is a good investment to put up buildings on these sites. That was his excuse, or one of his excuses, for the erection of this building in Buctouche—because the lot was bought in 1913. Well, I want to inform the government that in 1913 or 1914 a lot was bought in Middleton, Nova Scotia, where a public building is required. If it is a good investment to put up a building in Buctouche because the government

owns a lot there, it is an equally good investment to put up one in Middleton where it has owned a lot since 1913 or 1914. That seems to be the principle on which these buildings are being constructed, and on that principle a building is due the people of Middleton. I want to say to the minister, therefore, that we shall expect to find in his estimates next year a vote for a building to be erected on that site in Middleton, Nova Scotia. From his own statement he considers it a good investment to use these lots which are owned by the government, and we can expect him to carry out this policy with regard to Middleton.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

SUTTON POSTMASTERSHIP

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): By unanimous consent I beg to lay on the table supplementary return regarding the appointment of a postmaster at Sutton, which return was asked for by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Clark).

At six o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, April 25, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Tenth report of select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.—Mr. Cahill.

Sixth report of select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.—Mr. Parent.

NEW WESTMINSTER POST OFFICE

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I desire to lay on the table of the house copies of letters, documents, and so on from the file of the Civil Service Commission concerning the appointment of a stenographer at New Westminster.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE PARENT, Quebec West, (for Mr. Jacobs) presented the second report of the select standing committee on public accounts as follows:

The select standing committee on public accounts beg leave to present the following as their second report:

Your committee now have under consideration certain items contained in the Auditor General's report for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1928, as referred to the said committee.

It is deemed advisable by your committee that certain other items which are contained in the Auditor General's report for the previous year also be taken under consideration. Your committee therefore recommend that the Auditor General's report for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1927, be referred to the said committee.

Mr. C. W. BELL (West Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, there is an apparent misunderstanding in connection with this report.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should give notice.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): I am not opposing the motion, Your Honour. The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent) is making this motion in place of the chairman of the committee, the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). When the committee was in session yesterday I made two motions, and I think the hon. member for Quebec West has not quite grasped the import of what took place.

The first motion was for the production of material in connection with the Matane dredging contract. This matter dealt with items from the Auditor General's reports of 1924, 1925 and 1926, and it was then suggested that without leave of the house it would not be possible to have the reports for those three years taken up.

The second motion was in relation to the Beauchemin library, and dealt with extracts from the Auditor General's reports for the years 1926, 1927 and 1928.

In view of the fact that information is sought in regard to these matters, and the files relating to entries appearing in the Auditor General's report for those respective years are asked for, it was thought that the house should be requested to refer to that committee all of the entries and all the files relating to the various years. The hon. member for Cartier undertook to bring that matter up and place it before the house. I am quite satisfied that that was his intention but he has been unexpectedly called away, and I am asking now that the hon. member for Quebec West place the matter before the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under the circumstances, I think the motion had better stand.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): May I draw this to your attention, Mr. Speaker: My information from the hon. member for Cartier is that owing to certain religious observances in which he is at present concerned, it will not be possible for him to be present in the house until some time next week. I think the work of the committee should not suffer

meanwhile, and I am quite sure the hon. member for Quebec West will concur with me that the matter is as I have stated. Therefore I ask that the motion may be so altered as to enable the committee to go on with its very necessary work.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion had better stand.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Since the motion has been called, a rather serious situation has developed. I am not saying at the moment that a deliberate endeavour has been made to prevent investigation, but the fact is that two very prominent members on the opposite side of the house are energetically taking action that, if carried to its finality, would result in the investigations never being completed. I need hardly point out to the house that it has been a rule from time immemorial that when an item is under consideration in the public accounts committee, you may trace it back to its origin without any further reference to the house. Unfortunately, however, the contention has been made—and a majority vote in the committee succeeded in carrying the views of that majority, of course—that you cannot investigate an item, the details of which appear in a previous auditor general's report, beyond the year preceding the year just ended. I need hardly say that such a contention, if carried to its finality, would render nugatory any effort made by the public accounts committee.

The rule, as I understand it—and I have asked some of the oldest members of the house—is perfectly clear, that if in the public accounts for the year ended March 31, 1928, there appears an item indicating that payments have been made to A. B. and it becomes necessary to trace the matter back to its origin, even as the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said, to confederation itself; if it is a continuous series of transactions, then you can trace it back to its origin without referring the matter to the house. That looks on the face of it so sensible as not to require discussion. The hon. gentleman who has made the motion has an entirely different view. He believes the house adopted another rule. I do not find any evidence of the adoption of such a rule. The public accounts are on the motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) referred to the public accounts committee. It will be recalled that last year a little conversation took place with respect to that owing to the late date in the session at which the public accounts were referred; and without prejudice to our position. At the moment, the motion of the hon. member for Quebec West is a motion intended to empower the committee to go back beyond the Auditor General's report for 1928 with respect to a certain related item, and of course the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) will realize just what that means. You cannot carry on your discussion with respect to the final payment of an account unless you can go back to its origin and trace it down, because it is based on a contract either express or implied, a contract in writing or a verbal contract given by one of the departments. That may be five or six years ago. I know of one ten or eleven years back.

Mr. MANION: The Welland canal.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, the Welland canal contract was signed in—

Mr. DUNNING: There are a large number of Welland canal contracts dating back quite a number of years.

Mr. BENNETT: I thank the Minister of Railways. They go back at least six or seven years and they are being projected into the future. Suppose in 1929 the public accounts committee is investigating the accounts of March 31, 1928, with respect to any one of those contracts: I think the house has ruled time after time—and the committee has always thought it was so plain it was not necessary to come back to the house—that you can investigate from the origin of the contract down to the date you are then considering, on the assumption, of course, that the matter has not been previously investigated, and if so, the details are available. Payments of public moneys are authorized either under statute or by contract. There may be a written contract or sometimes only a verbal contract and the duty of the public accounts committee is to investigate the soundness of the payments; whether they were warranted or not; whether the prices paid were reasonable; whether tenders were called; whether the moneys voted and paid reached the source indicated by the account or some other source. The public accounts committee is endeavouring to function, not as a party machine, but for the purpose of indicating to the people of Canada whether or not the money is properly expended in accordance with the will of parliament. If it has not been, this committee is going to ascertain that fact. The mere fact that the chairman of the committee is absent to-day or to-morrow should not be a reason for holding up the matter. Summer will come and winter too, if we are going to have only one meeting of the committee a week and then

have it met by such a motion as that which has been considered during the last few days. For that reason, I think the observations made by the hon. member for West Hamilton, which indicate that a certain resolution was to be submitted to the house because a majority of the committee determined that it would be against all precedent—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: There was no vote in the committee at all.

Mr. MANION: I was in the committee and I opposed it throughout.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: There was no vote.

Mr. MANION: No, but I opposed it throughout.

An hon. MEMBER: The ayes and nays were called.

Mr. BENNETT: On every occasion where it has been possible the majority of the committee has been summoned to prevent these investigations from being carried on.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. BENNETT: I ask the minister to read the record. I know what he has seen in his experience in connection with public accounts. The committee has now adjourned until next Wednesday. On Wednesday an effort will be made to have it meet on Thursday at ten o'clock, and on Friday at ten o'clock. Surely hon. members remember that the public accounts committee, when an opposition was investigating the Arctic accounts, sat for days and weeks and it dragged into a month before they got all the horrid details brought to the attention of the public. We are going to endeavour to do the same thing this year and to do so means that the will of a majority is not going to impose itself against the right to investigate the public accounts of Canada which represent moneys paid by the people of Canada and not by any one party. Let that be clearly understood.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I fail to see just exactly what the leader of the opposition has been asking for. I understood that the request of the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Bell) was that a certain report, which is before the house at the moment, should be amended before it is accepted.

Mr. BENNETT: To carry out an agreement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is a matter of changing the wording of a report, and a report that was signed by the chairman. The chairman happens to be absent at the moment; but if my hon. friend will permit me the time necessary to telephone him, I will endeavour to get his consent to make a change that is a matter, as I gather it, not of any consequence beyond that of having the committee meet, if possible, at an earlier date.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): May I interrupt the Prime Minister just a moment? As the Prime Minister rose to his feet, I think the hon. member for Quebec West was about to say something further, and possibly he was about to express his acquiescence in what I had asked for. If that is the case, we can make progress.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If other members of the committee are agreeable, it will facilitate matters, but the chairman who signed the document ought to know, before that document is changed, if there is an intention to alter it. I should not think we would be losing very much time if the motion were to stand over for another day. If it can be settled at the moment, so much the better. I object, however, to my hon. friend taking advantage of a discussion of the kind when a certain courtesy is being asked of the government—

Mr. BENNETT: It is not a courtesy; it is a matter of right.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Do not insult the members of the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not see why my hon. friend the leader of the opposition should lose his temper over it. It is not as serious as all that. The government is entirely in accord with the view of my hon. friend that the public accounts should be investigated whenever it is thought desirable to have them investigated, and that the fullest opportunity for investigation should be given. No one takes any other view.

Mr. BENNETT: They act the other way.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is a most unfair reflection.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is possible that we can arrange to meet my hon. friend in the way that has been suggested, but if the other members of the committee have some substantial reason for not acquiescing in my hon. friend's request at the moment, we shall have to ask him to let the matter stand until to-morrow, and in the interval I will get into communication with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, may I say—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): I am only speaking in answer to what the Prime Minister has just said. Is that out of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. POULIOT: I think by unanimous consent we might hear the hon. gentleman.

Mr. A. L. BEAUBIEN (Provencher): I would like to say a word in answer to the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett). Having been a member of the public accounts committee for many years, I strongly resent the hon. leader of the opposition insinuating or seeking to create the impression in this house that the public accounts committee are trying to prevent hon. members on the other side of the house from investigating in the committee any matter in connection with the public accounts. There is no such intention and there has been no such action on the part of any members of that committee since I have been a member of it, and that is a good many years now.

The report which has been presented by the chairman was discussed last Wednesday before the public accounts committee, and my recollection is that the committee unanimously consented to this reference to the house because some members of the committee thought that we did not have power to go into the public accounts of years gone by. The chairman himself stated that he did not think we had that power. The committee therefore agreed that we should refer back to this house and seek authority to investigate the public accounts of years gone by and go into the files. I wish to repeat that there has been no intention on the part of the committee, and no action taken, to try and prevent a thorough investigation of any item in the public accounts.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William): As a member of the public accounts committee, I was present throughout the whole discussion yesterday, when not only did various members on the other side of the house sitting on that committee take the attitude that we could not examine further back than the present Auditor General's report, but the Solicitor General himself (Mr. Cannon), a member of the government, stated that the reference of the house to the committee concerned only the Auditor General's report which is lying on the table at the present time; that is, for the year 1927-1928. That was the attitude of the whole party on the other side of the house sitting on that committee—absolutely. I argued against that at considerable length, as did others, and in the end, because the government members were in the majority and we could not do anything else, we agreed to refer back to the house for a ruling.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): Before my hon. friend sits down, I would like to ask him if there was any objection on the part of any members of the committee to securing what they regarded as the necessary authority, namely, a reference by the house of the accounts in question?

Mr. MANION: There was objection throughout to going further back than the present Auditor General's report without first coming back to this house for a reference.

Hon. E. B. RYCKMAN (East Toronto): As a member of that committee, I desire to support what the last speaker (Mr. Manion) has said, and to say a word in answer to the remark made by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe)—"most unfair, most unfair." I would like to point out to the house the treatment that was accorded by that committee. It is true that by a majority vote at the meeting just previous to the last one we asked that we should be allowed to examine the files in relation to a contractor named MacMillan, whom I do not know, in regard to a matter in connection with Bedford basin. We said that we desired the file in order to find out the nature of the case, and to examine the officers of the department so as to have a complete story of the matter. The position taken by the majority on the other side, of course, was that we could not do this, that we could not find out whether there was a proper case or not to allege against MacMillan unless we had MacMillan himself present.

Mr. THORSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, should the hon. member discuss the proceedings of the committee when the particular matter on which he is speaking is not before the house? The question before us is a motion to extend the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. gentleman is simply giving an illustration in leading up to his point that at the last meeting of the committee the opportunity was not given to the minority, I suppose, which they desired. The hon. gentleman will please come to the point.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I will come to the point, Mr. Speaker, which is this, that a majority of that committee by a vote of nineteen to fourteen said that we were not to be allowed to examine the files or call the officers of the department and ascertain whether or not there was a case until we had Mr. MacMillan present.

Mr. J. T. THORSON (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct an impression which the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) left on this house. I understood him to say that the committee by a majority vote had taken a certain decision last Wednesday. I am a member of the committee and was present at the meeting of the committee. The hon. leader of the opposition was not present. The hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Bell) made a motion for the production of certain papers and certain files relating to a certain account, and the question was raised—it was put by myself to the chairman of the committee, for information—as to the rule that should govern in such cases. In the course of the discussion two points were raised: First, whether it was within the power of the public accounts committee to discuss items beyond two years back; second, whether the committee could go beyond the order of reference from this house. Earlier in the session the public accounts as contained in the Auditor General's report for the year ending March 31, 1928, were referred to the public accounts committee, and the question raised in the committee was whether the committee could go beyond that order of reference. Those were the two points raised.

There was no vote taken in the committee one way or the other. The chairman was of the opinion that the committee could not go beyond its order of reference and it was the general agreement of the committee that if it did not have sufficient power to go into the accounts that were desired to be examined, it should come back to this house for an extension of its power. There was no suggestion of blocking inquiry in any way, shape or form. There was no vote taken one way or the other with regard to the matter.

Mr. J. F. POULIOT (Temiscouata): As a member of the public accounts committee, I resent very much what the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) has said with regard to supposed obstruction by some members of that committee. I am for fairness in discussion, and for nothing being hidden in connection with the committee's inquiry. I move that not only should MacMillan appear before the committee, but also the Minister of National Defence in the Meighen government of 1926, the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), and the Minister of Railways and Canals in the same government, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Black); that they should be invited to appear before the committee to explain why they stopped the contract, afterwards gave orders to the contractor to resume the work, and later cancelled the contract. I think they should explain their action to the committee.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Mr. Speaker, if I understand aright the difficulty which has arisen, it appears to me that a majority of the committee was of opinion that the committee could not inquire into anything beyond the single Auditor General's report which was referred to the committee on the motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb). It has always been a rule that any item in that particular report may be inquired into and may be traced to its inception, no matter how far back it goes. But I agree that a new investigation should not be started in regard to an item which appears in past reports of the Auditor General, but which does not appear at all in the particular report under consideration by the committee. But that, Mr. Speaker, is fundamental. Surely the committee does not require instructions in regard to it. With all due respect, I think the majority of the committee has acted very strangely in bringing the matter before the house at all. If an item is in the report which has been referred to the committee, that item can be traced back to its inception, and it has been the custom for the last thirty years to do so. But I do not think the committee has the right, unless specially directed, to inquire into items which do not appear in the last report referred to it; that is, the committee cannot rake up matters contained in former reports of the Auditor General unless those matters are specially referred to it.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the public accounts committee and I do not know what happened there. I have nothing to say about its proceedings but my friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ryckman) has taken exception to the words I uttered, "most unfair". I was not referring to anything that has happened in the committee, but to the words of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition when he said that Liberal members were summoned to attend the public accounts committee for the purpose of preventing the proposals of my hon. friends opposite being adopted. I thought

those words most unfair, and I still think so. The members of the public accounts committee who happen to be sitting on this side of the house have a duty to discharge in that committee, as well as my hon. friends opposite. It is their duty to attend there, and it is unfair to reflect on their attendance. It is rather difficult to please my hon. friend, for I remember last year when a certain committee was sitting he complained twice or three times in the house that Liberal members of that committee deliberately refrained from attending its sittings. This year he is complaining because they are attending. I think—

Mr. BENNETT: That was to make a quorum.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think those words are unfair, and I still protest against them.

Mr. BENNETT: I desire to correct a statement made by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe).

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BENNETT: This is a question of privilege. The Minister of Justice said that last session I complained because Liberal members did not attend the committee. I complained of their non-attendance at that time because there was not a quorum, and there could not be one unless they attended. Why did they stay away?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is a great difference.

Mr. DUNNING: I desire, Mr. Speaker, to concur in the view expressed by the hon. member for South Wellington—with all due deference to the chairman of the committee, I suppose we can all have views on the matter under discussion—to the extent that wherever an item appears in the current public accounts, and its source is in the public accounts of previous years it is competent for the committee to follow that item back to its source. But may I point out that so far from this report being a reflection on the motives of the majority of the committee, the report itself, if adopted, will go much further than my hon. friends opposite desire to go,—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. DUNNING: —because apparently not only will it permit the committee to trace the items which appear in the current public accounts back to their source, but it will also permit the committee to go into any other items which appear in the previous public accounts mentioned in the report. That is my reason for objecting to the unfairness of the insinuation—shall I say?—which emanated from the other side in regard to the matter. Without at all debating whether or not the items in the present public accounts can be traced back to their source, at least the majority of the committee desired the house to place every facility at the disposal of the committee.

Mr. MANION: You were not at the committee.

Mr. DUNNING: I hold in my hand the report of the proceedings, and I will read it into Hansard for the information of the house. When motives are called in question the actual language used surely can be quoted. Let me read from the report:

> It is deemed advisable by your committee that certain other items which are contained in the Auditor General's report for the previous year also be taken under consideration. Your committee therefore recommend that the Auditor General's report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1927, be referred to the said committee.

This is, the whole report for the previous year.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, while agreeing with the views of both the member for South Wellington and the Minister of Railways with respect to the logical procedure in matters of this kind, I must disagree with the implication of the last remarks of the Minister of Railways. I am wondering to myself what is going to happen if, every time an examination of an item that comes before the public accounts committee discloses that its source is to be found in previous accounts, that committee is to have to come before this house—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Just a moment; if that committee has to come before this house for an extension of power.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend will surely permit me to say that in my opinion—and I am not the judge; I presume the Speaker is—such a return to this house is not necessary, provided the item in question has its origin in previous public accounts.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what we have said.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): With that I agree; but the implication in the latter part of my hon. friend's remarks would lead us to believe that the majority of the committee had met that situation and gone much further.

Mr. DUNNING: It has.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I may be entirely wrong, but I hold the view that if

the house adopts this report it will create a precedent which will require on every subsequent examination of accounts, other than those of the current year, that the committee must come back to this house in order to gets its powers extended for the purpose of such examination. If it is to be regarded as a precedent, I must object to it, not because I am a member of the committee but because I do not think it is the proper procedure. I do not think it is logical, nor do I think it will facilitate the work of the committee. If it is not to be regarded as a precedent, well and good.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, as a private member of the house—I am not a member of the public accounts committee—as soon as the report was read I at once intended bringing to your attention what I conceive to be a very serious principle involved in the report. As I understand the situation, it is this. It has been ruled by the chairman of the public accounts committee that it is not competent for the committee to examine into files on matters beyond the single year contained in the Auditor General's report, in this case covering the fiscal year ending March 31, 1928. I submit to Your Honour that the members of the public accounts committee have a perfect right to request production of the files and to examine officers of whatever department may be involved in regard to any item included in that year's report, and to follow that item as many years as it goes back in the records of parliament. If that is the case, then the submission to parliament to-day is unnecessary. If the adoption of this report is to be accepted as establishing the ruling of the chairman of the committee that it was not competent for the committee to go back beyond the current report of the Auditor General without a further reference to the house, then I would oppose very, very strongly the adoption of the report. And that is the understanding which we on this side of the house have of the ruling of the chairman of the committee. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) has made what I conceive to be a perfectly proper interpretation of the rule, namely, that it is competent for the committee to follow an item back without reference whatsoever to the house; and if the house agrees to that then, so far as I am concerned, I have nothing more to say on the subject. If, on the other hand, the adoption of the report nullifies the opinion expressed by the minister, who is not at the moment leading, then it is a very serious matter.

Mr. DUNNING: I think I intimated that it was the Speaker who would determine the rule.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): The objection to the report, it seems to me, is this: It must be admitted that when any item in the present Auditor General's Report is under consideration, which relates to an antecedent contract running through two or three prior years, the committee has the undoubted power and authority to proceed to investigate the antecedents of that item, if it is, for example, a continuing contract or a contract on which payments were made, say, three years ago, the final payment falling within the last Auditor General's Report. You have the right to trace the item back to the initiation of the contract under which it arose. That seems to be conceded by the Minister of Railways. Now this resolution assumes, first, that the committee cannot investigate any item further back than the year which has just closed.

Mr. DUNNING: I read it carefully—

Mr. CAHAN: I have it before me.

Mr. DUNNING: —and I find in it no reference—

Mr. CAHAN: I find in it a clear intimation or implication to that effect. The report states:

> It is deemed advisable by your committee that certain other items which are contained in the Auditor General's report for the previous year also be taken under consideration.

That, if it passed, would create, it seems to me, the clear implication that although the item which appears in this last annual report might be investigated, it could be investigated only in case that the previous Auditor General's report is brought before the committee. And it is that implication which we oppose in this report. If it is the clear understanding that when an item has arisen in the last Auditor General's report, relating to a continuing contract, that item should be or may be investigated by the committee back to the last year and to the preceding year, or for any number of years until you reach the source from which the item arose—until you reach the contract under which it arose—then the case is different. It is therefore the implication in this report, that the committee cannot go beyond the last year unless by order of the house, to which we take exception. It is suggested that under the proposed order you could not go back beyond the second preceding year, whereas, as a matter of practice in this house, the item should if necessary be traced to its origin.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it has been made quite clear from this side of the house that we do not differ at all from hon. gentlemen opposite in the view that any item being investigated by the public accounts committee may be traced back to any number of years. That is perfectly clear. With respect to this particular report, we on this side of the house, might take the view if we wished to be unduly suspicious, that hon. gentlemen opposite in not wishing to have the report adopted, see some desire on the part of Liberals to have some items which appear in the 1927 report and which do not appear in the 1928 report not referred to the committee for investigation, because of what the investigation may lead to. I do not think that any purpose of that kind is contemplated. The committee was genuine in wanting to clear up to the satisfaction of everyone the difference of view which took place the other day, and if we are agreed on the main point, that an item may be traced back to its source, and that this report was brought down with a view of helping to make that possible in order to remove any difficulties in that direction, we may adopt the report.

Mr. BENNETT: No, withdraw the report; otherwise, as my right hon. friend will see, it limits investigation to 1927 and 1928.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No. It may be that the majority would like to have that particular report referred to the committee—

Mr. BENNETT: It is now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, that is the 1927 report. The 1928 report is the one which has been referred to the committee. I hope my hon. friend does not want to be placed in the position of preventing the 1927 report from being referred to the committee.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Did not the Prime Minister, at the last session, say that there would be no objection to considering items in the Auditor General's report, 1926 and 1927? That is covered by the motion, and so long as it is understood, and the Prime Minister's statement implements that understanding, there is no quarrel.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I not only said it last session but I say it now, and would be prepared to say it again next year.

Mr. BENNETT: Speaking to the point of order, it seems to me, as the Prime Minister has said, that we are more or less agreed. It does not seem to me to serve the purpose of the Prime Minister to adopt the report in the language in which it now appears, because, as worded, it will be a precedent with respect to the necessity of coming back to the house to obtain authority to deal with matters of this kind which have not originated in the current Auditor General's report. If the report of the committee is so amended as to provide for the consideration of items in the manner indicated, then we are all agreed upon it; but it cannot be accepted in the terms in which it now appears.

Mr. POWER: Is it not a fact that certain members of the committee have asked for the production of documents which are referred to, not in the 1928 Auditor General's report but in the 1927 report, items which have not their origin in 1928? If that is the case, the resolution I submit is a perfectly proper one.

Mr. BENNETT: I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman's question, but the chairman of the committee no doubt knows. The hon. gentleman himself was present and he would know.

Mr. POWER: I was not there yesterday.

Mr. BENNETT: But it is perfectly clear now—and we are agreed on this point—that the only question is as regards the language of the motion. It is desirable to have the motion so worded that it shall not be a precedent which would make it appear necessary to come back to this house to get authority to investigate items to their source.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have asked from the beginning that the motion stand.

Mr. BENNETT: In view of the fact that the chairman is absent, and as the Prime Minister has properly said he has signed something which he might not desire to have someone else amend, the motion might stand.

Mr. SPEAKER: The report cannot be amended by the house but there may be a motion to refer it back to the committee with a view to its amendment in certain respects. I understand that it is the wish of the house that the motion stand, but if it is intended that the report be amended it must be referred back to the committee. Bourinot says:

> A report may be referred back to a committee for further consideration, or with instructions giving them power to amend the same in any respect.

Mr. POWER: Someone who was present yesterday must know what happened.

Mr. BENNETT: Not always.

Mr. POWER: Surely some member of the committee can tell us whether or not the items which are required to be discussed had their origin in the 1928 report.

Mr. BENNETT: It has not been suggested here that it was so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood the wish of the house was that the motion should stand.

Mr. ERNST: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is moved by Mr Ernst, seconded by Mr. Barber, that the debate on the motion be adjourned. If the debate is not adjourned, hon. members who have already spoken might speak again to-morrow.

Motion stands.

NIAGARA FALLS MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. F. S. CAHILL (Pontiac) moved:

That the recommendation contained in the tenth report of the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines respecting the reprinting of Bill No. 22, to incorporate the Niagara Falls Memorial Bridge Company, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

NEWSPAPER VAPAUS

Mr. E. A. LAPIERRE (Nipissing): I beg to present a petition regarding a Finnish language newspaper published in Sudbury under the name of "Vapaus" by the communist Finnish Organization of Canada, asking for the suppression of the paper upon what appears to the petitioners good and sufficient grounds. This petition is signed by the following organizations: For the Canadian Legion, B.E.S.L., Sudbury branch, R. H. Hall, president; for the Sudbury High and Technical School Board, by the president; for the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire, by Clara E. Andress; for the Women's Canadian Club by Catherine Moyle; for St. Joseph's Roman Catholic church, Sudbury, by T. H. Trainor; for St. Andrews United church, Sudbury, by Helen Parlow Matheson; for the Sons of England Benefit Society, Sudbury, by Charles H. Taylor; for the Catholic Women's League of Canada, Sudbury, by Teresa Racicot; for the Catholic Women's League of Canada, Copper Cliff, by Minnie F. O'Connor; for the Baptist church, Sudbury, by William Hay; for the Loyal Orange Lodge, Duke of York No. 1088, Sudbury, by A. E. Poulton and for the Catholic Women's League of Canada, Diocese of Sault Ste. Marie, by Teresa Racicot.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN NATIONAL STEAMSHIPS

Mr. DICKIE:

What is the total cost commissioned of the Canadian National Steamships, (a) Lady Nelson; (b) Lady Somers; (c) Lady Drake; (d) Lady Rodney; (e) Lady Hawkins?

Mr. DUNNING: 1. The Lady Nelson is the only one of these five steamships as to which a reasonably complete statement of total cost is yet available, the figure being approximately $1,538,270.00.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES

Mr. FRASER:

1. What was the total expenditure in British Columbia each year by the Department of Fisheries since the inception of the department?
2. What was the total of the pack of sockeye salmon, by districts, in British Columbia, each year since the inception of the Department of Fisheries?
3. What was the yearly expenditure of the Department of Fisheries in the Fraser river district of British Columbia since its inception?
4. What was the yearly pack of sockeye salmon in the Fraser river district of British Columbia since the inception of the Department of Fisheries?
5. What was the amount of sockeye fry released in the Fraser river, its tributaries, including lakes, each year since the inception of the Department of Fisheries?

Mr. LAPOINTE (for Mr. Cardin):

1. See Fisheries Annual Report 1927-28, page 202.
2. See same report, pages 86-95.
3. Certain services are used for all districts. The cost of them for any one is not apportioned.
4. See above cited report, page 94.
5. Statement attached.

Distribution of sockeye in the Fraser river system

Year	Number
1885	688,000
1886	2,625,000
1887	3,405,000
1888	5,375,000
1889	4,419,000
1890	6,540,000
1891	3,603,500
1892	6,000,000
1893	5,764,000
1894	6,300,000
1895	6,390,000
1896	6,383,000
1897	5,928,000
1898	5,850,000
1899	4,242,000
1900	6,200,000
1901	
1902	15,768,000

Year	Number
1903	12,612,900
1904	11,830,000
1905	9,250,000
1906	C0,839,900
1907	34,220,000
1908	52,515,000
1909	39,349,000
1910	63,823,000
1911	22,737,000
1912	30,629,000
1913	30,588,000
1914	67,095,000
1915	25,388,000
1916	63,959,800
1917	35,104,000
1918	23,415,000
1919	33,975,825
1920	53,894,145
1921	40,340,583
1922	37,292,226
1923	44,743,952
1924	32,032,711
1925	44,969,049
1926	39,760,853
1927	44,535,530
1928	40,946,213

LABOUR DEPARTMENT OFFICER IN MARITIME PROVINCES

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton):

1. Is there an officer of the Labour department located in the maritime provinces?
2. If so, who is such officer, and where is he located?
3. What are his duties and what salary is he paid?
4. Have any reports been received from such officer?
5. By whom was he appointed?

Mr. HEENAN:

1. Yes.
2. Thomas W. Martin, Halifax, N.S.
3. Duties: Under direction, to compile wage schedules for government building and construction work which are considered fair for the locality in question; to investigate complaints as to working conditions, rates of pay, and hours of labour; to act as mediator between employers and employees for the prevention of lockouts and strikes where questions of working conditions, rates of pay, hours of labour, or acts of discrimination are involved; to assist in establishing boards of conciliation and arbitration for labour disputes; and to perform other related work as required. Salary: $2,100 per annum.
4. Yes.
5. The Civil Service Commission.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT

Mr. KAISER:

1. Under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and the regulations relating to the same, how many animals in each province of Canada were affected during the fiscal year 1928-29?

[Mr. Lapointe.]

2. How many of each class of animal, in each province, were slaughtered under government authority during the above mentioned period?
3. How many owners in each province were compensated for loss of such animals during the said period, and how much was paid to each?
4. How many claims in each province of the Dominion on account of such slaughters are unsettled as of date April 15, 1929?

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS BRANCH LINES

ST. WALBURG—BONNYVILLE

The house resumed, from April 19, consideration in committee of Bill No. 54, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from St. Walburg, in the province of Saskatchewan, to Bonnyville, in the province of Alberta—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): This bill has been considered by the committee, previously and when it was before us last progress was reported in order that I might have the legal officers of the department give consideration to a point raised by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) with respect to a note to the schedule. I think I can meet my hon. friend's point by moving that the bottom line of the schedule as it now appears be dropped to below the printing, which will mean that the qualification to the schedule will become a part of the schedule itself which will, I think, effect the object desired.

Mr. SPENCER: How will that read?

The CHAIRMAN: It does not change the reading at all.

Mr. DUNNING: The reading is not changed, but by dropping that line to below the printing in the bill the qualification will be included as a part of the schedule, which will overcome the objection raised the other day.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ALLIANCE—YOUNGSTOWN—DOBSON

The house resumed, from April 19, consideration in committee of Bill No. 55, respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line from Alliance to a point near Youngstown or Dobson in the province of Alberta—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. DUNNING: There is a different amendment to this bill because the criticism was founded on different reasons. First, Mr.

Chairman, I move that in the last line of section 1 the word "the" be struck out and the letter "A" added after the word "schedule" in the same line.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUNNING: Now I move that in the fourth line of section 4 the word "schedule" be struck out and the word "schedules" inserted in lieu thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUNNING: Now I move that a new section be added after section 8, which will have the effect of making what was formerly a qualification a part of the bill itself. It will read as follows:

In the event of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company commencing to build within one year and completing in two years a line from Coronation to near Youngstown or Dobson, and joint and equal running rights are secured from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company between Lorraine and near Youngstown or Dobson for the company, that part of the line authorized by this act between Lorraine and a point near Youngstown or Dobson shall not be constructed and estimates of cost of construction shall be as set out in schedule "B" to this act.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUNNING: Section 9 will require to be renumbered as section 10, and I move that the letter "A" be inserted after the word "schedule."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUNNING: I move that a new schedule, schedule "B," be added. Schedule "B" is mileage 9.5; the amount to be expended, $408,500; average expenditure per mile, $43,000. The effect of this will be that if the agreements contemplated between the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific railways is carried into effect, then schedule "B" is the authority. If, through any unforeseen circumstances, these arrangements are not carried out, then schedule "A" becomes the authority for the construction of the line in question.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 130, to amend the Canadian National Railways Act.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Definition.

Mr. BENNETT: These independent lines acquired would not become part of the system unless by order in council?

Mr. DUNNING: The section in that regard is identical with the present section. At the initiation it was not possible to include legislatively these various companies, but from time to time, as circumstances permitted, they have been brought into the system. In that respect, the section is the same.

Mr. BENNETT: Take the Kent Northern, for instance. This line should ipso facto become part of the Canadian National system, because that is the only way in which you can secure the proper operation of the line. When a purchase is made, it is made on the assumption that it is desirable in the public interests that the line should become part of the general system. The order in council probably would be passed, but my querry is whether or not there should be any question about our legislatively doing it, as we have done in some instances, without waiting for the order in council. Something might happen which might induce a government—I do not say this government—not to pass the order in council.

Mr. DUNNING: To use the illustration of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett), the Kent Northern; that point would be covered, because the Canadian National acquires the physical proporties of the other company.

Mr. BENNETT: And it is merged into the system?

Mr. DUNNING: It is merged into the system. The feature in the old act, and which is continued in this amendment, only relates to the companies which become part of the system as such but which are not merged in the corporate sense with it.

Mr. BENNETT: By the acquisition of shares?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Application of Railway Act and Expropriation Act to company.

Mr. BENNETT: I mentioned this matter the other day. It is very difficult for the small property owners to have recourse to the exchequer court, and these matters could be more readily dealt with by the county or dis-

trict judge. I gather from the amendment which the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) has said he proposes to move that he thinks the suggestion is meritorious. I mentioned $1,000 the other day, but the minister proposes to make that sum $2,500, so that the exchequer court will deal with all cases in which the amount exceeds $2,500. I think that is a very good solution, because the $2,500 will bring these cases within the jurisdiction of the supreme court and if a litigant felt that there was some great principle at stake he could take an appeal to that court.

The amendment contains the words, "where the claim does not exceed $2,500." That is rather indefinite because a man might claim $5,000 and the government might make an offer of $2,000. I think it should be made absolutely clear and the test should be certain. As it now stands I do not think the test is certain, because we do not know to whose claim this refers.

Mr. DUNNING: In order to get the matter before the committee, Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment which the leader of the opposition has just referred to.

Mr. GEARY: Will the minister read it, please?

Mr. DUNNING: It would be an addition following the word "thereof" in the eleventh line of subsection (d) of section 2, and reads as follows:

Provided that such compensation may in any case where a claim does not exceed $2,500, be ascertained under the provisions of the Railway act beginning with notice of expropriation to the opposite party.

I discussed the point just raised by the leader of the opposition with the law officers from the point of view of the actual operation of such a procedure, and I am advised that "beginning with notice of expropriation to the opposite party" does immediately involve the making of a claim for compensation by the opposite party. We are therefore making the amount $2,500 based upon the claim made by the party who is being expropriated. I raised the amount to $2,500, having in mind the factor to which my hon. friend referred, namely, that it would allow greater latitude while at the same time leaving the operation of the amendment to be based upon the claim of the party whose property was being expropriated, rather than upon the action of the company who was expropriating.

Mr. BENNETT: Would it not be better to say "Where the claim of the owner does not exceed $2,500," and thereby remove any possible doubt as to the meaning of the language?

Mr. DUNNING: I defer to my hon. friend's legal knowledge in that regard, but, as he is aware, in expropriation proceedings other factors than ownership enter.

Mr. BENNETT: I know.

Mr. DUNNING: I am therefore afraid of complicating the language. The use of the term "opposite party" later on is intended to apply generally and to include owners or tenants or any others who might have an interest in the property. Probably my hon. friend would examine the amendment.

Mr. BENNETT: I have examined it. The point that I desire to make is that the term "opposite party" does not convey the meaning the minister desires to have us understand. I should think we want to make it perfectly clear that where a claimant sets up a demand for more than $2,500, he must go to the exchequer court, but where the demand does not exceed $2,500, the matter may be heard by the district court under the provisions of the Railway Act. The amendment reads:

Beginning with the notice of expropriation by the opposite party.

Should that not be "by the railway company?"

Mr. DUNNING: The wording is:

Beginning with notice of expropriation to the opposite party.

That has reference also to the provisions of the Railway Act.

Mr. BENNETT: I think it would be better if it read: "Notice of expropriation by the railway company." As my hon. friend will recall, this is the practice: first of all, the plan is filed at the registry office. Then notice is given of intention to take, indicating how much money will be paid. The owners or those interested, if dissatisfied, may go to the district court to have that compensation assessed. The difficulty is that the claim must not exceed $2,500, but the man has no opportunity to set up his claim until after the government or, at least, the railway, has filed its plan. The notice to take is the first step; then there is the opportunity to decide upon the sufficiency of the offer. The claimant has the option of indicating that he will not accept the amount offered, and that he requires a larger sum. Would it not be better

to say: "After notice has been given by the railway company of expropriation," rather than "to the opposite party?" In that case you have no doubt that it begins from the time you give notice.

Mr. DUNNING: I am looking up the sections of the Railway Act. I always hesitate to change a purely legal draft without being sure of my ground. Section 215 of the Railway Act is the section dealing with the matter. It reads:

Preliminary to proceeding to arbitration to fix compensation or damages the company shall serve upon the opposite party—

The same language is used, you see.

—a notice, which shall contain

(a) a description of the lands to be taken, or of the powers intended to be exercised with regard to any lands therein described;

(b) a declaration of readiness to pay a certain sum or rent, as the case may be, as compensation for such lands or for such damages; and

(c) a notification that if within ten days after the service of this notice, or, where the notice is served by publication, within one month after the first publication thereof, the party to whom the notice is addressed does not give notice to the company that he accepts the sum offered by the company, either he or the company will be entitled to apply to have the compensation fixed by arbitration as provided in this act.

Apparently what the officers had in mind was to transfer the option of placing the case before the exchequer court or the district court to the claimant, rather than to retain that option themselves. I think that has merit.

Mr. BENNETT: I am not objecting to that, but does the provision make it clear that a claim which a man sets up for $5,000 has to go to the exchequer court, although he might ultimately receive $2,000?

Mr. DUNNING: I think that is clear.

Mr. BENNETT: Is that what it is intended to do?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Having regard to the fact that this country is so large and the facilities of treating with matters in the exchequer court are so limited, when you fix $2,500 as the criterion, as the minister has done, I think it is an exceedingly fair proposition. That will meet most of the cases I had in mind the other day. But I think it should be fixed in the statute itself as being either the sum offered by the railway company on the one hand, or claimed by the owner on the other. As the matter stands now, the man who might claim $3,000 would have to go to the exchequer court although he might be awarded $2,500. I am only suggesting to the minister, in the light of my experience, that it is hardly fair to ask persons from whom land has to be taken by expropriation, that they should go to the exchequer court. It is too expensive; it requires the employment of solicitors and lawyers to deal with forms and procedure, whereas the other method is very simple. I have known many men conduct their cases successfully before district courts and while I do not desire in any sense to delay the minister's legislation, it seems to me it would be preferable to say "where the sum offered by the railway company does not exceed $2,500." In other words, the law officers of the minister's department have told him to put the onus on the unfortunate owner. I suggest that it is rather desirable to put it on the railway company. I only do that because, as the minister himself realizes, in a province as large as Saskatchewan, for instance, there are many cases in which a man has his land taken from him by the railway, values it at three or four thousand dollars, and may get only $2,500, and the costs in exchequer court proceedings would be very considerable, and the court only goes to that country once a year. I do not think it conduces to the orderly conduct of affairs, in view of the small sums of money affected in this way, to put the onus on the individual I leave it entirely to the minister, but if the responsibility were mine, I think I would prefer to put it the other way and let the sum tendered by the railway company be the determining factor.

Mr. DUNNING: I confess to the committee that the sum suggested to me by the law officers of the railway was less than $2,500. It was in fact $600, to correspond with the normal jurisdiction of the district court judge

Mr. BENNETT: They have a jurisdiction of $1,000 in some of the provinces.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not know much law, but I happen to know—and this I pointed out to them—that strangely enough the district court judge apparently had wider financial jurisdiction under the Railway Act than under the act setting up his court in the first place. That is an anomaly that presently exists. Therefore I saw no reason to adopt any standard contained in any district court act, but for the reason advanced by my hon. friend I would rather raise the limit in favour of the claimant. With regard to $2,500, what I have in mind is the usual small expropriation for right of way which involves the

crossing of a farm. There are very few farm crossings nowadays that take any such sum as $2,500. I had in mind that general situation in setting the sum.

Apparently the only point my hon. friend asks me to consider is whether I should not go a little bit further and make the basis that the jurisdiction should be determined rather by the offer made by the railway company than by the claim made by the owner. I would like to hear that point discussed a little further, if other hon. gentlemen who have had experience with these expropriation matters would give me their advice. I am quite open-minded about it, with this one qualification: More and more the exchequer court of Canada, in connection with small cases, is using that provision of the Exchequer Court Act or Expropriation Act which permits them to have hearings held by delegates of the court, rather than by the court itself sitting in different parts of the country. That practice is growing, and wisely I think, in connection with small expropriation claims. That is to say, the exchequer court may delegate a district court judge to hear the case, the district court judge not deciding it, but referring his evidence and his opinion thereon to the exchequer court, which in turn renders the decision.

Mr. BENNETT: I doubt very much if they have any power to do that in this case.

Mr. DUNNING: Not under the Exchequer Court Act?

Mr. BENNETT: I know, but this is the appointment of a tribunal to deal with a definite matter. That tribunal is the exchequer court, and the judgment must be a judgment of that court. That is one of the reasons why I pointed out to the minister the desirability of making it as easy as possible, because the poor unfortunate who fails in his claim will have nothing left, because of there being so much machinery to put in action. Although the exchequer court holds local sittings at various towns and cities in Canada, it is domiciled, so to speak, in Ottawa. It was that which prompted my suggestion the other day. I think the minister has met it exceedingly fairly. But I still doubt, having regard to the very great area of Canada and to the fact that there is but one court with two judges, whether it is desirable to fix the jurisdiction at $2,500 as the sum offered by the railway company, and if any greater sum is offered by the railway company, recourse can be had to the exchequer court. If it is less than $2,500, the claimant can avail himself of the provision of the Railway Act. I do not think that is unfair. But the minister is charged with responsibility in connection with this matter. The money comes out of the people of the country in the long run.

Mr. DUNNING: I am prepared to adopt for a moment the comfortable position of a judge on the bench and listen to argument. I am willing to make either decision in the judgment of this committee. If my hon friend from South Toronto (Mr. Geary) has any suggestion to make, I shall be pleased to hear it. Personally I think there is a difference of opinion between the lawyers themselves.

Mr. BENNETT: May I say, without trespassing too much on the time of the committee, that usually in arriving at the sum to be offered, the railway company is governed by the report of the engineers and appraisers. They realize that the responsibility is theirs, having compulsorily taken the land in the first instance, and they usually desire to ensure that they will not be compelled to pay a larger sum than they offer. I have been engaged in many of these cases both for the railway companies and the owners. I recall the entrance of the Grand Trunk into Calgary, in connection with which I acted for a very large number of small owners, some of whose lots it split in two. The railway company offered what they conceived to be a fair land value, but it was not adequate compensation for the lots, and the owners succeeded in getting a somewhat larger sum. I am speaking merely in the public interest in this matter, and I am sure the minister wants to place on the statute books a provision that will work no hardship to any honest claimant, at the same time protecting the public treasury from settlements that are forced, so to speak, by reason of local or other pressure that may be brought to bear in connection with matters of this kind. The local tribunal is a very complete answer, as the minister knows, because the county court judge understands the situation better than a person not residing in the locality.

Mr. GEARY: It seems to me that you are on sounder ground in basing the jurisdiction on the value made by the company rather than by the claimant. I think experience shows that it is quite likely that in most cases the railway company will be more nearly right than the claimant's idea of what he should get. The company is also better versed in the procedure, and better versed in judging what is going to result from the

evidence that is given, and as to the sort of award the court is likely to make. So it seems to me that the company's estimate of damage is more likely to be right than is the estimate of the claimant, and I think you are on a sounder basis if you take the company's proposition up to $2,500 as being the basis of jurisdiction, rather than taking the claim made by a man who may have very exaggerated ideas as to the value of his land, and who who may be kept out of this simple court because his ideas are exaggerated.

Mr. BENNETT: And the responsibility for going into the other court will always be his, if you have it the way we suggest.

Mr. DUNNING: The officers of the company who deal with these matters advise me that the most extraordinarily exaggerated demands for compensation arise mainly in connection with small compensation claims—that the larger the actual amount involved, the less the degree of exaggeration in the claim of the claimant. That is the broad experience.

Mr. GEARY: That is natural too.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, and I have no doubt that the officers, in considering it, had in mind that the legal advisers of the claimant would pay due regard to the court before which the claimant would have to appear in the first instance and present his claim in connection with these small amounts. However, in order not to take up further time, as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is anxious and ready to go on. I would suggest that we follow this course: strike out the word "claim" in the second line of the amendment, and insert instead the words "offer of the company." With this understanding, that we will report the bill out of committee and leave it for third reading in order that I may make absolutely sure that no complication will arise as a result of the amendment.

Mr. BENNETT: I think that will cover it.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not question the legal advice of my hon. friend, but he will understand my desire to get the legal advice of the officers of the department.

Mr. BENNETT: I think that entirely covers the situation, Mr. Chairman. I quite appreciate the minister's position. His duty is to take responsibility on the advice of his legal officers, and we do not happen at the moment to be in that happy position. If on third reading it is thought desirable we can again deal with the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The section will now read:

provided that such compensation may in any case where the offer of the company does not exceed, $2,500.

Mr. DUNNING: That is it.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 122, page 31 of the estimates:

Maritime provinces generally — Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc., $50,000.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): Before this item carries, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the minister, as I have for the past four years, to the most disgraceful condition of the post office facilities in the town of Oxford, Nova Scotia. When discussing this matter last year or the year before I asked the minister whether this new post office building was on his list for consideration of those that I understand have to be first submitted to the treasury board for approval, and he intimated that it was, and that the estimated cost was $35,000. There is nothing in the main estimates this year for the much-needed post office facilities in this town. The people there have been clamouring for a better service. The post office is conducted, as I have said at least four times before, in a shack. The population of Oxford is about 1,500, it is the hub of the county, and is the centre of several rural routes. Petitions have been circulated and forwarded to the government by the town council, and the board of trade, and many prominent citizens have urged the Department of Public Works to improve these deplorable facilities. May I urge once more on the minister that when the supplementary estimates are brought down this year provision be made therein for building a post office at Oxford. It would be well, I think, when the minister is visiting in the east, to view this particular part of the province and see for himself in what an inadequate building the Oxford post office is located. Recently the customs office was closed there and in future this branch of the public service as well will have to be conducted in this shack of a building which will cause the public still

greater inconvenience. I appeal to the minister on the grounds mentioned and also on the decency of conducting public business in a proper standardized building that he include in the supplementary estimates this year a vote of $35,000, which has been estimated by his departmental engineers to be sufficient to provide adequate postal facilities at this point.

Mr. GARDINER: What was the total amount spent under this item last year?

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): For a number of years the item has been fixed at $43,000, but it has always been found inadequate. Therefore we are asking for $50,000 this year.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): May I have a statement from the minister in this connection? I think I have been fair and reasonable in the matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I apologize to my hon. friend if he thinks I am not paying attention to his request. I have again made a note of it, along with many other similar requests. I do not deny what the hon. gentleman says with regard to the advantage to be derived by having a new public building at Oxford, and perhaps if funds were available we could not justify refusing his request, but I do say that this is one of the places which is not any worse off than a number of other places where we have had to refuse such requests. However, his request is receiving consideration, and I shall be very glad to accept his very courteous invitation to visit Oxford to look personally into the situation if I get an opportunity.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): I omitted to say that the Post Office Department instructed me in the past that the building at Oxford is totally inadequate for the proper performance of their duties. It is not a case of desiring a building simply for the ornamentation of the town; it is absolutely necessary for the proper conduct of public business. I shall be delighted to have the minister come to the county. I would not urge him to visit us just when there is an election, but on any other occasion he will be most welcome.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

Item agreed to.

Quebec

Beauharnois—public building, $10,000.
Cowansville—public building, $10,000.
Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc.—$110,000.
Farnham—public building—enlargement—$30,000.

Grand'Mère—public building, $54,000.
Grosse Isle quarantine station—improvements, repairs, etc.—$20,000.
Huntingdon—public building, $20,000.
Lennoxville—public building, $12,000.
Maisonneuve—public building, $25,000.
Montreal—Craig St. drill hall—mastic floor—$20,000.
Montreal—new examining warehouse—improvements to heating, $6,500.
Montreal—postal station in Notre Dame de Grâce—$15,000.
Montreal—St. Henri postal station—$15,000.
Montreal—Stephens building—improvements, alterations and equipment—$25,000.
Montreal general post office—installation of pickup table and alterations to fittings, $8,500.
Montreal—postal station in Outremont division—$27,000.
Montreal—postal station "B"—improvements and alterations—$9,000.
Montreal—towards purchase of Lavut building for postal station "G"—$13,200.
Montreal—old examining warehouse—reconstruction—$75,000.
Quebec Citadel—Governor General's quarters—maintenance, etc.—$20,000.
Quebec—Savard Park hospital—repairs, alterations and addition—$80,000.
Quebec—accommodation for military stores—$100,000.
Quebec public building—installation of pickup table—$3,500.
Rock Island—Customs—excise building—$15,000.
Ste. Anne de Bellevue—public building—$10,000.
St. Hyacinthe public building—addition and improvements—$30,000.
St. Marie de Beauce—public building—$20,000.
Ste. Martine (Châteauguay)—public building—$10,000.
St. Romuald—public building—$27,000.
Ste. Rose—public building—$25,000.
St. Roch de Québec—public building—improvements and repairs—$3,000.
St. Pascal—public building—$24,000.
Thetford Mines armoury—improvements and repairs—$1,000.
Victoriaville—public building—$30,000.
Waterloo—public building—$20,000.
Westmount—armoury—$13,500.—Total, $937,200.

Mr. MANION: Are you taking one item at a time, Mr. Chairman?

Sir EUGENE FISET: No, the whole.

Mr. SHORT: They want them in bulk in Quebec.

The CHAIRMAN: We have been taking the whole resolution for the other provinces.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Surely the minister will explain some of these items.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be glad to give all the information available relating to the different items. I would point out that the total asked for in connection with public buildings in the whole province of Quebec

is under $1,000,000. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will feel that we have exercised the same care in granting only those that were absolutely essential as we are trying to take in respect to the other provinces.

Mr. MANION: We are not criticizing these votes but the item is a big one and we want a general explanation in regard to the more important votes. Here for example is $100,000 in connection with accommodation in military stores. The minister might tell us what need there is for this.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This item deserves attention. At the present time the military stores in Quebec are housed in quarters which are needed by the Quebec Battlefields Commission, who have moved to other quarters. The suggestion has been made that rather elaborate buildings should be provided and that they should be moved into these buildings. It is also suggested that if they are moved during the present year they be moved to the Carriere Lainé property in Levis, which belongs to the government and is now vacant. All we are asking for is the cost of removal; we are not making any provision at the present time for other buildings.

Mr. MANION: Take, for example, the item in connection with the Savard Park hospital, amounting to $80,000, of which this is a revote of $48,000. How much was spent in the past year and how much will be spent altogether?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The amount is for repairs and addition to hospital begun in 1928-29 under contract with Scott Brothers of Scotstown, Quebec, involving the sum of $83,870, and also for general alterations and repairs to the old building. The amount already spent is $43,736, and the revote asked for now is $48,000, together with a new vote of $32,000.

Mr. MANION: Is that the total?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is the total for building work.

Mr. McGIBBON: Is this a quarantine hospital?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. McGIBBON: How many patients were there last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am sorry I cannot give that information. Those who come in will be under the jurisdiction of either the Department of Health or the Department of Immigration. I think the Department of Health would be able to furnish the information my hon. friend asks for. This accommodation has been requested in order to enable the Department of Health properly to carry out their duties at this particular point. The contract was entered into last year.

Mr. McGIBBON: Where was the work carried on before?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is not a new hospital but merely an addition to an existing hospital which has proved inadequate.

Mr. GARDINER: This is in connection with immigration work?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, a quarantine station.

Mr. SHORT: How many of these items in this vote for Quebec are for new buildings?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There must be twelve or thirteen new buildings, nearly all small.

Mr. SHORT: You are dealing fairly generously with Quebec in the matter of buildings compared with the maritime provinces. There are two new buildings in Nova Scotia, onc in New Brunswick and none in Prince Edward Island. In other words, there are three new buildings in the whole of the maritime provinces compared with twelve or thirteen in Quebec. I do not want to complain about what Quebec is getting, but I call attention to the meagre amount provided for the maritimes.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is about in proportion to population.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the population of Beauharnois?

Mr. POWER: Mr. Robb and a few others.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will the minister tell us whether this amount in the estimates is the total; what is the total cost of the new building, and will there be another vote next year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is not the total.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It will not be the total?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No. The amount of $10,000 in connection with Beauharnois is to provide for the purchase of a site and towards the erection thereon of a public building for postal purposes. The chief superintendent of post office services reports that the present accommodation is entirely inadequate and he asks for this building. It is contemplated that the total building, fittings, concreting of sidewalks, contingencies and superintendence will

run to about $30,000. The population of the town is 2,400, while that of the parish outside the town limits is about 2,700 more. This is one of the towns which are growing quite rapidly.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the revenue?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The postal revenue is $5,691.97. This is a district where it is expected there will be a very extensive development in a short time.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister a moment ago said that this estimate for Quebec was a very moderate one in relation to this year's votes. Here is a case where, as he tells us, the sum of $10,000 appears in the estimates whereas building and outfit will cost $30,000. Does that apply pretty generally to the rest of the estimates? Let us get the history of the next one and we shall be able to determine better. Will the minister give us some information in regard to the Cowansville public building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: In the case of Cowansville it is expected that the building will cost $41,000. This is towards the purchase of site and erection of building.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the population?

Mr. ELLIOTT: In view of the representations made by the district superintendent in his report regarding the inadequacy of accommodation afforded by the premises in which the post office is at present located, and the impossibility of providing improved accommodation in the present building, it is felt that this expenditure is warranted. It is recommended that an item be placed in the estimates for the erection of a public building at that point which will be adequate to meet the present and future needs of the community so far as postal facilities are concerned. At present Cowansville has a population of between 2,400 and 2,500, which represents an increase of about 100 per cent in the last ten years, and it is stated that there is not a single unoccupied store or dwelling in that town. The report further goes on to say, "I was in the office during the last inspection and found the lobby crowded to suffocation. It was only with the greatest difficulty that a person could force his way from one end of the lobby to the other." Then there is an additional difficulty here; there is also an objection to the present location of the office. It is situated at the intersection of two highways and in the summer time, with the continuous traffic over these two roads and the parking of buggies and automobiles belonging to patrons awaiting their mail, it is a very dangerous spot. In 1928 the revenue was $6,768, an increase from $5,327 in five or six years.

Mr. McGIBBON: What was the revenue in 1927?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The revenue was $6,119 in 1927.

Mr. McGIBBON: Surely the minister does not claim that to be a remarkable increase.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, I was directing attention to the fact that in 1920 the revenue was $5,237 and that last year it was $6,768.

Mr. McGIBBON: That does not indicate that the place is growing so rapidly as was indicated by the minister's first statement.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend will also notice that in 1927-28 the customs revenue was $148,775 at this point, and this building is for customs as well as postal purposes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: From a cursory glance at these two items it would appear that they represent only about 25 per cent of the total expenditure which is to be made, and I suppose next year we will be asked to vote more money. So it would seem that the minister is not very accurate in his statement that the votes asked for are small, because the total cost of these buildings will be three or four times the amount of these appropriations. The minister says this is a case of need, but let me direct his attention to a case of need in my own locality.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CHAPLIN: My hon. friends need not laugh, this place is not in my constituency at all. It is a town whose population has doubled or trebled in the last few years; at present it has a population of about 5,000. The attention of the minister has been directed to this place repeatedly, and although the revenue is greater than that obtained from both these places, no accommodation at all is provided. The minister knows the town to which I refer; I am speaking of Thorold, which is in a constituency adjoining my own, where the need is possibly greater than that of any place of which I have knowledge.

Mr. BANCROFT: Where is the member representing that town?

Mr. CHAPLIN: The member has spoken about it; no doubt he has gone personally to the minister and I have heard him mention

in this house the need which exists, but nothing has been done. It appears to me that the charge made the other day with respect to Nova Scotia could be made again in this case. In Nova Scotia only three towns were provided with public buildings, but the government were mighty sure that those towns were in constituencies represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. The minister said money was being spent in Halifax, but that money is spent to benefit the whole province and the whole Dominion. I am quite sure that if Halifax alone were considered not a copper would be spent, judging from what has been done elsewhere. The same thing applies in this case, and I would like to see a little more consideration given these small places which are growing rapidly and which need accommodation. There are several towns in this list about which I do not propose to say anything; with regard to Grand'Mère and Farnham, for instance, probably these buildings are needed, but I do believe that some of the other places mentioned could very well wait until more pressing needs are filled.

Mr. GEARY: Is the minister going to put a clock in this building also?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Clocks are getting pretty expensive, and we are cutting down expense as far as possible. That will be a matter for consideration.

Mr. GEARY: I might just suggest to the minister that since a clock was put in the Glencoe building he might finish the job and put in a weather vane so that he might always know which way the wind is blowing.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is more difficult in certain other ridings to tell which way the wind is blowing than in the riding to which my hon. friend refers.

Item agreed to.

Ontario

Chatham public building—addition—$20,000.
Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc.—$125,000.
Exeter—public building—$21,000.
Fort Frances—public building—$35,000.
Haileybury—addition to armoury—$30,000.
Hamilton public building—alterations and repairs—$11,000.
Hawkesbury public building—addition—$7,000.
Hespeler—public building—$35,000.
Kenora public building—improvements to heating—$1,600.
Kingston R.M.C.—messing accommodation—$20,000.
Listowel public building—improvements and repairs—$1,600.
London—Westminster hospital—paving roadway—$10,000.
Mildway public building—addition and alterations—$2,500.
Niagara Falls—public building—$95,000.
Oshawa public building—installation of elevator and improvements, etc.—$2,000.
Ottawa departmental buildings—fittings, etc.—$60,000.
Ottawa—equipment for Post Office department—$26,000.
Ottawa—forest products laboratory—addition and improvements—$10,000.
Ottawa—laboratory of hygiene—$10,000.
Ottawa post office—installation of pick-up table—$3,500.
Ottawa—laboratory for Department of Mines, Booth St., and alterations—$100,000.
Ottawa—towards purchase of building for government workshops—$12,200.
Ottawa—towards purchase of Daly building—$112,000.
Parkhill public building—improvements to heating—$2,000.
Port Arthur public building—addition and alterations—$23,000.
Rockland—government's share of cost of local improvements—$1,200.
Sarnia public building—improvements to lighting—$3,500.
Sturgeon Falls—public building—$28,000.
Sudbury public building—addition and alterations—$7,500.
Timmins—public building—$30,000.
Toronto—customs house—$750,000.
Toronto—armoury—$28,000.
Toronto—postal station "A" mechanical equipment—$60,000—Total, $1,683,600.

Mr. MANION: Once more I want to direct the attention of the minister to a matter which I mentioned last year and which on one or two occasions I have taken up with him privately. The post office in my city has not been repaired for a great many years, although the city has grown very much since that building was erected. The accommodation is very insufficient; at Christmas time they find it almost impossible to carry on the work, and in general the post office is badly in need of some extension or alteration, not necessarily costing a great deal of money but sufficient to put it in good condition. I would like the minister to give consideration to this matter in the estimates next year. I am not going to press him to place an amount in the supplementary estimates this year, but just as a friendly suggestion I would say that next year, the year before an election, would be a good time to put in some work on that building. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee in discussing this question now but I hope the minister will give it serious consideration when he is preparing his estimates next year. I think it should have been done this year, but for the moment I am going to overlook that in the hope that some attention will be given this matter in order that fair play may be given the people of that city.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): I would like to direct attention to a situation which exists in my own county, where a public building is absolutely necessary, and to ask the minister if, during the recess, he received a delegation from the town of Georgetown, with reference to a post office in that place. Perhaps he might also say whether or not he received a delegation from the town of Oakville requesting some improvements there.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Georgetown, in common with a great many other places, sent a delegation which made certain representations. Perhaps I can answer my hon. friend and the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) at the same time. No doubt a building is needed at Georgetown, as well as improvements at Fort William and Port Arthur. I think I can fairly say that the Georgetown situation perhaps is not as urgent as the situation at Fort William, and neither of them are as urgent as those which have received attention.

Mr. BENNETT: Such as Hantsport.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Hantsport perhaps was the most urgent.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What about Thorold?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Thorold is a place which has nearly doubled in population in the last three years, but I would call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that that place is not the only one in that part of the country which has nearly doubled in population during the last three or four years. I know the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) will be fair; he knows that we have had to incur heavy expenditures in that very riding to provide for a public building at Niagara Falls.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The necessity there was caused by a fire.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is quite true, but it is also due to the great increase in business.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is for the general good of the country, not of the city.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend will agree that we have been treating that section of the country with great consideration. I would say to the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Anderson) that the same thing would apply to Georgetown.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): The expenditure at Niagara Falls is necessitated by the protection which this country is giving to the exportation of liquor to the United States; the government is spending far too much money in that direction. Why should we protect the United States?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There was a fire and explosion at Niagara Falls which practically demolished the whole building.

Mr. GARDINER: What exploded?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The boiler.

Mr. STEVENS: The building must have been full of booze.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We intend to erect a building which I hope will be in keeping with the growing needs of that community. It will be a much more expensive building than the previous one.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am very curious to know in what riding the city of Chatham is?

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend is not as well up on the geography of the western part of Ontario as upon the geography of other sections. Chatham is in one of the most beautiful ridings in that great western Ontario section, a riding which was represented in this house by my hon. friend's brother.

Mr. POWER: And well represented too.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think it received pretty good treatment from this government when my hon. friend's brother was here, and I hope it will continue to receive as much consideration.

Mr. CHAPLIN: They needed the post office as much when he was here as they do now.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The revenue was hardly as large. I would tell my hon. friend that this is a very delightful part of the country, next to Middlesex one of the finest.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister has been very good in giving me information. Will he go down the line and tell me in what constituency the town of Exeter is?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Exeter is in another excellent constituency; it is in South Huron.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will the minister tell me what constituency Fort Frances is in?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is in the constituency of Kenora-Rainy River.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is the constituency of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan).

Mr. ELLIOTT: Another constituency which is exceedingly well represented.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): I do not want the minister to get away from Georgetown. Georgetown is one of the most needy places in the Dominion of Canada at the present time as far as post office accommodation is concerned. As far back as fifteen years ago an estimate was put in for the purpose of building a post office, and the people purchased a site and have had it waiting there all these years. The post office is very small, the entrance to it is poor and the accommodation for the public is about as bad as anything you could find in this country. There is considerable revenue from the office as a number of rural mail routes start from this point. I would like the minister to take this matter under serious consideration and endeavour to implement the request made by the delegation which came down here asking for the early erection of a post office building. I would like to know if the minister gave any encouragement to that delegation as to the erection of a post office building within, say, the next year.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would not like to say that we got down very definitely to dates, but it is one of the places which must have a public building some time in the future, and that not very distant. I would direct my hon. friend's attention to this fact, which I think distinguishes Georgetown from the two places mentioned by the hon. member for Lincoln—probably as conversant with Ontario in general as any member of the house. As far back as 1914 my hon. friend's friends thought that a building was necessary at Exeter, and a site was purchased. The same thing applies to Fort Frances, referred to by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) on many occasions, and I think he will be one of the first to stand up and say that he thinks the necessity for a building at Fort Frances was very urgent. A site was purchased for $16,500 on September 28, 1912, and a site was purchased in Exter on March 18, 1914. Unfortunately Georgetown was not considered quite as urgent at that time by my hon. friend's friends, because during the time they were buying sites in these other more urgent places, no site was selected for a building in the town of Georgetown. I think that is one of the best tests of urgency.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): I differ with the hon. minister; a site was purchased and it is there to-day. As I said before, an estimate was provided in 1914 for the building of a post office in Georgetown.

Mr. McGIBBON: Seeing that the hon. minister is in such good humour this afternoon and as he is admitting that the revenues are quite large, I am going to call his attention to the condition of the wharfage at Bracebridge. As the minister knows, that part of the country is very dependent upon the tourist trade and during the summer months great demands are made upon the wharf facilities. The department has the information regarding the needed improvements there. A new wharf is not needed and it is not going to cost much money, but the improvements would be of very great assistance to navigation. I hope when the minister brings down his supplementary estimates he will be good enough to include this small item of a few hundred dollars. I thank the minister for his promises.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Let us have no misunderstanding about this. I am not going to quarrel with my hon. friend about the necessities of the case, but we are dealing now with public buildings and he is referring to a matter which comes under the heading of harbours and rivers. This matter has received consideration by the engineering department, and the representations which have been made by Bracebridge and several other places in that section of the country are receiving the very best attention.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): I would correct my statement. I said there was a site or plot for a post office in Georgetown, purchased not by the government, but by the town itself. In 1914 an amount was placed in the estimates for the erection of that post office, but the intervention of the war prevented the building of it. At that time it was considered very necessary to have a post office in that town. I am bringing the fact to the attention of the minister in order to assist him in coming to a decision.

Mr. CHAPLIN: To come back to the Fort Frances public building for which the sum of $35,000 is placed in the estimates, what is the total cost of that building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It will be much more than $35,000. This amount of $35,000 is required towards the erection of a public building on a site on Scott street, at the corner of Portage avenue, for postal purposes.

Mr. MANION: That is the same site that was purchased some time ago?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. The proposed building will be a two-story, L-shaped brick structure, having a frontage of 94 feet on Scott street by a depth of 54 feet on Portage avenue, and will provide accommodation for the post

office, National Revenue, Indian Affairs, immigration, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and living quarters for the caretaker. The total estimated cost is as follows:

Building—$75,000.
Post office and customs fittings—$6,000.
Grading and sidewalks—$1,500.
Superintendence—$2,000.

Mr. GARDINER: When this item was before the house last year, I called the minister's attention to some new sidewalks built in the parliament grounds. Can the minister make any reply to my question as to those sidewalks, and does he notice they are deteriorating this year to a greater extent than last?

Mr. STEVENS: They are scandalous, disgraceful.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I cannot quarrel very much with what my hon. friend has said or what my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre has said. The matter was under consideration at the time is was referred to in the house a year ago. Under the contract we had with the contractors, they were not bound to make the repairs.

Mr. GARDINER: Last year the minister produced a contract by which they were bound.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, but my recollection is that it did not bind them to make the repairs. At any rate, I think they were wise enough to know that one of the reasons we give in the department for refusing to accept a tender is that work has been bad in the past. They were men enough to say: We will make the sidewalks right, and they attempted to make them right. Due very largely, I think, to the fact that the contract was let perhaps a little late, and the frosty weather came on before the concreting was completed as it should have been, the job turned out badly. They made some repairs; the repairs they have made are not satisfactory, and they have undertaken to rebuild the sidewalks at their own expense and without cost to the government.

Mr. GARDINER: That is very satisfactory I would call the minister's attention to another important point, and that is to the coating of the concrete. The minister will see that in many places the finishing coat is not more than a quarter of an inch thick. What officer of the department was looking after the inspection of this work, and is he still in the employ of the government?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I could not give my hon. friend offhand the name of the inspector, but I know the inquiry revealed to me the fact that frost had something to do with the matter. I do not think my hon. friends can tell, by looking at the sidewalk now, just what the real cause of the trouble may have been. He knows very well, of course, that as regards mixing cement, unless it is properly set or kept warm, it is liable to be injured by frosty weather.

Mr. GARDINER: I am talking about the finishing coat.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That applies to the finishing coat. The rest does not make much difference. At any rate while we are on this subject I should like to call the attention of hon. members to the fact that very frequently the work of the department does not get started until the middle of the summer. Last year, for instance, I do not think our estimates were passed until the middle of June. I am not finding fault with anybody in regard to this, but it is worthy of consideration by hon. members in every section of the house.

Mr. STEVENS: The estimates were not taken up until very late in the session.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, but the difficulty was that our estimates were not passed until the middle of June. I am not objecting to the criticism which can be made; I think that is proper and it is helpful to the officers of the department; but I think it is in the interests of every hon. member who is anxious that this business should be carried on in a proper way, that the estimates of the public works department should be got through, if it is possible to arrange to do so, so that we would have warm weather for doing the work which is largely work that cannot be done after the frost starts. It is very largely seasonal work and if you do not get your men started preparing the tenders until the month of June, as was the case last year, a great deal of work that should be finished in the warm weather will not be completed until the frost comes. I want, however, to say to the credit of the two gentlemen who are the contractors in connection with the work in the parliament grounds, that I hope whoever lives to see the house meet another year will find that they have done the job right.

Mr. SHORT: I hope the minister does not blame us on this side for the fact that he did not get his estimates through earlier. Why did the government not bring them down at the beginning of the session? The estimates are not brought down until about the middle of the session, and the supplementaries do not come down until just a

few days before prorogation. No one is to blame but the government themselves that the estimates do not get through earlier. The estimates should be one of the first matters that the house should take up.

Mr. BENNETT: They used to be.

Mr. SHORT: Ever since this government came into power, or since I have been in the house, the estimates have not been brought down until away on in the middle of the session, and the supplementaries until just a few days before parliament prorogues.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend knows that the estimates are not passed until after the budget.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh, no.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That has been the practice for years.

Mr. STEVENS: That is a new practice. The Minister of Finance is very clever; he brings his budget in before the rest of his more innocent colleagues get wise, and he is finished and has a nice, easy time afterwards. It was April 15 when the estimates started. The house has been sitting since February 7. Let the minister not forget that.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The remarks of the minister regarding the lateness in bringing down the estimates have no bearing on the repairs of the cement sidewalks about which he is speaking. If those men want to make those repairs they do not need to wait for any estimates to be passed. They can go ahead with the work whenever they like, and if they leave the work until the frost comes, that shows they are delinquent in their work.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have not made myself clear, and I apologize. I want to be fair to the contractors. They had to do the work late in the fall. The fact that the frost started before the work was completed is, to my mind, partly responsible for the condition of the sidewalks. I am saying this without prejudice to our right to have them put in proper condition. There is no doubt that this cement work would have had a much better chance if they had got started on the work and completed it before the frost came.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I have this to say in reply to the remarks made by the minister. No contractor had any right to go on with that work in frosty weather unless he took proper precautions to protect it. What were your inspectors doing? If that work had been properly supervised it would have been protected, and the work would have been good. There was some fault somewhere, either with the inspection department, or with the contractors for going on with the work in that kind of weather.

Mr. GARDINER: I am glad to hear the minister's statement in regard to the contractors being willing to rebuild these sidewalks, but in view of the contractors making such a slipshot job as they have done here, what are they likely to do on work that is not under the eyes of the members who can see what is being done? Is this typical of the character of the work done generally by the department?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does my hon. friend think that is a fair question? Does he not know that every riding in this country is represented in this house?

Mr. GARDINER: But the members do not see all the work that is being done.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Members even on this side have been very ready to make criticisms of bad work, and I hope they will continue to do so when bad work is found anywhere. Every riding is represented in this house, and if we are doing bad work in connection with this department I shall not only be obliged to the member who draws my attention to it or brings it to the attention of some of the officials of the department, but I shall endeavour to see that that bad work is remedied, and we will watch very carefully when that contractor is tendering on another job.

Mr. GARDINER: Before vote 117 for Ottawa public buildings comes up, I would like the minister to tell us who was the inspector who had charge of that work, and if he is still in the employ of the government. I would also like to know what was the nature of the mixture used for the finishing coat, and what was the depth of that finishing coat as called for by the contract.

Mr. GEARY: Is it not usual to have a provision in the contract that the contractor shall look after the work in connection with sidewalks and pavements for a certain number of years? That is in all city contracts.

Mr. ELLIOTT: When my hon. friend was city solicitor for Toronto I think that was the practice, but I am advised that it is not the practice in cities to-day.

Mr. GEARY: I think it is.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The question of my hon. friend from Acadia is a fair one; I think we should know who the inspector was. I

made inquiries about it some time ago, but I have not been able to carry the name in my head; I will look it up. The mixture was the usual mixture for cement, and is supposed to produce a good job. The reason we are able to get the work replaced is that it did not produce a good job.

Mr. GARDINER: I would take it, from an examination of that sidewalk, that the finishing coat was not very good for a piece of work like that. I hope the minister will look into that point and give the committee the information in time for us to discuss it when the item comes up. That certainly is not a good finishing coat.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. KENNEDY: Would the minister give us an explanation with regard to the public building at Hespeler, and tell us on whose recommendation this vote is in the estimates?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is pretty hard to name anybody from that district who has not asked for it. This is one of the places where my hon. friends opposite thought it was necessary to have a public building, and they purchased a site for it on January 16, 1913. This building is being requested by deputations from Hespeler, including the town council, and from what I can gather from the hon. member who represents that constituency, he met with no opposition whatever to the idea of this building being constructed there.

Mr. KENNEDY: Is it a post office?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. We were in a rented building. I can assure my hon. friend that this vote was not put in for political purposes, but because the building was really required in order to provide proper postal facilities. That is the information we have in a report from the Post Office Department.

Mr. LUCAS: What is the population and the revenue?

Mr. ELLIOTT: These young towns are doing pretty well under the present government.

Mr. BENNETT: Despite the government.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Hespeler has made great progress.

Mr. GEARY: Put back that duty on yarn and it will do better.

Mr. BENNETT: The yarn we are listening to is the trouble.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend's remarks are intended for my colleague the Minister of Finance rather than myself.

Mr. GEARY: I do not think the member for that riding (Mr. Edwards) would be so remiss as not to ask for the post office.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Do not think for a moment that he has ever let a month go by without asking for that post office. If he has, I have forgotten it. Here are a few details of this vote: This amount of $35,000—there is a revote of $15,000—is required to complete the erection of a public building on the corner of Queen and Cooper streets in the town of Hespeler for post office purposes. The work is being performed under contract by G. H. Thomas and Son, Limited, for the sum of $33,276. The cost of the site was $5,200. That was paid out some time ago. The expenditure for 1928-29, on contract, was $5,000. It is estimated that $35,000 more will be required. Tenders were called for, and the lowest tender received was for $33,276. An order in council was accordingly passed granting authority for the acceptance of the lowest tender.

Mr. SANDERSON: Will the minister tell us who is the member for that riding?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That riding is well represented by my hon. friend from South Waterloo (Mr. Edwards) who started out well, politically.

Mr. EDWARDS (Waterloo): He is going to finish well, too.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am glad to hear that. The population of Hespeler is approximately 2,900. The revenue for the last fiscal year was $9,351. All the reports are that Hespeler is a growing town, and the absolute requirements of the department made it necessary to provide these facilities. The building we are now providing is not a bit too commodious, and if things go on as they are now doing there will have to be an addition to it before a very great length of time.

Mr. SPOTTON: Mr. Chairman, I feel rather lonely when I find every constituency contiguous to my own has received consideration in these estimates.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Evidently you have not looked at Harbours and Rivers.

Mr. SPOTTON: I am afraid to discuss harbours after a recent incident.

Mr. ELLIOTT: You are too timid.

Mr. SPOTTON: I wish to mention at the moment the village of Brussels, as the government owns a piece of property there. This of course was purchased just prior to the war. The building is in very bad condition. If the Minister of Public Works has not been in that building, at least I know some of his colleagues who have been there. One visited Brussels on a very important mission on September 12, 1927. I am not objecting to the vote for Exeter. I wish to congratulate the member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) and that part of our county on getting a new post office. I hope that since relative urgency in these matters seems to be based upon the good judgment of the previous administration in selecting sites—that appears to be the guiding star with the minister—

Mr. ELLIOTT: Well, it is a certain amount of corroboration.

Mr. SPOTTON: I hope the minister will compare Brussels and Exeter and tell us why the one was taken and the other left, because I know my people are expecting something, as it is not long since they were told, "Ask and ye shall receive." I find South Bruce, North Perth, Lambton West and South Huron—all represented by members on the other side of the house—have received a little donation from the funds of the Dominion of which the minister is trustee, and I congratulate them on their good fortune; but we have not received anything in Brussels. The building there is in very bad shape, in fact it is not any better than an ordinary livery stable. I would ask the minister to give his reason why he selected Exeter, for instance—I am not objecting—and left out Brussels, where so many of his friends in September 1927 were fully seized of the fact that something was very urgently needed with respect to post office accommodation. I do not want the minister to say that he is lying awake at nights because we are all asking for consideration. I know he is in a hard position, I know he cannot grant everything that is asked, but I would respectfully suggest to him that he keep his engineers or inspectors a little closer to their jobs at Ottawa. When I pick up a local paper here and there I find that an inspector or an engineer of the Public Works department or of the Marine department has been in a constituency looking over things and looking very wise, giving a nod here and a wink there. It is not long since that I saw an article in a western Ontario paper stating that two members of parliament were travelling about the district in company with an inspector or an engineer either from the Public Works department or the Marine department, I am not sure which. They were slipping around two contiguous constituencies exhibiting this official, and they felt so shy about it—their consciences must have been chiding them—that in one village, the paper says, they were shadowed by the local constable. Apparently they themselves felt that they were hardly doing the correct thing. Before the government chides us any more about asking for too much in the way of public buildings, I would respectfully suggest that they stop the practice of sending out departmental officials to look over constituencies with a view to finding an excuse for spending a little more of the people's money. I do not wish to labour this point, but since Hantsport, Buctouche, Exeter and all these other favoured places have received consideration—and the minister has said their cases must be urgent because sites were purchased in 1913 or 1914—I would ask him next year to be prompted by the same reason and build a post office at Brussels, and so carry out one of the many promises made by his friends. True, he did not commit himself, but on the other hand he did not in any way chide those who were making the promises. In the meantime if he will tell me on what he based his ultimate conclusion that Exeter should be taken and Brussels left, I may be able to justify his action to my constituents.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. minister would be justified by faith.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, but my hon. friend has both faith and works. I am rather surprised to hear him compare the riding of North Huron with the riding of South Huron, because he looks alarmingly like the gentleman who was in my office not very long ago with a deputation from his riding expressing their great appreciation of what was being done by this department for that particular riding.

Mr. SPOTTON: No, what was being promised.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What was being done.

Mr. SPOTTON: Promised.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No. The words of the deputation as I recollect them referred to what had been done last year to the harbour at Goderich, and stated what excellent results were flowing therefrom.

Mr. SPOTTON: We will discuss that when the harbours are up. We are dealing with post offices now.

Mr. ELLIOTT: But I see some of my hon. friends wish to mix the two, and I am not objecting to that now. If he will look at the estimates a little further on he will see that for Goderich harbour there is an appropriation of $205,000. He is the last man that I would expect to object to this set of estimates.

Mr. SPOTTON: I did not object; I congratulated the member for South Huron on his good fortune and stated I was delighted to see Exeter get a public building. I was simply asking the minister to tell us how he reached his conclusion which resulted in his taking Exeter and leaving out Brussels.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If that is what he was trying to do I am satisfied.

Item agreed to.

Manitoba

Brandon—public building—$50,000.
Dauphin public building—addition—$9,500.
Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc.—$35,000.
Emerson—building for customs and immigration purposes—$20,000.
Gretna—public building—$25,000.
Transcona—public building, $27,000.
Winnipeg—Fort Osborne Barracks—power plant—$9,100.
Winnipeg—hospital for Department of Pensions and National Health—$160,000.
Winnipeg post office—extension, $90,000.
Winnipeg public building—improvements and alterations—$8,000—Total, $433,600.

Mr. BENNETT: Is the whole of 124 carried?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not what was intended, Mr. Chairman. You were calling the Hespeler public building.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the resolution.

Mr. BENNETT: But the buildings at Ottawa have not yet been discussed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. BENNETT: It is no good for hon. gentlemen opposite to shout "carried." We want to know something about these buildings at Ottawa, particularly regarding one matter. Many departments of the public service are engaging in the same enterprises, especially with respect to research work. I think the minister should make some statement to the committee with respect to these matters.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Which item is my hon. friend referring to?

[Mr. Spotton.]

Mr. BENNETT: The last item called was the Hespeler post office.

The CHAIRMAN: We have been discussing indiscriminately the items in the resolution and not any one of them in particular.

Mr. BENNETT: The Ottawa items are all together; in vote No. 124 the Ottawa buildings all follow one after the other. On page 32 in the Ontario item there are these votes: Ottawa departmental buildings, fittings, etc., $60,000; equipment for Post Office Department, $26,000; forest products laboratory, addition and improvements, $10,000; Ottawa, laboratory of hygiene, $10,000; Ottawa post office, installation of pick-up table, $3,500; laboratory for Department of Mines, Booth street, and alterations, $100,000, of which $40,000 is a revote; Ottawa, towards purchase of building for government workshops, $12,200; and towards purchase of Daly building, $112,000. The Prime Minister will realize what I have in mind when I point this out. We are now endeavouring to establish a research department and I have been looking into the matter to ascertain what duplication there is. The minister will observe that we are providing for a laboratory of hygiene and a laboratory in connection with mines and minerals, and the new building discussed last year was to deal with certain other matters in connection with forest products which are being tested. Now the question is whether or not there is duplication of activities in the various departments. Why, for instance, should the Minister of Public Works deal with the matter of machines in the post office? Take that $26,000 for equipment in connection with the post office. Is this for the new machines that have been patented, for the purpose of lessening the amount of manual labour which has to be done, and which machines are merely leased and not bought? I ask this question because this is the only means whereby we may get information on the subject.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is no departure from the practice that has been followed with regard to the fitting of post office buildings. This item of $60,000 is required for the purchase and installation of metal file cases, shelving and other fittings needed in the parliamentary and departmental offices in Ottawa.

Mr. STEVENS: All over?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. It is impossible to give in specific detail a list of the requirements, but I can give what we spent last year and in other years, and my hon. friend will see that this amount is required.

Mr. STEVENS: What is the $26,000 for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is to provide for the purchase of steel equipment for the money order branch of the Post Office department. It was asked for by the Postmaster General in a letter forwarded in April 1928.

Mr. STEVENS: That conveys nothing.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps I might read the letter:

I wish to inform you that it is the intention of this department to submit a requisition to your department in the course of the next few weeks for steel equipment for the reorganization of the money order work in the Blackburn building, Ottawa. It is considered that this equipment will cost approximately $26,000. I am bringing this matter to your attention in case you may be able to place an item in the supplementary estimates to provide for the work.

This request was made a year ago but we did not see our way clear to comply with it at the time. As a matter of fact an item of $20,000 was provided in the supplementary estimates for 1928-29 but the treasury board, in cutting us down, cut it out, stating that they thought it could wait another year.

Mr. STEVENS: What sort of steel equipment is it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: They are steel cases for filing the various money order records.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister is sure they are just steel filing cabinets?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: They are not these cancelling machines we hear so much about?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No; this vote does not apply to them.

Mr. STEVENS: Is there provision in these estimates in that regard?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, not for Ottawa.

Mr. STEVENS: Is the department replacing those machines bought four or five years ago?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Not that I am aware of. The department supplies facilities largely for the various other departments which require them, and we endeavour to satisfy ourselves as far as possible not only that a particular department wants them but that they are absolutely necessary. There has been no request, so far as I know, for a renewal of the equipment the hon. member speaks of.

Mr. BENNETT: I have already referred to installations in connection with various laboratories. I shall have something to say in regard to dredging and the advisability of having some central organization in connection with the conduct of public affairs, but I will not go into that matter at the moment. Just now I am dealing with laboratories and other buildings of that character. We cannot possibly get along if each department claims the right to have one of these establishments; we cannot possibly make progress under such conditions in a country such as this. We are establishing this new department of research, about which we are all so anxious and which will serve useful purposes in this country, and what I want to point out in this connection is this: We are voting public money to establish, in several other branches of the service, undertakings which ultimately must be regarded as research in the true sense of the term, and I for one am opposed to that being done. I mentioned the matter last year when the Prime Minister was discussing the matter of research activities. We are engaged, for instance, in wood testing and activities of that sort, all desirable, all admirable in their way. But the Prime Minister having invited suggestions as to how public money might be saved, I suggest that we prevent duplication wherever possible; in other words, that a well organized department should take care of the very work which at present is being done in several departments of the public service. I do not think it is conducive to the public interest that one particular service should set up a research department of its own for testing purposes, say, another department do the same, and still another. We are endeavouring now to consolidate our activities, and while one could understand such duplication at one time it should now be avoided. I am not saying this in any critical or censorious spirit; I say it because I have been investigating the matter and I find that there is on the part of officials a tendency, which after all is but human, not to let go what they now have. I do not think however that we should expend public money to erect buildings which will indicate, on the part of this parliament, a desire to have more than one department dealing with questions of research, however manifold may be the activities of the various departments. I cannot consider it desirable that the departments should engage in these various enterprises.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps my colleague (Mr. Elliott) will allow me to say a word on this matter inasmuch as it affects many departments.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, many of them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is a committee of the cabinet composed of ministers in whose departments research work is carried on, and the object of the committee is to centralize as much as possible all research work of the government. The committee has been considering this whole matter very fully having in mind the establishment at an early date of the new industrial and scientific research laboratories, and I can assure my hon. friend that these particular requests, especially from one or two of the departments, have been examined in relation to the larger equipment for which arrangements have been made. There is a special reason, which the Minister of the Interior would be able to give if he were here as to why one or two laboratories separately existing should continue so to exist, but I can assure my hon. friend that the government is entirely of his view with regard to consolidating scientific and industrial research work and will prevent, as far as possible, any overlapping of the service in that regard.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sure the country will receive the statement just made by the Prime Minister with great satisfaction, but a laboratory of hygiene, for instance, is perhaps one of the matters with which a well organized research bureau would think it had a great deal to do as a branch of its activities. In putting up these buildings I fear we may be promoting what I might call the sense of an independent branch of the public service rather than a coordinated branch having to do with research work. That is the point which I endeavoured to make, although I have not made it very clear. Perhaps we will ask the Minister of the Interior about the workshops, the mines and the forest products.

It seems to me that the Department of the Interior is hardly the department under which one would expect forest products testing operations to be carried on, for instance, because so far as the local situation is concerned the companies interested usually look after that work. However, I believe that with respect to export business this work has been very valuable; I might mention the work which has been done in connection with the tensile strengths of woods and so on. I should think that work would be very properly under the Department of Trade and Commerce, and that is the reason I ventured to bring this matter to the attention of the house at this time. The observations of the Prime Minister quite assure me that the government are desirous of doing what I think most thoughtful Canadians desire in this regard, but to vote money for these separate buildings will put them in a bad way when they begin the work of consolidation. Many difficulties will be interposed; I am sure that during his investigations my right hon. friend has ascertained how difficult it is to overcome that great jealousy possessed by men which will not let them surrender any of their activities in connection with scientific work. The jealousy with which men will hold on to their little positions in an endeavour to maintain an organization is amazing, and these four items struck me as being so related to the large activities to which this country has very properly committed itself that I venture this criticism in the hope that the minister would lend himself to the expenditure of public money in such a way as to afford a foundation for the effort which will be made later on not to coordinate but rather to maintain independent organizations.

Item agreed to.

Mr. VENIOT: I know this is rather irregular, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to announce that I have here the remainder of the returns which were asked for and which will be laid on the table of the house for the benefit of any hon. member.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: The next item to be considered is vote No. 125, public buildings, Manitoba.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are you taking these up item by item?

The CHAIRMAN: We have been considering the resolutions as a whole.

Mr. BENNETT: You will never get supply through that way, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: It is for the committee to say whether it wants them called item by item.

Mr. STEVENS: That has been the practice, and we might as well follow it.

Brandon public building, $50,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is that building intended for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The intention is to arrange for the erection of a new public building to provide adequate accommodation for all government services.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are there any buildings there now?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is one building which was erected some years ago, but it is thought that the present building will be required as well as the one proposed.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is this a post office?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc., $35,000.

Mr. BENNETT: How much of that was used last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: About $20,000.

Item agreed to.

Gretna public building, $25,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The postal revenue for 1927-28 was $2,329, and the customs revenue $18,370.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What part of the province is Gretna in?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is in the constituency of Lisgar.

Mr. LUCAS: What is the population?

Mr. ELLIOTT: About 600.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the total cost of the building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: $25,000.

Mr. BENNETT: That will include the cost of the site?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The cost of the building is estimated at $17,000; cost of fittings, $3,000; grading sidewalks, and so on, $2,000; and contingencies and superintendence, $3,000. The site was purchased in June, 1913.

Item agreed to.

Transcona public building, $27,000.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the population of that town?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The population is 5,300, and the postal revenue is $5,187.

Item agreed to.

Winnipeg—hospital for Department of Pensions and National Health, $160,000.

Mr. McGIBBON: How many patients were there in this hospital last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am sorry that I cannot give my hon. friend that information. The necessity for this hospital arose from the fact that these patients were formerly housed in the Winnipeg civilian hospitals and they served notice upon the government that they were overcrowded and would not be able to accommodate these cases. We started the construction of this building a year ago.

Mr. McGIBBON: Has not the department more hospital accommodation in the Dominion than is really required?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is something which could better be answered by the department concerned. They succeeded in satisfying us that they could not get along without this accommodation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This was a very doubtful proposition last year, and we want to get some information about it.

Mr. McGIBBON: As a matter of fact the departments of health and soldiers' civil re-establishment are closing hospitals in a number of places in Canada, and it looks unreasonable to be spending more money for this kind of accommodation.

Mr. ELLIOTT: On January 11 we received the following from the Minister of Health, dealing with the necessity for additional accommodation:

> At present there is an extremely urgent situation in respect to hospitalization of pensioners in Winnipeg.
>
> Hitherto the department has maintained an eighty-bed hospital of its own, which has been chiefly used for convalescent cases and aged veteran pensioners, while the active treatment cases have been attended to by contract with the civilian hospitals in Winnipeg.
>
> Last spring this department received notification from both the Winnipeg General Hospital and St. Boniface hospital that, in consequence of civilian bed shortage in Winnipeg, it would be impossible to guarantee further accomodation for ex-soldiers as provided by them for the past ten years. You will remember, therefore, that appropriations were passed late in the last session for the building of a new wing to the existing departmental hospital in Winnipeg. Meantime temporary arrangements were made with the civilian hospitals to take a lessened number of soldier patients, in order to tide over the emergency. My medical advisors inform me that the situation at present is much more urgent even than last year in respect to bed shortage in Winnipeg, and that this department is at the present time incurring a great deal of extra expense in consequence of having to pay extra for private rooms and private nurses, because no public ward accommodation is available—this in spite of the fact that the St. Boniface hospital, for example, has cleared out the wing where formerly their help were housed, in order to provide additional beds.
>
> Neither civilian hospital will guarantee us any further accommodation, and are clamoring

to have the present beds allowed for the treatment of ex-soldiers cut down to at least half of what the department has been using, because they cannot at present accommodate all their civilian patients, who have the first call on them.

Today there are seventy-four active treatment cases in the Winnipeg General hospital, sixty-two in St. Boniface hospital, and seven in St. Roch hospital, while the departmental hospital (Deer Lodge) is full and overflowing, and patients waiting for admission.

The urgency is so great that tentative arrangements are being considered for obtaining a part of the old Immigration building in Winnipeg, and fitting it up as an emergency hospital. If this is necessary, it will have to be done at a great expense which will not be recoverable.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How much has the department spent on this building already?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The expenditure to the 31st March was $215,516.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How much will it take to complete it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount of $160,000 is expected to complete it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will that furnish it, too?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think so. It includes laboratory and equipment.

Mr. MALONEY: What is the capacity of the new hospital?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think the total accommodation is to provide for all the patients that I have already referred to, namely, seventy-four in one hospital, sixty-two in another, and so on. I think it is a 200-bed hospital.

Mr. McGIBBON: My point is this: if I am correctly informed, the department are closing hospitals in different parts of Canada. Could these not be so readjusted by moving the patients as to avoid the expense of building another elaborate hospital? The work of this department is, of course, diminishing all the time and this looks to me to be a waste of money.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend will perhaps remember the discussion last year in regard to that very question. It is considered only fair to the pensioners who are receiving treatment in these hospitals that accommodation should be provided within some reasonable distance of their place of residence, and therefore we have to have hospitals in different areas. That was the explanation that was given at the time.

Mr. MANION: What is the total area that this serves?

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think there is any hospital but this one between British Columbia and Winnipeg.

Mr. MALONEY: Will this item cover the equipment as well as the building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It includes an amount of $10,000 for equipment.

Mr. MALONEY: $10,000 for a $350,000 hospital!

Mr. ELLIOTT: There are different kinds of equipment. This is additional to the equipment they already have. There is $10,000 for equipment, $10,000 for X-ray and laboratory, and there is the dumb waiter and various other installations. I think this finishes everything.

Mr. BENNETT: Here again we have the Department of Public Works constructing a hospital, according to the statement just made, of only 200 beds. The minister must have observed from the other figures he gave that there is not sufficient capacity in the new hospital to take care of the requirements. If he takes the figures he has already given us as to the crying necessity for this new institution and adds on to that Calgary and parts of British Columbia, he will find that the hospital is unable to cope with the situation. As the minister will perhaps recall, we rather hoped last year that before the country launched upon this undertaking, it would endeavour to construct the hospital as an added unit to the general hospital. I think the minister will remember that was the suggestion and it was to be looked into, the hope being that the government would thereby obviate the necessity of duplicating equipment and that facilities would be provided in the larger institution which would also be available in this one instead of having an isolated unit. We have a hospital at Deer Lodge and I think there is one at the Fort Osborne barracks.

Mr. THORSON: No.

Mr. BENNETT: When I lasted visited it, there was rather a considerable unit being maintained there.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have a further explanation to make which perhaps I had better do before my hon. friend proceeds with his remarks. I am informed that I was in error in saying 200 beds. The information I receive from the Department of National Health is that the accommodation is 250 beds.

Mr. BENNETT: As I understand the matter, the hospital cases are not increasing in number. They are decreasing, as my medical

colleague tells me. Some effort should be made to correlate these added hospitals facilities to the facilities of a great city so that utilization could be made of the advanced scientific methods and apparatus that a great hospital has, because if we have to duplicate them with this hospital, we shall have a vast expenditure for which there can be very little warrant. This is another instance of unnecessary duplication with respect to a portion of the proposition, and this hospital should be attached as a unit to the larger hospital of the city so that the inmates of this hospital would have the advantage of the benefits of the great city hospital. That was a matter we suggested last year and it was understood that it would be looked into. I assume tenders were called for the hospital, the contract has been let and the building is partly completed?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: I cannot think this sum is adequate to provide for proper facilities in the way of scientific and other apparatus such as is used in a returned soldiers' hospital, because my observation, and in fact, my knowledge is that it costs a great deal of money. Ten thousand dollars would not go anywhere in equipping a hospital.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What my hon. friend says about the suggestion being made a year ago is quite true as to making additions to the civic hospital—

Mr. BENNETT: With this very money to build a new unit.

Mr. ELLIOTT: —for additional accommodation; but I was advised that suggestion was not new by any means; that it had been threshed out years ago by previous ministers in the department, and that the department and the municipalities had never succeeded in getting together on a satisfactory basis along the line suggested by my hon. friend. It was tried, and the records show that during the war time it was thought that theory could be worked out. It is a theory that appealed to me after it was mentioned in this house a year ago, but the result of the trials and the efforts have been that apparently the civil and the military do not seem to get along so as to make the arrangements satisfactory to both.

With regard to equipment, it looks offhand as if this would not be sufficient to supply the necessary equipment, but I find on inquiry that they have a fairly adequate supply of equipment now. The thing they most need is bedroom accommodation and it is hoped that this will fill the requirements.

Mr. MALONEY: Is it intended that this hospital will be for the care and treatment of returned soldiers only?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Pensioners.

Mr. MALONEY: After these poor men have passed away, possibly fifteen or twenty years from now, what does the minister propose doing with the building and so forth?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would say to my hon. friend that the government will then consider what is the best thing to do under the circumstances.

Mr. MANION: This government might be back in power by that time.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We have no notion of making any change before then.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would like to supplement what my leader has said. I think the minister is proceeding on the wrong path at present. He says that it has not been found satisfactory to combine civil and military hospitals. There is in my riding one which I think is working very satisfactorily. Some years ago, about 1920, the government of Canada built an addition to the Gravenhurst sanatarium purely for military patients, and that has been probably one of the most successful soldier hospitals in Canada. Those who go there always want to return, and those who cannot get there are very desirous of going to that institution because of the good reports they have heard of it. I think the point raised by the hon. member for North Renfrew is a very important one. These patients are gradually growing less and less in number and it will not be so very long before they disappear. Then the government is going to have on its hands a lot of buildings and equipment for which it will have very little use. The department has already closed many hospitals in different parts of Canada; they have been or more or less scrapped. Here we are launching upon an expenditure for another 250-bed hospital. I think the suggestion that this should be combined with the civic hospital at Winnipeg is sane and rational.

Item agreed to.

Winnipeg post office—extension, $90,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Those of us who know the city of Winnipeg and are familiar with the circumstances under which the present site was chosen for a post office are very curious to know just what extensions are contemplated. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works has himself seen the post office in Winnipeg—

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have.

Mr. BENNETT: —and perhaps he is familiar with the circumstances under which that site was acquired for a post office. He might explain in what direction he proposes to make the extension, whether up or down or east or west.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We already have title to the property above and below. There is no question but that an addition must be made to the post office very shortly. This amount is to provide for the purchase of lot 122 and the building thereon on the east side of Garry street south of and at the rear of the post office building in the city of Winnipeg, in order to provide increased accommodation. The purchase of this property has been urged by the Postmaster General in a communication dated November 19, 1923, and by the Deputy Postmaster General in letters dated May 9 and 17, 1924, February 29 and November 14, 1928.

Mr. BENNETT: Is it proposed to expropriate the land?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think not, if it can be purchased at what looks like a reasonable price. If it can be acquired for something like $90,000 my own judgment would be to take the responsibility for making the purchase.

Mr. BENNETT: This is in the rear of the building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Saskatchewan

Canora—public building—$12,000.
Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc.—$17,000.
Gravelbourg—public building—$23,500.
Indian Head forestry building—addition—$18,000.
Melville—public building—$25,000.
North Battleford—immigration building—$15,000.
Prince Albert—immigration building—$38,000.
Prince Albert—public building—addition—$30,000.
Regina—armoury—$28,000.
Regina post office—installation of pick-up table—$3,500.
Regina public building—addition—$100,000.
Rosthern—public building—$32,000.
Saskatoon post office—installation of pick-up table—$3,500.
Saskatoon—public building—$400,000.
Swift Current— public building—$48,000.
Tisdale—public building—$10,000.
Wilkie—public building—$26,000.
Yorkton public building—addition—$12,500.
Total, $842,000.

Mr. PRICE: What is the explanation of this item of $400,000 for a public building at Saskatoon?

[Mr. Elliott.]

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that we take this vote up item by item?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am in the hands of the committee, but I would think we would make better progress in that way. If there is any item included in the vote which some member of the committee would like considered, we will consider it if he mentions it, or else we will take the items separetely one after the other.

My hon. friend from Westmorland asked wtih regard to the $400,000 item for a public building at Saskatoon. This amount is required to begin the construction of a public building at Saskatoon for the housing of all the government services in that city. A site situated at the corner of First avenue and Twenty-second street was purchased in 1928-29 from Byers Brothers, Limited, for $53,000. It is the intention to erect upon this site a new building of six stories and a basement, with frontage of 138 feet on First avenue and 128 feet on Twenty-second street. It will be a brick structure, but the fronts on the above-named streets will be of stone. The building is estimated to cost $795,000—building, $740,000; fittings and boxes, $40,000; gradings and sidewalks, $2,000; contingencies, $13,000; or a total of $795,000.

Mr. MANION: I do not think those items total up to the amount the minister mentioned.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think so.

Mr. MANION: What about the site?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The site has been purchased.

Mr. MANION: What did it cost?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It cost $53,000.

Mr. MANION: When was it purchased?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It was purchased in 1928-29 from Byers Brothers, Limited.

Mr. BENNETT: Is the minister aware when they purchased the site?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am reasonably well aware of all the circumstances, because this matter was considered a year ago. Part of it they had owned for some time, and part of it had been purchased not very long before the purchase by the government.

Mr. BENNETT: From the city?

Mr. ELLIOTT: They obtained the site with a view to building a theatre, and they were about to build the theatre at the time the government made the purchase from them.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would direct the attention of the minister to the fact that the postal facilities at Wynyard are very inadequate. I think it was drawn to his attention last year and again this year by the local Liberal association and other bodies. The post office is in a very small part of a public building owned by the town, and is entirely inadequate for the purpose, but no other suitable accommodation is available. Is there any possibility of anything being done this year to relieve the situation?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is hard to say what may take place this year. I know a number of representations were made by my hon. friend and by others on behalf of Wynyard, and the matter has received some consideration, but up to the present time we have not seen our way to set aside an appropriation for a new building. I think it could be very well justified, but the case did not seem more urgent than some others that we had to postpone.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Has the minister had any report on the situation from the local inspector or some other officer of the department?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I could not say offhand. As I have already explained, I have before me only the details relating to the estimates.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Will the minister get a report on the situation? Then I hope he will treat the case so sympathetically that something will be done, because really the need is urgent. If the postmaster could secure a suitable building he would do so, but there is none available. To make matters worse, I understand that the council require the space at present occupied by the post office, and the postmaster fears that he may not be allowed to retain the accommodation very much longer. It is really imperative that a new building should be provided very shortly.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If there is not a comparatively recent report in the department I shall be very glad to have the matter looked into again and see what can be done.

Mr. EVANS: I had hoped to see in the estimates provision for a public building at Biggar. The Postmaster General himself has admitted the need of such a building, and I thought from what the Minister of Public Works told me that he was not averse to having a public building erected in the town. Biggar has a population of three thousand, and the post office yields a yearly revenue of $11,000. It is a railway centre and growing very fast. I think the minister knows the place very well. No suitable building is available for a post office. I do think the government should follow some well-defined policy in meeting the need for post offices in certain places. Gretna, although only one-fifth the size of Biggar, is being given a public building. Not only is Biggar a much larger town than Gretna, but its need for a public building is very urgent. I do not think it is fair to the people of Biggar to discriminate against them in this way. Seeing that the government does not follow any policy so far as population or need is concerned in allotting these grants, I should like to know what its policy really is. In looking over the estimates for Saskatchewan I see no grant is made to any but Liberal constituencies, and it does not seem fair that there should be this discrimination against Biggar when the need of proper post office facilities is so great.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It would be pretty difficult to make a grant towards a Conservative constituency in Saskatchewan. That is our first difficulty, if it can be called a difficulty, but I have not found it such. But, joking apart, I do know the town of Biggar, and something of its requirements, and I am aware that it together with a number of other towns might be provided with better post office facilities. Biggar is a much younger town than Gretna and other places which were in existence before there was even a townsite at Biggar; and the post office there is not in an old building, there being no very old structures in the town. My hon. friend never omits an opportunity to advance the cause, and the requirements of Biggar have been receiving consideration. The town is deserving of consideration, and I am sure will get it in its proper turn.

Mr. EVANS: Next year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I cannot say next year, but I can assure my hon. friend that it will get consideration in the proper order of urgency.

Mr. PRICE: What is the net revenue expected from the $400,000 expenditure on public buildings in Saskatoon?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The postal census for Saskatoon in 1901 was 113; for last year it was a little over 30,000.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): It was 45,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend from Saskatoon admits that it is 45,000 now. I have no doubt it is not any more than that or he would have said so. The postal revenue for 1918-19 was $194,420.

Mr. PRICE: That is net?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Net; for 1927-28 it was $311,589.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Perhaps the local member can tell you whether that has increased.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have no doubt. But it is not in any special category from that fact because there are many other places increasing by leaps and bounds. The customs revenue last year was $1,059,772.

Mr. PRICE: Can the minister explain why we will not set aside sufficient money for a new post office in the city of Moncton which returns a profit of over $1,000 a day, while he can make an appropriation of $400,000 for public buildings in Saskatoon, where the postal revenue does not warrant such an expenditure? Will he please stand up and justify his action?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I hope my hon. friend will not expect me to start my defence until he finishes his arraignment. What did he say was the customs revenue in Moncton?

Mr. PRICE: There is over $1,000 a day net profit in Moncton, yet you will not put up a building there.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is not the customs revenue; what is that revenue?

Mr. PRICE: I think the revenue from the customs is just as large in Moncton as it is in Saskatoon.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will not contradict my hon. friend.

Mr. PRICE: I am speaking about the general revenue turned into the treasury and I want the minister to explain why he cannot put up a building in Moncton.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Unfortunately I do not know as much about Moncton as my hon. friend does, but he does not know offhand nor do I know what the customs revenue of Moncton is.

Mr. PRICE: I will say to my hon. friend, be careful you don't back into something. If you were before a court and the judge were hearing your case, with the information you have at the present time, and the way you are backing up, he would say, and very properly, "Be careful you don't back into something."

Mr. GOTT: I want to call the attention of the minister to the fact that the postal department alone in Windsor had a net operating surplus in the last six years of $1,144,159. The post office in Windsor was built fifty years ago and both staff and business have increased, the net revenue for the last year having been $386,622, while the salaries paid amounted to $182,839.20. The customs revenue at the port of Windsor is $6,070,357.92. The minister will no doubt recall a splendid demonstration given him by the Liberals of Windsor when he visited the city and attended a banquet. At that meeting, if I mistake not, he promised a new postal building to Windsor.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What was that last remark?

Mr. GOTT: I say that to my knowledge the minister, at this splendid banquet in Windsor, promised a new postal building to the city of Windsor.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I must say to my hon. friend—

Mr. BENNETT: You weren't conscious of it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, I was quite conscious; and if there is one thing more than another I did not say to the people of Windsor it was that I was going to put up a building there. No one knows that better than my hon. friend does.

Mr. GOTT: Unfortunately I was not present at that banquet. The Minister of Justice laughs; I may tell him that I had an invitation to the function, and the only reason I was not present was the fact that I was not going to sit there and concur in the general activities of the evening. Now if the Minister of Public Works did not say to the people of Windsor, "We will construct a new building for you," may I ask him what he did say?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would refer my hon. friend to a copy of The Border Cities Star of that date which he will find contains, I think, the speech in full.

Mr. GOTT: With a full page heading.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. PARENT: It was worth it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And photograph.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That report makes it perfectly clear, if my hon. friend will read it, that I made no promise whatever.

Mr. GOTT: You got a warm reception, I will say that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I must say they are most hospitable people, and any representative of this government who visits a town that has done as well as Windsor has done since this government came into power would get nothing but a wonderfully hospitable reception. I cannot speak too highly of their wonderful cordiality and hospitality.

Mr. GOTT: The minister has said either too much or not enough. There is nothing in the estimates for any post office building there, and if he thinks that he can put it off until next year and then offer it as a bait to the people of Windsor I can assure him they will resent it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why is it that in a city the size of Saskatoon there are twelve postal substations? It seems rather extraordinary. There must be a reason for it, but what is that reason?

Mr. DUNNING: It is a very scattered city.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The revenue of the head office is some $272,000, and there are twelve postal substations. This does not occur in any other city of the same size.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I must say frankly that this is a departmental matter, rather within the post office than within the Department of Public Works. Perhaps I ought to have that information but I have not. There is no doubt however that they are not sub-post offices in the ordinary sense of the word. There are a number of places where postage stamps are sold. My hon. friend knows something about the layout of Saskatoon, and he will recall that the river Saskatchewan runs between two portions of the city. It is a large territory, and I think the twelve substations to which he refers include some districts outside, like Sutherland and some of the adjoining places.

Mr. DUNNING: It includes the university.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The university and other places the mails for which are made up at Saskatoon.

Mr. GUTHRIE: These, then, are merely places set aside in stores for the sale of stamps, money orders and so forth.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is all, so far as I know.

Mr. MANION: Will the minister explain the $100,000 for the Regina public building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is for the erection of an addition to the public building at Regina in order to provide adequate accommodation for all the government services in that city.

Mr. MANION: Will this complete the work?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, it will not.

Mr. MANION: I see the Minister of Railways shakes his head; he is looking for more. How much will it take to erect this building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think it will take about $150,000 in addition to this amount, at least.

Mr. MANION: Then there is another item of $28,000 for the Regina armouries. What is that for?

Mr. DUNNING: Amortized rent.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is required as a second payment in connection with a building for armoury purposes.

Mr. MANION: The Minister of Railways says it is amortized rent.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. As a means of providing adequate armoury accommodation a building is being erected by an organization incorporated under the name of the Regina Armoury Association. The city of Regina donated a site worth $40,000 in the northeast corner of the exhibition grounds for the proposed structure, and the association has raised an amount of money sufficient to construct a building to cost $350,000. An amortization arrangement was made and this is the second payment on account.

Mr. BENNETT: Is this not an amazing thing? Imagine the Dominion of Canada being a party to a transaction of this kind. It is true it has been done before by other governments, but that does not make it right. Imagine the Dominion of Canada letting private enterprise build a $350,000 armoury in Regina and paying $28,000 yearly under an amortization arrangement. I ask the minister if he does not think that little short of a public scandal. The Dominion of Canada, mark you, with a surplus in the treasury, allows private enterprise to obtain the gift of a site and erect thereon a building costing $350,000, and the government pays them $28,000 a year. For how many years, may I ask?

Mr. ELLIOTT: For twenty years.

Mr. BENNETT: Then $560,000 without interest is to be paid by this country in order to obtain a property built by private enterprise at a cost of $350,000, with the site donated by the city of Regina.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend hardly stated the matter fairly. He said the payments will amount to something over $500,000, without interest, but of course he knows that the interest on the cost of the building would have to be paid in any event, no matter who built it.

Mr. BENNETT: Not if it were built out of the revenues of the country, as are all other buildings.

Mr. DUNNING: The interest on the money would have to be met. However, my purpose in rising was to clear up one point only, because this arrangement was discussed in this house before it was agreed to and entered into. As my hon. friend indicated, this same policy has been followed previously by other governments.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister tell us where?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes; in Westmount, Montreal, and I believe in one instance in Toronto.

Mr. BENNETT: And in Saskatoon, where they took up an old building.

Mr. DUNNING: I cannot say as to that, but in justice to those public spirited citizens who joined themselves together for the purpose of erecting this building it should be stated that the organization in question is entirely a non-profit organization, organized by the officers of the various battalions in the military district and consisting wholly of those officers. As a matter of fact, the organization cannot make any profit. It happened that the Saskatchewan military district was the only district in Canada without adequate headquarters accommodation; large sums were being paid in rent for various buildings there, but now military headquarters is well equipped in the new armouries under the arrangement approved by this house last year. I may say that the building is located on the exhibition grounds; the city, which owns these exhibition grounds, donated the site, and therefore the building can be used much more frequently for what might be called peace time activities than for normal military purposes.

Mr. BENNETT: I was not present when this question was discussed last year, and that is my reason for bringing it up now. I have a very strong feeling against the Dominion of Canada doing this sort of thing. We have had a revenue surplus for many years, and if it were necessary to erect an armoury costing $350,000 in Regina that building should have been paid for out of the revenues of the country in the ordinary course. Under this arrangement we are paying capitalized interest over a period of twenty years; in other words, we have prevented ourselves from paying off this amount. That is the objection I am trying to make clear, purely a question of finance. My hon. friend knows, as do most of us, that we personally make contributions continuously to assist in maintaining just such organizations as this to which he has referred; I have done so for twenty-five years. I think a very great and useful service has been rendered in western Canada by military establishments, but the point I am trying to make is that it is altogether wrong that private enterprise should be required to construct an armoury and then, instead of getting their money back at once, have the payments extended over a period of twenty years, including interest at some rate which I do not know at present but which I will know very shortly. Really that is my objection. Now may I ask the minister what is the rate of interest?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Five per cent.

Mr. BENNETT: And last year we paid $33,500.

Mr. DUNNING: That included rents for other buildings.

Mr. BENNETT: Who maintains this building now? Has it been taken over by the government?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The government takes it over at the end of the term, but the rental is not supposed to take care of the upkeep in the meantime.

Mr. BENNETT: Who makes the repairs?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I assume that under such an amortization agreement the upkeep will be borne by the government, who will eventually own the building.

Mr. BENNETT: Who heats it and who looks after the caretaking now?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The government pays the cost of heating.

Mr. BENNETT: Is it not an imposition on private individuals to compel them to put up their own money for the construction of a public building in a city like Regina, and is it not an indignity to the Dominion

of Canada that instead of putting a sum in the estimates sufficient to take care of this work and be done with it we have agreed to an amortization arrangement, with interest to be paid at 5 per cent for a period of twenty years, at the end of which time we own the building? We should have expropriated it at once and that would have been the end of it. The rifle range at North Vancouver was expropriated in that way. Of course my hon. friend says this organization was not formed in order to make a profit. The real fact is that somebody is putting money into a venture with the best sort of intentions, and we are giving them a twenty-year investment at 5 per cent guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada. How many people are there who would not be glad to make an arrangement of that kind if they knew the government was going to come along and take over the investment on a basis of 5 per cent per annum, providing an annuity for a period of twenty years and paying 5 per cent in conection with the undertaking? Surely the principle is wrong. I know there is one hon. gentleman in this house, for whose busines judgment and acumen I have the very highest regard, who would not do it in the province he came from, and that is the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning). You could not have induced him to do it. Just think what this means. Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars has been put in by private enterprise, and instead of buying them off and taking the building over, we are making an investment for twenty years with interest at 5 per cent. This country is paying $210,000 as interest for the privilege of taking the property over at the end of twenty years.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): You paid more than that for vacant lots in the city of Regina not long ago.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sure the remarks of the hon. member for Melfort add greatly to and brighten up the discussion in connection with this question which the minister is about to answer. I am sure it is very interesting, but passing over that for the moment—

Mr. DUNNING: Pass over it, it is pretty bad.

Mr. BENNETT: It may be pretty bad.

Mr. DUNNING: I did not introduce it, but it is pretty bad.

Mr. BENNETT: What were the lots acquired for in Regina?

Mr. DUNNING: I canont give you the exact figures, but it is probably ten times as much as they could be sold for to-day.

Mr. BENNETT: The Grand Trunk Pacific railway and the National Transcontinental railway were built by the people of this country for many times more than they could be sold for to-day.

Mr. DUNNING: There was no building involved in the purchase of these lots.

Mr. BENNETT: But it was intended to put a building on them. Instead of that, the city of Regina gives the lots to a private corporation and instead of buying the corporation off this country has undertaken to pay $28,000 per annum for twenty years.

Mr. DUNNING: The lots referred to were not purchased for an armoury.

Mr. BENNETT: They were purchased by the government of this country for some purpose.

Mr. DUNNING: But not for armoury purposes. My hon. friend will remember that for years there was a standing offer by the city of Regina to give sufficient property.

Mr. BENNETT: It is wise for this house quietly to sit down and vote, in the days of surpluses when you have plenty of money, money in this way? Instead of buying the property at a reasonable price and extinguishing the private interest in it, you are paying $28,000 per annum for twenty years, which is $560,000, outside of the other expenditures in connection with caretaking, fuel, and matters of that kind, and $350,000 from $560,000 leaves $210,000. Divided by twenty, that amounts to something over $10,500 per year which is being paid by the Dominion of Canada for interest in connection with this matter. With the surpluses which this country has it should be able to find money enough to take care of the investment and not pay an annuity of $28,000 per annum to private interests over a period of twenty years.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend made a somewhat flattering reference to my business acumen. I would like to ask him if he knows of a similar case, similar in the sense that money was obtained at the rate of 5 per cent under such circumstances and with the prevailing rate being as it is? So far as the arrangement is concerned, I for one am prepared to defend it, because the rate of interest is low enough and it represents a real economy in that regard. In this connection I would refer my hon. friend to the relative rates prevailing when the Westmount armoury proposition was undertaken.

Mr. BENNETT: That was not the one I had in mind.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not suppose the Minister of Public Works has the agreement before him, but if my memory serves me correctly, when this matter was before the house a year ago it was stated that the agreement provided that the government retained the right to buy the property at any time. I think that is correct, but I am subject to correction from the minister in that regard.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is my impression; I have been trying to check it up, but I cannot say positively.

Mr. DUNNING: The arrangement having been approved last year, it is quite natural for the minister not to have all the material here this year.

Mr. BENNETT: There was no approval given; there was just an item in the estimates.

Mr. DUNNING: Full explanation was given by the minister and the vote was passed subject to that explanation given one year ago Everyone proceeded on the assumption that the house having been made aware of what was contemplated had approved of it.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not an approval of an agreement.

Mr. DUNNING: I have some respect also for my hon. friend's business acumen, and I would be ready to submit that agreement to him and ask if it was not a good agreement, once he grants the principle with which it commences to operate.

Mr. BENNETT: I cannot approve of the principle. I would not care whether it came from Westmount or anywhere else, because I think the minister will agree with me that it is an indignity to the Dominion of Canada that a private enterprise—

Mr. DUNNING: I do not agree with that at all.

Mr. BENNETT: I would say that the Dominion of Canada was not borrowing money at 5 per cent when Canadian national securities were being sold at 4.6 per cent on the world markets.

Mr. DUNNING: I think the rate was 4.72.

Mr. BENNETT: Last year?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: I regret I was not here last year when this matter was discussed, but is there no way by which we can purchase the annuity? That is the point I desire to have cleared up.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. DUNNING: My memory of the agreement—this can be confirmed by the minister and the department—was that the right was retained by the Dominion to buy off the whole property at any time and terminate the amortization.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I happen to have an extract from Hansard showing the discussion which took place last year.

Mr. BENNETT: I was not here.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think you were; at any rate your name does not appear in connection with the discussion.

Mr. BENNETT: Which is prima facie evidence that I was not here.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Negotiations were under way at that time and were practically completed at the time the matter was presented to the house, figured on a basis of $33,500 per year at the rate of 5½ per cent interest. Later on we were able to come to an arrangement of 5 per cent, which accounts for the lower payment.

Mr. BENNETT: Has a formal agreement been drawn up?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Last year when the estimate was passed, there was no formal agreement. There now is, and the point I think it would be for the Attorney General of this country to consider, is whether there is any power in any minister, without any statutory authority, to commit the country to pay an annuity for twenty years. I have the information at last. There was no authority given to make such an agreement. That has to be done by statute. The executive of this country, without parliamentary sanction or authority, but by the authority of an order in council, have signed an agreement to commit Canada to pay $28,000 a year for twenty years. Can the government legislate for twenty years by order in council without regard to parliament? Is there an obligation on this country with respect to this matter? Where is the statutory authority? That was what I was asking.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think there is a very distinct obligation upon this parliament, having passed an agreement on the understanding that—

Mr. BENNETT: But there was no agreement.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Parliament having passed the first payment with the distinct understanding that it was one of twenty payments at the

rate of $33,500 a year, it would hardly repudiate it after it had been reduced by one-half of one per cent per annum, and now amounts to less than was approved by parliament a year ago.

Mr. BENNETT: But the Attorney General of this country is supposed to advise upon questions of law, and I put this question to him: What authority had the executive of Canada, without legislative sanction or authority, to sign a document that commits the Dominion of Canada to pay any sum of money for twenty years? When the minister said that this had been approved last year; when both ministers said it, not being present I did not desire to controvert it. When the Minister of Railways was the one to say what took place, followed by the Minister of Public Works, I then understood thoroughly that no agreement had been signed, nor was one signed until after parliament prorogued. All documents that are executed by the government must be either by reason of the prerogative of the crown or with statutory authority. Where is the statutory authority to warrant the signature being affixed to an undertaking to pay $28,000 a year for twenty years?

Mr. LAPOINTE: All the details were given to parliament when this vote was accepted by the committee of supply last year. It was part of the supply bill. Every particular was given; it was ratified by the house and, apart from that, the same thing has been done many times in the past. For instance, we are still paying for the famous Daly building.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Exactly in the same way we are bound by a contract and parliament ratifies it every time supply is voted for the purpose.

Mr. BENNETT: The right of the crown to buy a building is undoubted, but the question is whether or not the executive branch of the government has power, without statutory authority, to bind the country to make payments of money for a period of twenty years. The Attorney General of Canada will remember that this question was discussed last year. The view I have entertained is that no statutory authority for the payment of money should contemplate any further period than the life of the government or perhaps a few months or a year beyond that, to enable an incoming government to consider the matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I agree in principle that we should not bind future generations.

Mr. BENNETT: This parliament, without passing a statute—and that is the essential thing to keep in mind—and having given no authorization in the matter, finds itself called upon this year to pay $28,000 which we are voting. That in itself shows that there is no agreement, because, if there were, it would not be necessary to place this sum in the estimates. That is, if there is an agreement to pay, the government could pay it out of the consolidated fund under the authority of statute without reference to an appropriation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: All leases of buildings are made in the same way, and we are voting the money every year.

Mr. BENNETT: We do not vote it for each separate lease.

Mr. DUNNING: We are doing the same thing in the case of the Daly building, in the case of steamship subsidies, which are voted each year but which are five-year contracts.

Mr. BENNETT: Some are and some are not. The point is this, and I do not think there will be any difficulty in finding authorities that support this proposition; without statutory authorization the executive should not endeavour to bind the future to the extent of the payment of money for twenty years. That is the position I take with relation to the matter. If it were intended that this agreement should be binding upon a future generation, there should have been a ratification of the agreement by parliament. That is the principle upon which a former Liberal administration acted in connection with the Yukon. It is a very serious principle. Surely the house must see where this leads: it puts the country in a very difficult position in the future.

Mr. ELLIOTT: May I say in answer to my hon. friend's argument that the object of having this item in the estimates now is to have parliament pass upon it?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. Supposing it is skipped next year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps my hon. friend will permit me for a moment. That must be done every year during the twenty years. What greater safeguard can the people have than that parliament passes upon that item each year? I ask my hon. friend: When the general policy was submitted to the house—

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend has begged the question.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Not at all. When the policy was submitted to the house and approved before the first payment was made,

is my hon. friend going to argue that any subsequent parliament would repudiate an agreement that is one-half of one per cent per annum better than the one approved by parliament last year?

Mr. BENNETT: It is amazing that the Minister of Public Works would make that statement. First, there was no agreement. That was settled when parliament granted $33,500.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps my hon. friend will call it a proposal. Will my hon. friend permit me a question? Does he think anybody had power to make an agreement? Could I have come to the house with an agreement before it had been submitted to parliament?

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly, the only kind of agreement that should have been made was a provisional one subject to ratification by parliament, and this is not a ratification. Surely the minister knows that. Parliament has never seen or considered the agreement and, what is more, the minister now has made a statement that is amazing. He has said: Do you think any parliament would repudiate it? In other words, I have no right now to consider the matter at all. It is settled by parliamentary sanction. I saw the Minister of Railways smile when my hon. friend made the statement.

Mr. DUNNING: I did not smile at the Minister of Public Works. I smiled at my hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister says: Could anything be better than that parliament should pass on the matter for the next twenty years? And in the next breath he says: Does he think any parliament could repudiate it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I said "would".

Mr. BENNETT: Then why should we discuss it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I submit it to parliament.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, but we have to take it willy-nilly. The whole thing is a mockery, and my hon. friend knows it. There was no agreement last year. An agreement has been signed in between times. Now we are asked to vote one instalment of that payment, and thereby confirm that agreement without its being submitted to parliament for approval. That is the story and all the sophistry in the world cannot do away with it. The good faith of this country is committed, so that we have to pay these amounts whether we want to or not, and because the government, by order in council, has done this, there is no opportunity of discussing the merits of it in any way, shape or form. In other words, government by order in council has superseded the legislative power and authority of parliament. The Minister of Justice will say so.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is surely unfair, for this reason: Had the Minister of Public Works entered into an arrangement or agreement for twenty years without advising this parliament, before he got the authority to spend the money, of the nature of the agreement which he contemplated entering into, my hon. friend's point, I submit, would be well taken; but before any agreement was entered into, what did the minister do? He came here with a vote sufficient to pay the first year's rental—

Mr. BENNETT: On a 5½ per cent basis.

Mr. DUNNING: On a 5½ per cent basis, and he said: "We hope to put through this kind of arrangement," and he outlined the kind of arrangement he proposed. Parliament approved the amount of money, but later on, after negotiations, the minister was able to get the rate of interest reduced from 5½ to 5 per cent; consequently, because of a smaller instalment being necessary this year, he comes to the house with a better arrangement than that which he communicated a year ago, and then the leader of the opposition says: This is a mockery; the house has never been consulted.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say that. I said that the house had never had the opportunity to pass upon that agreement, and it has not now. Where is the agreement?

Mr. DUNNING: The house last year passed upon—

Mr. STEVENS: What date?

Mr. DUNNING: I cannot tell the exact date offhand, but it is easily ascertainable. The house last year in passing this estimate passed upon the nature of an agreement proposed by the minister whereby the sum then being voted would be expended. The minister has been able to make a better agreement than the one he communicated to the house last year, and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition says that there is some deception about it.

Mr. BENNETT: No, I did not say that. I said it was a mockery.

Mr. LAPOINTE: A milder term.

Mr. BENNETT: That special pleading does not get home either, Mr. Chairman. There is a rule which at least the gentleman who sits to the left of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Ralston) will tell him, if not the gentleman who sits to his right (Mr. Lapointe), that any confirmation or ratification of an agreement by parliament you should be able to find in the statute books of the country. That is an elementary rule. A resolution of parliament has no force in the courts of the country; a resolution of this house has not.

Mr. DUNNING: What about the Daly building?

Mr. BENNETT: I am saying that I disagree with the principle without a ratification or agreement of sale.

Mr. DUNNING: If this is not legal, the agreement with respect to the Daly building and the agreement with respect to the Westmount armoury are not legal, and if I hunted through past years, without reflecting on any government, I could find scores of instances of the same nature.

Mr. BENNETT: Not scores, but you may find several. The point I desire to make is this: When the Minister of Railways said that that agreement was communicated to this house, he certainly did not seriously mean it; for his colleague had said that the agreement did not come into existence until after the house rose.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is not quoting me correctly. I said that the nature of the agreement which the minister purposed entering into was stated as a condition on the passing of the vote last year.

Mr. BENNETT: The mere statement of the nature of the thing does not constitute an agreement, and no man knows that better than my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. What we have done is this: We have agreed, by solemn agreement, to pay $28,000 a year for twenty years. There is no statutory authorization for it. The only authority is a statement made by the minister that he contemplated doing something that would involve an expenditure of $33,500 a year, not $28,000, and he now says: I have been able to do better than that, because I am only paying $28,000 for twenty years. Now I find that early last year Canadian 4½ per cents were selling in New York at 101, so we could have borrowed the money at 4½ per cent and paid that off, and saved this country one-half of one per cent on the purchase for twenty years.

Mr. DUNNING: You could not have got that rate for the government at the time the agreement was entered into.

Mr. BENNETT: What was that date?

Mr. DUNNING: I cannot tell the date.

Mr. BENNETT: Then what do you know about it?

Mr. DUNNING: I have a distinct recollection of the difficulty of financing at 5 per cent.

Mr. BENNETT: Financing what at 5 per cent?

Mr. DUNNING: Financing the armouries at 5 per cent. I make no excuse for having given what assistance I could to the armouries' association to enable them to meet the condition which the Minister of Public Works imposed, which was to finance at 5 per cent. I do not think I am giving away any secrets when I say that it was finally arranged through the medium of the Royal Bank.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so, but that cock does not fight so far as I am concerned. My hon. friend might as well say that it was the Bank of Nova Scotia. I want to point out to my hon. friend that early in the year the direct securities of Canada were selling at 4½ per cent. The guaranteed securities always sell for less, and this country could have borrowed $350,000 at 4½ per cent, which is only $15,750 a year and the amortization fund of 2 per cent would not have brought it up within $8,000 of the sum we are now paying.

Mr. DUNNING: I would like to check your figures.

Mr. BENNETT: It is mental arithmetic—$350,000 at 4½ per cent is $15,750, according to my arithmetic.

Mr. DUNNING: You are quicker than I am.

Mr. BENNETT: $15,750 plus the sinking fund, and the result would have been that we would have had the armouries paid for in full and we would have owned them, and saved several thousand dollars per annum. The point I am making is that it is time that attention was directed to the undesirability of doing business in this kind of way. Immediately after the war when revenues were not buoyant it was suggested that this was a good way to do business, but when you have surplus moneys, and when you have markets where you can borrow at 4½ per cent on the direct securities of the country—

Mr. DUNNING: I do not think any bonds of the country were sold at 4½ per cent net to the treasury in 1928.

Mr. BENNETT: One of my friends ascertained for me that the 4½ per cent securities of Canada were quoted in New York at 101.

Mr. DUNNING: Not net to the treasury I think.

Mr. BENNETT: I could not say.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Might I just say a word in answer to my hon. friend? In his calculation he is starting with 4½ per cent. May I call his attention to the fact that he does not estimate any interest on the cost of the site which is being included as part of the agreement, or proposal, or arrangement, or whatever he chooses to call it.

Mr. BENNETT: But the site was given. There was no interest on that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It was given by the city of Regina as part of this proposition.

Mr. BENNETT: Are we paying interest on that too? This is getting worse. I understand that we made a gift to the association, and now I understand that we are paying interest to the association on the money we gave.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend is too shrewd to know that that is not fair.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Not at all. My hon. friend started figuring how this government could have made this purchase at $350,000 on the basis of 4½ per cent. He spoke as if the property were worth only $350,000.

Mr. BENNETT: No, that is what has to be paid.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If my hon. friend will permit me, I think he will see it more clearly. This is not the purchase of $350,000 worth of property. This is the purchase of property for $350,000 in addition to a site worth $40,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Nonsense. The site is free.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend whose main talk is "Nonsense"—

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, nonsense.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Will my hon. friend just contain himself for a moment?

Mr. STEVENS: We have been waiting a long time.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. CHAPLIN: Let us get the deal anyway.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The city of Regina put up a site estimated at $40,000. This company is formed, and undertakes to expend the cost of putting up the armoury, which is estimated at $400,000, which we are able to get eventually for an annual payment of $28,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Tell us how the figure of $28,000 is arrived at; then we will know the details.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The $28,000 a year for twenty years is to pay not only the rental, but to give us the property at the end of the twenty years—not merely the $350,000 that the building cost, but the site that was presented as well.

Mr. CHAPLIN: But you are not paying anything for that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: May I call my hon. friend's attention to what took place? Last year, as shown by Hansard, I made this statement, which is to be found at page 2718:

> This is the first payment on the purchase of a building for armoury purposes in the city of Regina. As a means of providing adequate armoury accommodation it is proposed to erect a building by private enterprise by an organization to be incorporated under the name of the Regina Armoury Association. The city of Regina is prepared to donate a site worth $40,000, situated in the northeast corner of the exhibition grounds for the proposed structure, and the association proposes raising the necessary funds for the erection of an armoury building costing approximately $400,000. It is proposed to lease the building to the Dominion government on a rental-purchase basis at an annual rental of $33,500 for a period of twenty years, at the end of which time the building becomes the property of the government.

Mr. BENNETT: What becomes the property of the government?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The building.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly; but not the land.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Oh yes.

Mr. BENNETT: The land belongs to the city.

Mr. ELLIOTT: They have given it. Now, in the purchase of the Westmount property or of any of the other properties, what was the procedure? Exactly that followed here, only we did not get a free site. Has there ever been in this house in connection with any of those arrangements that have been carried out such a proposition as my hon. friend now suggests? What would it mean? It would mean that the minister

in charge must come to the house and say: This is what is proposed. I have not an agreement, of course, because I have not power to enter into any agreement until I obtain authority from the house.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I may not have power to get the agreement completed.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so.

Mr. ELLIOTT: As a matter of fact, if my hon. friend's statement is right it was August before the final arrangements with the bank were made.

Mr. DUNNING: I forget the month, but about that time.

Mr. ELLIOTT: At the time the house was not sitting. My hon. friend's proposal would mean that I must first come to the house with the proposal.

Mr. BENNETT: Ratify the proposal by statute, of course.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Would my hon. friend suggest that that practice has ever been followed in this country?

Mr. BENNETT: It certainly was in connection with the Yukon railway.

Mr. ELLIOTT: But in connection with the purchase of property of this kind.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what I say is wrong. There must be statutory authority for the exercise of this power.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Then until authorization for entering into the agreement is made by parliament no agreement could be entered into.

Mr. STEVENS: No authorization ever was given.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Authorization was given because the item was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not authorization.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is not?

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. BENNETT: No. Nobody knows it better than my hon. friend.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is the kind of authorization in connection with what are called rental-purchase agreements.

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I defy my hon. friend to cite any rental-purchase agreement that has ever been entered into by any of the departments where such a statute has been passed as he suggests.

Mr. BENNETT: There are only two. The Daly building was not of that kind—it was a purchase by instalments; and the Wench building in Vancouver was purchased by the present government but they could not pay off—

Mr. ELLIOTT: The principle applies to all rental-purchases. You have to have your vote each year.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes; but the only two rental-purchases that I know of are the armouries in Saskatoon, an old building, and the other in Westmount. The Daly building was a purchase by instalments.

Mr. DUNNING: What is the difference in principle?

Mr. BENNETT: It is entirely different.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The Lavut building in Montreal—

Mr. BENNETT: That is the other one.

Mr. ELLIOTT: And the workshop building in Ottawa.

Mr. BENNETT: Last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, we are pretty near at the end of the payments. When I call my hon. friend's attention to what would have to take place, I know he will be one of the first to admit that what he is now suggesting is a rather unreasonable procedure.

Mr. BENNETT: The only correct procedure.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister has persisted in saying that last year parliament authorized him to enter into this agreement with the Regina Armoury Association. What happened is very clearly set out in Hansard and covers about a column and a half. What the minister read a moment ago is practically all that appears there in regard to the matter. I notice the item passed just before eleven o'clock on May 4 last year. This is all that was said:

Regina—armoury, $33,500.

That was the item called. Then the report continues:

Mr. Gardiner: Will the minister explain this item?

Thereupon Mr. Elliott, the minister, said what he read a moment ago—which I shall not repeat—stating at the outset:

This is the first payment on the purchase of a building for armoury purposes in the city of Regina.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend surely admits he will find there that I had something to say on the matter?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, the Minister of Railways has about eight or ten lines in reference to it, which he will admit is not a very complete exposition of the agreement later entered into.

Mr. DUNNING: A very simple one.

Mr. STEVENS: I will read his words. I am quoting from Hansard at page 2719:

Mr. Dunning: Perhaps I might say that while the term "private enterprise" was used by the minister, the association which is being formed is a non-profit organization consisting of the officers of the various units in the city. In connection with the arrangement there is no private profit of any kind at all. The city itself is contributing the site, as I say the organization will be a holding company merely to enable the cost to be amortized over a period of years.

That, I think, is virtually all that was said about it last year. No one will contend that that constitutes serious consideration by parliament of a proposed agreement.

Mr. DUNNING: But it does constitute a complete explanation.

Mr. STEVENS: I would say a very meagre explanation.

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Mr. STEVENS: Let both hon. members be fair in this matter. Obviously parliament was in an amiable mood on that occasion because I see "Item agreed to" appears five times on this page; so the estimates were passing through in a fairly expeditious manner —there was no critical examination of the items. The point at issue is whether by merely voting estimates from line to line, followed by a general money bill at the end of the session incorporating all the estimates, parliament is by statute sanctioning an agreement of that kind. I think my hon. friend will agree that obviously that is not a statutory approval or authorization of the agreement to which he has referred.

Mr. BENNETT: Because the agreement did not exist then.

Mr. STEVENS: By statute we voted $33,500 last year, and absolutely no more. This simply authorized the government to pay out $33,500, nothing more. There is a moral obligation resting on parliament to carry out an agreement the minister has entered into.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: There is no doubt of that. I think if the minister comes before parliament—or his successor who will soon follow him—and says: "This $28,000 is a moral obligation resting on this country; we entered into an agreement, and we must carry it out," undoubtedly parliament will vote the money to carry out the agreement. But, as my hon. leader has pointed out, would it not be better in future, and indeed in this instance, that such an agreement should be ratified by act of parliament, or else that that class of business should not be done at all? Personally I agree with my leader that the whole sum should have been voted last year—$350,000 for the construction of an armoury in Regina. Such things should be paid for out of the consolidated revenue of Canada and not be erected into a series of semi-capital issues, because they are neither one nor the other. My own opinion is that it would be far better for parliament in the future to frown upon this class of transaction, because the argument of the Minister of Public Works shows that we may expect more. An hon. member comes to the government wanting some particular and rather expensive piece of work done in his riding, and he cites Regina, Westmount, Saskatoon, and says, "In these cases you did so and so". By showing that $25,000 or $28,000 or $40,000 a year, over a period of forty years, will not look very bad in the estimates he may be able to persuade a kind-hearted minister to grant his request, whereas if parliament faced the full expenditure it would say—no, it is not warranted. And multiply a transaction of this sort by a number of instances and the country is let in for a very heavy sum. The long and short of it is that the country is still obligated in connection with this matter to the extent of half a million dollars. It would be far better for the minister to have brought in an estimate this year for the sum of $350,000 to pay off the whole business. The total for Saskatchewan is $352,000; I say, it would be better to add another $300,000 and pay the whole thing off if the agreement would permit this being done—and I presume, from what the minister says, that it can be done. For my part, at any rate, I do not want to

endorse the theory that because an estimate is presented to parliament, parliament has therefore ratified the agreement, or authorized the government or the minister to proceed.

Mr. RALSTON: What about leases ordinarily, say a five-year lease?

Mr. STEVENS: We have entered into a large number, especially in Ottawa. My hon. friend is a lawyer; I am not. But I am under the impression—

Mr. RALSTON: I am speaking of parliamentary practice.

Mr. STEVENS: I am under the impression that there is some general authorization whereby the government has the right to enter into leases for public buildings. The deputy is beside the minister and will undoubtedly be able to tell him whether or not I am correct.

Mr. DUNNING: That means this, if it means anything: that if the minister had entered into an agreement to lease this building from the armoury association for twenty years, or for any other period, paying the rental, it would have been perfectly all right; but because he added a provision whereby two per cent amortization should be paid, the government to own the property at the end of twenty years, then he has done something wrong.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not saying that the minister has done anything particularly wrong. My leader says—and I entirely concur in what he says—that this principle is bad; it is not the course that should be followed by parliament. I ask the government to consider this. Suppose we multiply this instance year after year, increasing the number of such cases; parliament will never know—unless it issues an order each year for a statement to be laid on the table of the number of such cases—just what our liabilities are. This creates a liability of half a million; and I would point out that, on the balance sheet in the annual statement of a private company, it would have to appear as a contingent liability, an undischarged liability. But it is not included at all in the public accounts of the country; it does not appear anywhere, nor does the Westmount item, nor the Saskatoon, nor the Lavut. And the minister said he thought there were many more. It would be interesting to know. The practice is obviously a bad one, and I contend, agreeing entirely with my leader, that this should be voted out of the consolidated revenue and paid for outright. Take the Wench building in Vancouver. When that transaction went through I thought it was a great mistake.

Mr. POWER: The Daly building in Ottawa.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, both of them; it was a mistake to purchase in that way.

Mr. DUNNING: Was authority obtained for the first payment on the Wench building? Was it done in the same way?

Mr. STEVENS: Speaking from memory, I believe the Wench building was purchased in this way. The government had the old post office site, with an old building on it—and by the way it is held now for $1,000,000. That site was given for $300,000 about four years ago.

Mr. DUNNING: Given?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, given to a gentleman for $300,000. The late Mr. McPherson, the former member, who negotiated the transaction, was down here. And in addition to this, the government made an agreement to pay $400,000 at the end of a certain period, on which sum they now pay $20,000 a year interest. It was a mortgage.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend approved of that.

Mr. STEVENS: In that case you could not help it. But it was not similar to this; it was not an analogous case.

Mr. DUNNING: These fine legal distinctions are too close for me; I cannot get them.

Mr. STEVENS: It was a mortgage not yet due, and the government is paying interest upon it. I think myself the government could have got a much better arrangement in connection with the purchase of that building had they taken more time. Expropriation proceedings could have been taken, or some other method followed. What we object to is the principle involved in this sort of thing, without parliament having each year full knowledge as to how much we owe on just such transactions.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Pages 32 and 34 of these estimates will show the agreements that are outstanding at the present time. Offhand, my information is that the first one was the Westmount armoury. That was $13,500 a year for twenty years.

Mr. STEVENS: It is here only as an ordinary payment. If it were cited in the item as intended to pay off a lease purchase agreement then the information would be correct.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I appreciate the argument of my hon. friends, because these are matters that are of interest to every hon. gentleman. The practice, however, has not originated recently; it was in vogue at the time the Westmount armoury transaction was put through, before the advent to power of the present government. That was an annual payment of $13,500. But may I point out that the next one, the Daly building, involved not a small amount but some $1,000,000, with ten payments annually. And that was done by my hon. friends.

Mr. BENNETT: No, by the Union government.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No. My information is that it was done by the Meighen government. That was the purchase of a $1,000,000 building. The next item was the workshops at Ottawa, appearing lower down on page 32:

Towards purchase of building for government workshops.

That took place under the present administration and involves a payment of $12,200 a year. The next one was the Wench building, which was purchased subject to mortgage, and the matter was done in the same way. In each case the agreement entered into was prepared and passed upon by the Department of Justice. The instructions of the Department of Justice, which the Auditor General follows, are that if you are going to lease a building in the ordinary way that money may be paid out of the general vote for rentals, but if you are going to purchase under what is called a rental-purchase agreement the proper way is that which has been followed in this case, and which, I need not repeat, was not instituted by the present government. The difference between this method and the ordinary rental-agreement is that the annual payment must be voted each year. That has been the practice.

Mr. IRVINE: Why not change the practice?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That might be a good idea if it were not for the fact that it is absolutely impractical, as I have pointed out. In this case we would have had to stay here until August before the negotiations were concluded. That is the difficulty. According to the Department of Justice this is the proper way in which this action should have been taken, and in spite of what has been said by my hon. friends I take it that this is according to law.

Mr. GEARY: The Department of Justice say that is the right way to provide for payment, of course, but I hardly think they would say that is the right way to do business of this kind. Is it the opinion of the Department of Justice that without an order in council and without any other authorization the government may go ahead and buy whatever they like? Is that the way these things should be done?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes; that is the way it has been done under all governments. The Department of Justice prepares the agreements and advises the Department of Public Works.

Mr. GEARY: On the assumption that it is properly authorized they see that the agreement is properly prepared.

Mr. ELLIOTT: They say that getting the vote this way properly authorizes payment, and that is the proper way to do it.

Mr. GEARY: But that does not impose any liability upon you to continue making the payments?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No; that is why I am asking parliament to continue to vote the money.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The minister for whom I feel more strongly than any other member of the government is the Minister of Public Works, for I know what he is up against. I have never seen this agreement, but I suppose it starts off by saying that the Dominion of Canada, represented by the Minister of Public Works, agrees to do so and so. If the minister has signed such an agreement he has had no authority from parliament to do so. There are terms in that agreement which provide for yearly payments; of course those moneys cannot be voted except from year to year, and we find as a result that the minister has entered into a contract not authorized by parliament. If there is any default under the contract, therefore, it would involve the personal liability of the minister himself, because he should have seen that there was parliamentary authorization for the agreement.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Surely my hon. friend as a lawyer, and quite a good lawyer, does not submit that argument.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I never was more serious in my life.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know what kind of lawyer my hon. friend is, and I know he does not mean that.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I can refer my hon. friend to a case of that kind pending just now before the privy council, a case involving the same principle. If a government passed legislation to do a certain thing the government would have power to do that thing, but in the case before the privy council the government did not pass that legislation and one of the ministers undertook to carry out that action himself, under the impression that he had the approval of the legislature. As a result the whole matter is in question.

Answering my hon. friend frankly and seriously, I think things should be done in a regular way. By what right did the Minister of Public Works say he represented the Dominion of Canada in this matter? I should think the minister would be very anxious that no default should be made under this contract, otherwise he might have to part with some of the money which I am glad to say he made in this part of that province. Parliament should not be confronted by a situation such as this.

The Minister of National Defence referred to the power of the government to enter into a lease for five years or for twenty years. It is true that this government inherently has the power to enter into such a lease; it has the power to incur any expense necessary to the carrying on of the business of the country, but it cannot enter into a five-year lease or a twenty-year lease for the benefit of some private individual or corporation. Any expense which is necessary for the carrying on of the affairs of the country can be incurred by the government, with parliament reviewing the expenditure, but that is not the situation here. It seems to me that if important expenditures of money are to be made there should be a clear authorization by parliament. In a matter of this kind there would have been no difficulty in entering into an agreement subject to ratification by parliament; that would have satisfied the other parties and the agreement would have been ratified by parliament readily if such ratification were justified by circumstances, and of course that would constitute an agreement of the highest standard. My objection is that this is not good business; this matter concerns $560,000, and I do not think the public money is being handled in the best interests of the Dominion. We all feel sympathy for these men who have been good enough to devote their time and energy to a laudable cause from which the country benefits, but it is not strictly a business agreement. The same result could have been arrived at with less money paid out of the treasury. If there are to be any more undertakings of this kind I hope parliament will have an opportunity to consider them before they become finally binding upon this country.

Mr. GEARY: What will happen if parliament does not approve of this payment?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Then parliament must accept the responsibility for its refusal.

Mr. GEARY: What would happen? Would these people have no recourse?

Mr. ELLIOTT: They would have no recourse against me.

Mr. SPENCER: In answer to the hon. member for Wetaskiwin I believe the minister said this was the only way to pay off this amount of money. What is there to prevent the government from putting an amount in the estimates sufficient to pay off the balance of this amount in one year or in two years, instead of waiting for twenty years?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think there is any objection to paying off the amount, and I have no doubt that such an arrangement could be made in practically all these cases. However, apparently it was thought at different times by different governments that this was a better way of doing it, or else the house would not have passed the item.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It is certainly a more expensive way of financing.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister ought not to say that; there are really no grounds for that remark. Will the minister lay on the table at the next sitting the agreement and the other documents?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will endeavour to have them by the next sitting.

Mr. GEARY: Is the government estopped from denying there is a contract by having made a payment?

Mr. RALSTON: The king can do no wrong.

Mr. DUNNING: There are too many lawyers here to-night.

Mr. SPENCER: I take it that there is nothing in the agreement which prevents this amount being paid off.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will the minister say that he will include the necessary amount in the estimates next year and clean the matter up?

Mr. STEVENS: Or put it in the supplementaries for this year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am very anxious to get these votes of mine through, and anxious also

to give the committee all the information I can. But the hon. member for Lincoln knows as well as anyone else—

Mr. CHAPLIN: I know it would be good business to do it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have great regard for the business acumen of my hon. friend, and his advice goes a long way on both sides of the house, but that any particular amount will be in the estimates is something which I hope my hon. friend will not press me to say.

Mr. GEARY: I think the minister would much rather leave it for this party to pay.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In that case the annual instalments would have been paid.

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): The next item is No. 127—public buildings, Alberta.

Mr. BENNETT: We are calling these item by item. This afternoon I directed the attention of the committee to the fact that there had been a departure from this procedure.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): I was simply following the procedure which had been adopted to-night before I took the chair.

Mr. STEVENS: It was not adopted.

Mr. BENNETT: That is hardly correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STEVENS: We asked this afternoon that they be called item by item.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): Is that the desire of the committee?

Mr. BENNETT: It is not a quesiton of the committee's desire, it is a question of the practice of the house.

Mr. DUNNING: In fairness to the Chairman may I point out to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) that this is apparently a misunderstanding; we were following that practice this evening.

Mr. BENNETT: We succeeded this afternoon in getting back to the practice of calling the resolutions item by item. When the hon. member for Wetaskiwin asked about that $400,000 item we got away from that practice. I want to inquire about some of these items, especially those with regard to the pick-up table.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend is referring to the pick-up table installation at Saskatoon.

Mr. DUNNING: There is one at Regina.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Regina post office—installation of pick-up table, $3,500.

Mr. BENNETT: What is involved in this?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is to provide for what is known as the Cummins pick-up table for the Regina post office, as requested by the Deputy Postmaster General on September 18, 1928, as follows:

I wish to inform you that the department has decided to install mechanical pick-up machines in the Saskatoon and Regina post offices. These machines to be similar to those already in operation at Toronto and Montreal.

After examination of practically all devices of this kind, the Post Office department decided upon the Cummins table as being the most satisfactory. It is said to save the labour of several men.

Mr. KENNEDY: What does it pick up?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It picks up letters.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The same machine is being installed at Calgary.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There was quite a long discussion a year ago with regard to this machine, and it was then pointed out that the department had decided that it was superior to any other.

Mr. DUNNING: It is being installed throughout Canada.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In the larger places.

Mr. BENNETT: Does this pay for the purchase of the machine, or is it on a rental basis?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is for the purchase of the machine.

Mr. FRASER: Where are they purchased?

Mr. ELLIOTT: From the International Equipment Company of Ottawa.

Mr. FRASER: Where are they manufactured?

Mr. ELLIOTT: They are made in Chicago. This is the only large pick-up table on the market.

Mr. SPENCER: Is there any duty against them?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think there is.

Mr. SPENCER: So the government is penalizing itself in paying duty on a table to be used in a government department, and which is not made in Canada?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is a bookkeeping entry; we have to get them wherever they are made.

Mr. ADSHEAD: There would be no duty if they were not made in Canada.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps not.

Item agreed to.

Regina public building—addition, $100,000.

Mr. GARDINER: What is that for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We passed this item some time ago. It is for the erection of an addition to the public building at Regina in order to provide adequate accommodation for all government services in that city. The situation here is similar to the situation in Winnipeg. The facilities are not adequate and it is desired to utilize the building and the site now owned by the government, and adjoining property has been expropriated by the government.

Item agreed to.

Rosthern—public building, $32,000.

Mr. BARBER: What is that for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is a revote of $21,000 from last year.

Mr. BARBER: What is the revenue of this post office?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The postal revenue is $6,871 and the customs revenue is $5,634.

Mr. STEVENS: Will this amount complete the building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Saskatoon—public building, $400,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What is this for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This item was passed some time ago.

Mr. GEARY: I suppose in all these items we are getting no accurate idea at all as to the ultimate expenditure?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Where there is a revote I think I can safely say to my hon. friend that it completes the building.

Mr. GEARY: I hope that is not the case with the Toronto customs house.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is not in this list.

Mr. GEARY: The minister may rely on an alibi for the moment. I do not wish to question the action of the committee in passing the item for the customs building at Toronto, but I should like to ask the minister when he is going to commence the work.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We are about to advertise for tenders. My hon. friend is perhaps sufficiently familiar with the local circumstances to know that we have been urging for the removal as soon as possible of the bridge that has been in the way on the site for some time. Plans and specifications are being prepared and I understand that within about a week advertisements for tenders will be issued.

Mr. GEARY: Are the plans prepared in the department?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. I shall be glad to have my hon. friend look them over. They will be found satisfactory, I hope.

Item agreed to.

Alberta—Calgary post office—installation of pick-up table, $3,500.

Mr. RYCKMAN: What is the company that supplies these tables?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The International Equipment Company.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Of Ottawa?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Can the minister inform me as to the personnel of that company?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, I cannot.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Can the minister's deputy enable him to answer the question?

Mr. ELLIOTT: He tells me that he does not know.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Does the minister buy from an outfit without knowing anything of the personnel? That is not customary. None of us do that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The Post Office Department investigate as to what they want. The function of this department is largely to supply to the various other departments the facilities that they require. If they decide, for instance, upon a pick-up table of a certain kind, and if they insist upon that particular table, we want first of all to be assured that it is the only one of its kind procurable, so that we may have an opportunity of comparing prices. The International Equipment Company have probably supplied all the pick-up tables that have been purchased by the government for a number of years. There is a uniform price.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The department is a sort of purchasing agent for the Post Office Department?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is somewhat the position.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Then I suppose we can get the further information we desire from the Post Office Department, or should we get it from this minister? Does the minister mean to say, from his remarks of a minute ago, that we have to go to the Post Office Department to get any information respecting the personnel of a company from which he is buying these goods, or do we get it from him?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We have a purchasing agent, and while perhaps I should have made an effort to come into contact with this particular company, I have not found time to do so. I have not done so, at any rate, and I am very frank in telling my hon. friend that I do not know any of the personnel of the company.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Does the minister wish to lead the house to believe, from his last few remarks, that he carries on the personal negotiations in regard to all these contracts?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No; I am trying to lead him to believe the opposite.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why does he try to do so when he knows this is being done by the departmental officials, and that they meet these people? No doubt somebody meets them, and they can surely inform us as to the personnel of the company.

Mr. POULIOT: If the price is fair, what difference does it make whether Joe or Thomas is the president?

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not know that the price is fair. How does the hon. member know? Does he know anything about it himself? Is he answering for the minister? Surely the minister is able to answer for himself.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend did not catch my "if." I did not give any information. It was just a reflection.

Mr. DUNNING: Just for the sake of information, I should like to ask the hon. member for Lincoln a question. I have not so far conceived it to be part of my duty to know the personnel of the various institutions with which the Department of Railways and Canals deals and I doubt if I could name one in a score. Surely it is not reasonable to expect the minister to know that. I doubt very much if the purchasing agent would know the personnel in connection with many institutions. He might know the salesmen or the officials in charge of tenders, in respect to some of the companies. If my hon. friend, on my estimates, asks me that question in connection with almost any company, I cannot answer it.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am sure the minister's chief officials will be able to tell him about the personnel of the companies with which his department is doing business. Nearly all the letterheads will state who the president and the secretary of the concern are. That is all we ask in this case.

Mr. DUNNING: I am quite sure it would be difficult for me to answer.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not doubt that what the minister says is true, but that does not alter the facts. It is possible to have such information in respect to any company one is dealing with, and it is only reasonable that at least some of the personnel of this company should be known.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not know whether I should trouble my hon. friend again with what I have already stated. This is the information that comes from the Post Office department:

> I wish to inform you that this department proposes to install mechanical pick-up machines at the following post offices during the fiscal year 1929-30: Calgary, Saskatoon, Hamilton, Ottawa and Regina.
>
> These machines to be similar to those already in use at Montreal and Toronto.

I could go back and find out what investigations were made by the purchasing agent when he purchased the machines for Montreal and Toronto, whether they were the first ones purchased or not. I know my hon. friend is not very serious about the objections he is making in this case, because he cannot refrain from smiling.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am smiling at the information. The information the minister is giving is entirely apart from what I have asked.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Then I cannot help my hon. friend.

Mr. FRASER: If the minister has the information so far in advance in regard to the number of machines he is going to use throughout the country, and if the Post Office department have made a thorough investigation of the machines, why does he not buy them from the manufacturers?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not know how you would buy from the manufacturers other than through their agents. That is what we do.

Mr. CHAPLIN: One reason why I asked for the information was that in many cases United States manufacturers of articles such as this, appoint officials from their own company as their agents in Canada, bring the goods in, pay the duty themselves and then resell their product. That is why I want to know whether this company is a branch of an American manufacturing concern, or whether it is a bona fide business proposition of somebody else selling their goods.

Mr. POULIOT: Would the minister say on which side of the Niagara river that firm is located?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Another bright remark.

Mr. BENNETT: May I ask the minister this question? We have a purchasing department. Here again is a principle to which I made up my mind I would try to direct the attention of this committee. We are purchasing vast quantities of goods of various kinds. We are installing pick-up machines, for instance, in several post offices, and in the larger cities I suppose there would be two or three of them. They cost $3,500 each. What do we maintain this purchasing department for, paying gentlemen very considerable salaries, if not for the purpose of dealing with matters of this kind? I find in the Public Works department one article, in another department another article, and in another department something else, and there is no coordinated effort to buy these various goods at the best prices obtainable. Dredges are used by several departments—by Marine and Fisheries, Railways and Canals, Public Works. There is no central purchasing organization, nothing to provide information in connection with many of these purchases which the different departments of the government are making, and each department is very jealous in retaining its rights with respect to the others. Instead of the Post Office Department asking the Public Works department, of all places in the world, to buy pick-up machines for the post offices, why is not all this purchasing done by a central agency? How is the Public Works department better equipped to make purchases of that kind than somebody else? How is it better equipped to buy filing cabinets, office equipment and that kind of thing? What is the purchasing department for, what are these men paid their salaries for, if not to enable the country to get the benefit that business gets by having purchasing agents? We all know the factors which a purchasing agent puts before a business executive. He prepares information as to the prices at which given goods can be bought, where they are made, the net cost delivered; and with all this information before them the management say yes or no, and that is the end of it. But here we have the Post Office Department writing a letter to the Public Works department—of all places in the world—to get filing cabinets and pick-up machines for the post office. The post office is a public work, it is true, but why should the Public Works department, which is charged with the responsibility of constructing and maintaining public buildings all over Canada, be bothered with making these purchases when we have a purchasing department?

Mr. CHAPLIN: The post office might as well have applied to the Health department.

An hon. MEMBER: Another bright remark.

Mr. BENNETT: When Sir Edward Kemp was chairman of the purchasing commission during the war, and Sir Hormisdas Laporte was with him, they evolved a purchasing system which I think challenged the admiration not only of this country but of all other countries as well. They kept minutes, they had their figures, and they are there yet as a permanent memorial to what they did. The Prime Minister said to us: Where can we save money? Money can be saved right here. In connection with many of the items I have been able to discover just by a little study, looking through the Auditor General's report and the estimates, if all the purchasing were put in charge of one central agency you could afford to pay a man a very large salary and still save at least half a million dollars a year. That is worth while; it represents the interest on a very substantial sum of money.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend's argument is rather an argument in favour of the practice that is now being followed. Perhaps it is not followed to the extent that my hon. friend would like, but just the same the Public Works department does purchase for several government departments. We purchase for the Post Office Department, for instance—

Mr. BENNETT: Do you purchase for the Department of Railways and Canals?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think they do their own purchasing pretty well.

Mr. STEVENS: They will not let you in there.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The cabinets and office equipment for the Department of Trade and Commerce, for instance, are all purchased through the one purchasing department.

Mr. DUNNING: You purchase filing cabinets, office equipment and furniture for the railway department.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, we are carrying out in that respect the policy which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is arguing for, that as far as possible there should be one central purchasing agent for all the departments of government, with a man at the head who knows about costs and prices.

Mr. BENNETT: We already have a purchasing commission. I am trying to find out what it is doing.

Mr. STEVENS: It has gone so dead that the minister has lost sight of it.

Mr. BENNETT: They call it salvaging now, but it has not salvaged itself yet.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think we are agreed that one central purchasing department can purchase to better advantage than several. It gets back to the sound business principle on which the chain stores work, the purchasing for all the stores in the chain being done through one agency instead of individually by each store. That is why a number of these chain stores have made such a great success of their business. That is why the Public Works department—

Mr. BENNETT: Is so successful.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps I should not say is the most efficient department in the government service—

Mr. BENNETT: But if the rest of the ministers were out, you would admit it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would not deny it. I really think that what is being done is largely what my hon. friend is arguing for. Perhaps it could be carried out to a greater extent than it is at the present time. I think that if my hon. friend saw the recommendations that come from the purchasing agent, as I have done for the last two years, and scrutinized them closely, he would come to believe that when the purchasing agent recommends a certain purchase it is about the best purchase that could be made of that particular class of goods.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Who is the purchasing agent?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Mr. Dawson, and if my hon. friend will go up and discuss with him the prices, for instance, of office equipment of various kinds, I am sure he will be satisfied that the purchasing department is in the hands of a man who knows his business pretty well.

Mr. ADSHEAD: You have one central purchasing agent?

Mr. BENNETT: That is in the Public Works department only. Let us assume that a considerable number of yards of carpet are required and that it is of a kind not manufactured in Canada, that it can be secured only from England. Do I understand that there is any rule requiring the purchasing agent to buy that through a set of merchants in London, Ontario? Perhaps the minister would give us information on that point. In view of what he has said it would be highly interesting to know just why the public accounts indicate such large sums of money being paid to firms in London, Ontario, if the purchasing agent has such a large scope for his activities and exercise the authority which the minister has indicated.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend will find that that is another example that proves the efficiency of the purchasing agent. It is perhaps the best example you could have of the care and good judgment he exercises in connection with matters of this kind.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am glad to know the minister feels that his buyer is so well acquainted with the value of all the houses in the Dominion that he has determined in his own mind that the market at London for certain things is much better than in Montreal, Toronto or some other large city. If something is required in the Department of National Defence, does the purchase go through the Public Works department or through some other agency, or is there a special buyer in the Department of National Defence?

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend will understand that the Department of National Defence would itself buy military clothing and other equipment.

Mr. DUNNING: Sam Brown belts.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Ross rifles.

Mr. ELLIOTT: But if the Department of National Defence requires something that comes reasonably within the scope of the Department of Public Works they issue a requisition to us and we purchase accordingly.

Mr. CHAPLIN: We were supposed to have a purchasing department that was a real purchasing department and acting for all the

various departments. How many of these departments have their own purchasing agents?

Mr. DUNNING: There is no purchasing department.

Mr. BENNETT: We had it for years.

Mr. DUNNING: I never knew of the time historically that the Department of Railways and Canals, for instance, did not have its own purchasing department. I think every department always has had a purchasing agency.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Oh no.

Mr. DUNNING: If my hon. friend can tell me any period of years when the Department of Railways and Canals did not have its own purchasing agent I shall be glad of the information.

Mr. IRVINE: If the post office has its own purchasing department, why does it apply to the Department of Public Works when it requires anything?

Mr. DUNNING: I will explain the matter as I understand it. While the Department of Railways and Canals has a purchasing agent, if the department requires anything in the way of office furniture or equipment of that character it applies to the Department of Public Works where such purchasing has been centralized for years. But when it comes to buying cement for the work on the Welland canal, or timber for repairing lock gates, and all that sort of thing over the canal system, with all due deference to my hon. friend from Lincoln, the purchasing has always been handled by the Department of Railways and Canals. I think there must be some misunderstanding between us, because I do not recollect the time when there were not several departments which had their own purchasing agencies, while at the same time, according to my understanding, the purchase of office equipment and buildings has been centralized for a number of years past in the Department of Public Works. I know if any office furniture, such as filing cabinets, pick-up tables in post offices and similar equipment, is necessary it is requisitioned from the Department of Public Works. But so far as buying machinery for the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned—

Mr. ELLIOTT: Cars, for instance.

Mr. BENNETT: Private cars; they don't buy any others.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Where do they purchase cars?

Mr. DUNNING: I did not mention cars.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The other minister did.

Mr. DUNNING: I did not hear him.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Does the minister say he did not?

Mr. DUNNING: I did not hear him. At the time I was trying to listen to the hon. member, I think from Peace River, who was on his feet.

Mr. BENNETT: Don't deny that other people may have heard. Learn a few lessons in the amenities, if nothing else.

Mr. KENNEDY: I understood that we had a purchasing commission.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It has gone out of business.

Mr. STEVENS: Chloroformed.

Mr. KENNEDY: Have we a purchasing commission?

Mr. DUNNING: Perhaps my time in the government has been too short to answer positively, but I have no memory of any purchasing commission, other than the commission for the purchase of war material. My understanding with respect to that—subject to correction from other ministers—is that it went out of business before this government took office.

Mr. BENNETT: No sir.

Mr. DUNNING: We have a salvage commission, which has to do with seeing as far as possible that materials required by one department are not already in the possession of another department.

Mr. BENNETT: There are two of three statements made by the Minister of Public Works that should be checked. I am sorry to have to do this, but I do not propose that Hansard should go out with these inaccurate statements. He has left an impression on the minds of hon. members that the Public Works department does the purchasing for the Post Office Department. The hon. member for East Calgary certainly got that impression, and one other hon. gentleman made the same observation. But his department purchases equipment only, it does not purchase, for instance, stationery for the post office.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Nor mail boxes, nor the locks.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, the lock-boxes.

Mr. BENNETT: I am talking of the rural delivery boxes.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course his department does not. It does purchase equipment for the post office in the way of furniture. The boxes with "D.C." on them I think are purchased through the Department of Public Works. But the great bulk of the purchases made by the Post Office Department we know are made by the department itself. The Railway department has its own purchasing agent; the Interior department in its manifold activities does much purchasing. The Public Works department does not purchase anything for the Interior department except office equipment, files and so on. The Public Works department does purchase equipment for buildings because it is charged with responsibility for buildings. Is not that a correct statement?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is pretty much what I said.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think the minister intended to leave that impression but—

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know my hon. friend does not want to be unfair, and I think Hansard will bear me out when I say that he has gained an impression that he should not have gained from what I said.

Mr. BENNETT: I am familiar with the purchases of the various departments, but the hon. gentleman from East Calgary is not.

Mr. DUNNING: How do you know; you cannot speak for him.

Mr. BENNETT: No, I cannot speak for him, but he asked because he said he desired to know. I know because for the space of a few minutes I had something to do with various departments of the public service; and what is more, during one period of my career as a member of parliament I made myself fairly familiar with the operations of the departments. I was much younger and more active then. During the war we had a purchasing commission, presided over by Sir Edward Kemp.

Mr. DUNNING: But it did not perform the functions of the purchasing agents of the various departments.

Mr. BENNETT: It became the central purchasing agency for all departments of the government.

Sir EUGENE FISET: For all items chargeable to war appropriation.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Rimouski is very familiar with that part of it, and his subsequent speeches when he was a candidate for election indicated that.

Sir EUGENE FISET: I have no regrets for any speeches I made when I was a candidate and have nothing to retract.

Mr. BENNETT: I am glad his memory is so bad.

Sir EUGENE FISET: It is more than you can say.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sure it must be very delightful to the hon. gentleman to have forgotten his speeches. But the commission presided over by Sir Edward Kemp dealt not only with war purchases but with all purchases incidental to the conduct of government, because there were then no public works being undertaken in Canada, during the war, except two public buildings.

Sir EUGENE FISET: That is exactly what I said—in charge of every purchase for all departments of everything chargeable to war appropriation.

Mr. BENNETT: But they were not chargeable to war appropriation, because there were no civil undertakings going on except two public works in the whole of Canada.

Sir EUGENE FISET: I am sorry to interrupt my hon. friend, but there was a civil vote for every department.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course there was a civil vote. But I am talking about expenditures in connection with public works; and there were only two undertakings in connection with buildings in the whole of Canada, from 1915 until 1919.

Mr. DUNNING: In connection with the department over which I now preside the work at Nelson was going on during a considerable part of the war.

Mr. BENNETT: I was talking about buildings.

Mr. DUNNING: Purchases is the point at issue.

Mr. BENNETT: They were not making any purchases at Nelson at that time.

Mr. DUNNING: Material purchases, yes.

Mr. BENNETT: I shall have something to say in that regard in connection with expenditures going on at Churchill at the present time, and which I wish to have checked up.

Mr. DUNNING: I shall be delighted.

Mr. BENNETT: I am interested for instance in the work of carpenters, paid 75 cents an hour, one of whom by the name of Scott I have in mind. He did not know the difference between a buzzsaw and a handsaw. Now, there was subsequently appointed a commission on which Colonel Lafleche sat, and associated with him was another gentleman whose name I do not recall.

Mr. POWER: Sir Hormisdas Laporte of Montreal.

Mr. BENNETT: Colonel Lafleche was subsequently chairman of that body. The name of the gentleman associated with him I do not recall at the moment. Perhaps the hon. member for Rimouski will remember the name.

Sir EUGENE FISET: Walsh, I think.

Mr. BENNETT: That was the purchasing commission which operated under the administration, from 1921 to 1925, prior to the minister coming into this house, and it was more or less chloroformed and became a salvage commission. That is the position. Last session I directed attention to the matter and asked the Minister of Finance what they did—this chloroformed commission which has now gone out to salvage the government. It was originally intended to be a purchasing commission. It was the intention of the government at that time that we should have a centralized purchasing body who would endeavour to save this country many hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. DUNNING: Does my hon. friend say that it ever functioned in relation to the Department of Railways and Canals?

Mr. BENNETT: In my somewhat cursory stopover at various departments I was never Acting Minister of Railways and Canals and therefore cannot say. But I can speak with respect to most other departments.

Mr. POWER: I do not want to interrupt the leader of the opposition, but I might point out that I happened to be a member of the house at the time the purchasing commission was in existence as such.

Mr. BENNETT: Which one?

Mr. POWER: The purchasing commission to which the hon. gentleman has referred, as it existed during the war and for a period afterward. During its lifetime it had the greatest powers such as the hon. gentleman ascribes to it; there were purchasing agents in all the departments. There was a director of equipment and supply in the Post Office Department, and he is still there. There was a director of contracts in the Department of National Defence, and he is still there; in fact, he has been in the department twenty-five or thirty years, the same man. There was a director of contracts or a purchasing agent in the Public Works department; there was one in the Department of Railways and Canals; and, although I do not know about the Department of the Interior, I think there was one there. These directors of purchases functioned during the time this super purchasing commission was in existence, and if after a while its functions were somewhat curtailed it was because the government came to the conclusion that they did not want any overlapping of responsibility. At least, that was the reason given in the house, and I think it was acquiesced in on all sides.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member has stated the case correctly so far as the various departments are concerned. During the period of the war the commission presided over by Sir Edward Kemp met daily, kept its minutes, and dealt with the whole problem of purchasing, and it was estimated at the end of the war that it had saved the country many millions of dollars—not hundreds of thousands—as the hon. gentleman from Rimouski will recall. Then it was thought that by reason of being able to fix prices it could be utilized in various departments in connection with purchases, and it was so utilized, although that was not part of its original function. The various purchasing agents were responsible, through that commission, for whatever was purchased, and they were able to get better prices. After the war a commission was appointed, and my memory is that Colonel Lafleche was chairman. But that commission was objected to by certain of my hon. friends opposite for reasons that are fairly obvious, having regard to the ante-war conditions with respect to purchases; and so the old procedure was reverted to. We chloroformed the purchasing commission, as my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre has said, and the commission is now a salvaging commission, whatever that may mean. No accurate definition has been given of it. The Minister of Finance last year, essaying the gentle art of sophistry, attempted to define its duties, but without much success; and no one has yet been able to suggest a satisfactory definition. The point is this. Why should we not be able to have this commission function as originally intended, so that the various departments that require the same things for the conduct of their business might be able to purchase satisfactorily—not to have several orders coming in, as they now are, through purchasing agents,

an order from the International Machine Company here and someone else there, but by reason of just the very principle my hon. friend has mentioned, the chain store principle, obtaining satisfactory prices through centralization of requirements? In this way purchases might be made effectively, efficiently and to the best possible advantage of the country. That is the position we have endeavoured to indicate, and therein lies the answer to the question proposed the other day, as to how money might be saved in the conduct of the public service. I shall have something to say later on to the same effect in connection with dredging.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The hon. member (Mr. Power) tells the committee that during a certain period different departments had purchasing agents of their own. He knows very well that these purchasing agents did not purchase; they were purchasing agents only in name. They were men who were left in the department for the purpose of making up specifications of goods required and handing them over to the purchasing agent, who purchased them in one lot. That was the sensible businesslike way of doing it because goods can be purchased better in that way than in any other.

Mr. POWER: Now that my hon. friend recalls it to my memory, I remember perfectly well, when I sat on the other side of the house as he is doing now, wishing in my own little way to embarrass the government and to prevent them from getting their estimates through. I advanced arguments similar to the argument the hon. member is now making. But I said: Why in the world should you keep these purchasing agents if you are going to have a super-purchasing agent? Why keep these individual agents in the different departments? I suggested that if they were not acting as purchasing agents there was no use paying them three, four and five thousand dollars a year; there was no use doing so if they were only clerks who were required to sent out requisitions to the government contracts supervision committee. I do not know whether my hon. friend was then sitting on this side of the house, but if he was not at any rate someone laughed at me and assured me that these agents had functions to perform. I am sure they told me that, because otherwise they would undoubtedly have listened to me. They were either doing something useful or they were not, one or the other; if they were not doing a useful service they should have been abolished and if they were doing something useful they are doing it to-day.

Mr. BENNETT: At page 66 of the estimates I find the following details:

Government contracts supervision committee salaries including L. R. LaFlèche, secretary, at $6,000, and that of L. H. Beer, salvage officer, $5,000, telephones, telegrams, travelling expenses, stationery, et cetera; 1929-30, $21,200; 1928-29, $21,500; decrease $300.

That is the commission to which I was directing the attention of the minister. It is now called the government contracts supervision committee, and the salvage committee has become a salvage officer.

Item agreed to.

Calgary—public building, $300,000.

Mr. ADSHEAD: How far will that $300,000 go?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am afraid it will not go very far; this will be a fairly expensive building, costing nearly $1,000,000. We are trying to cut down the expense a little, but we cannot do very much.

Mr. POULIOT: I would like to ask that the same amount be given to Temiscouata county.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

THE I'M ALONE INCIDENT

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN CANADIAN AND UNITED STATES GOVERNMENTS TABLED

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to lay on the table copies of the correspondence between the government of Canada and the government of the United States with respect to the I'm Alone incident. I have no doubt the house will wish to have this correspondence printed, and if it is agreeable I would move:

That 750 copies in English and 300 copies in French of the correspondence with respect to the I'm Alone incident now tabled be printed forthwith and that standing order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Friday, April 26, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

On the order for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Parent for the concurrence in the second report of the select standing committee on public accounts:

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall I say "Stand"?

Mr. ERNST: Stand.

Mr. POWER: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It was agreed that the motion should stand until the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), the chairman of the committee, who signed the report, was in his place. He is not present to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands, by unanimous consent.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT

SALE OR TRANSFER OF SHARES OF STOCK

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): May I remind the house and the country that in the budget speech delivered on March 1, notice was given of a proposed change in part seven of the Special War Revenue Act, concerning the sale or transfer of shares of stock. It was provided that this change should go into effect on the 1st of May, next Wednesday. It is now apparent that the necessary amending bill may not be ready to receive royal assent before that date and it is proposed that the revised rates shall not be effectual until July 1. The officers of the National Revenue department have been notified accordingly.

The abolition of the Special War Revenue Act tax on cables, telegrams, railway and other tickets becomes effective on May 1.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Is it proposed that there shall be no amendments in the rate of the new tax with respect to mines and mining shares, or is that subject to discussion and reconsideration by the ministry when the resolution is before the house?

Mr. ROBB: It is subject to discussion when the resolution is before the house.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William): Just in that connection I notice the minister used the words "revised rates." Since he mentions there are going to be revised rates, I was wondering if he should not make them public at this time.

Mr. ROBB: The term "revised rates" is used because the rates as presented to parliament in the budget are revised rates.

NEWSPAPER VAPAUS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Justice, or the Solicitor General, or whichever power or authority the question should be directed to, in respect of a petition which was presented to the house yesterday by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Lapierre), a petition which asked for the suppression of a paper called "Vapaus." I should like to ask whether the officers of the house have examined that petition, and whether they have formally accepted or rejected it. In connection with the question, if I am in order, I should like to point out that Bourinot, third edition, page 348, says:

> All petitions should be respectfully and temperately worded. The house will refuse to receive them if they contain any reflections on the king or his representative in Canada, or on the action of parliament, or on any of its committees, or on the courts of justice, or affect "the legal and social positions of individuals."

I believe that petition shows disrespect to His Majesty inasmuch as it asks for the suppression of liberty, whereas His Majesty stands for liberty to all British people. In the next place it infringes the law.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman, to be in order, should give notice and move that the petition be not received in spite of the report which has been made. The matter is not debatable just now, but if the hon. gentleman will give notice and move that the petition be not received for the reason he alleges, he will be in order.

Mr. IRVINE: Has the petition been examined?

Mr. SPEAKER: All petitions are examined by the officers of the house.

Mr. LAPOINTE: After they have been presented?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: So the petition is in the hands of the law officers of the house?

Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly. It is not before the house now. I will see what report has been made and will inform the house at

the next sitting. The hon. gentleman can give notice and move that the petition be not received.

WESTERN AIR MAIL CONTRACTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) a question, of which I have not given him notice, but I think he will be able to answer it without notice. I have received a telegram regarding the awarding of the air mail contracts for western Canada. It reads:

> Understand Western Canada Airways of Winnipeg will be granted entire western air mail contracts. When in Ottawa last month postal minister assured me that our company would be given consideration. You are aware I formed Great Western Airways and pioneered aviation here with board of directors fully able to finance air mail service between Winnipeg and Calgary. Disaster to my company not to be considered and grossly unfair especially after minister's promise to me.

That is from Captain McCall, an air man with a very distinguished record during the war. There is an article also in the Edmonton Journal of the 18th of February, complaining that the Commercial Airways, Limited did not have an opportunity to tender. Perhaps the minister will be able to remove the difficulties which these gentlemen are now experiencing by stating what are the facts in connection with the air mail service.

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): No contract has been awarded for that service yet. That company is being communicated with for an offer.

Mr. BENNETT: Thank you.

PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): According to the current issue of the Financial Post very extensive pulp and paper consolidations are likely to take place, as a result of a desire on the part of banking groups to consolidate their positions. I should like to to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) whether his department has been consulted with reference to this new development in banking policy.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): The first I have heard of it is the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Woodsworth). I have not yet read the Financial Post.

[Mr. Speaker.]

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose last evening, we had passed the first two items of vote No. 127, which is as follows:

Alberta

Calgary post office—installation of pick-up table—$3,500.
Calgary—public building—$300,000.
Carway — building for immigration and customs purposes—$2,500.
Camrose—public building—$35,000.
Coutts—building for immigration and customs purposes—$2,500.
Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc.—$17,000.
Edmonton—grain inspection building—$5,000.
Edmonton—immigration building—$65,000.
Edmonton — public building — addition—$100,000.
Redcliff—armoury accommodation—$1,200.
Red Deer public building—addition and alterations—$2,000.
Vegreville—public building—$35,000.
Wainwright—public building—$28,000—Total, $596,700.

The next item is:

Carway — building for immigration and customs purposes, $2,500.

Mr. GARDINER: I did not understand that we had passed the item with regard to a public building in Calgary. I would like the minister to give some explanation of this item of $300,000 for a public building in Calgary.

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): I do not know whether my hon. friend was present last night when the matter was under discussion. This amount is required towards the erection of a new public building to house all the government offices at Calgary. The proposed building will be an eight storey stone and brick structure situated on Eighth avenue at the corner of First street east. The building will have a frontage of 158 feet 9 inches on Eighth avenue by a depth of 120 feet on First street east. The new building proposed to be erected at Calgary was advertised in March, 1920, and tenders were received amounting to approximately $1,400,000. Those were the tenders at that time, and that is the best estimate that I can give to my hon. friend of what the probable cost will be. The building will contain 2,808,307 cubic feet which, at the price of $1,400,000, will be between 52 and 53 cents per cubic foot.

Mr. SPENCER: There is nothing in the votes and proceedings or in Hansard to show that Vote 127 was passed last night.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Hansard will show that this particular item was agreed to last night.

Mr. SPENCER: It should appear in Hansard.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is in Hansard. My hon. friend will see that the item was agreed to last night.

Mr. BENNETT: May I suggest the desirability of having that building faced with granite? When this building was discussed in 1914, it will be recalled that there was an item in the estimates of $250,000, but then the war came on. In 1920 tenders were called for a building of stone and brick. There is a very fine quarry of granite in the constituency of the Minister of National Health, and that granite has been found very serviceable. It makes an excellent building material. I was hoping that possibly alternative tenders might be called for the utilization of that granite. The Minister of National Health knows the granite to which I refer.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is only fair to my hon. friend to say that the present recommendations do not provide for granite proper. As my hon. friend knows, it is much more expensive.

Mr. BENNETT: It might not be very much more expensive.

Mr. ELLIOTT: However, I shall be very glad to consider the proposal of having alternative tenders, but I do not think we can make an exception of the city of Calgary in that respect.

Mr. MANION: When must the tenders be in?

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend will understand that we will begin to prepare the plans now. We have the old plans that were provided in 1920. Tenders were called for then. Of course my hon. friends will readily understand that we are doing nothing by way of preparing new plans or anything else until the estimate is passed in the house.

Mr. MANION: Of course, the plan could be prepared and tenders called for on the supposition that the item is going through. I say that in justification of my question. The calling for tenders does not necessarily mean the job is going through anyway.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, but perhaps my hon. friend knows the difficulties in the architect's branch, and this applies practically throughout Canada. Owing to the fact that during the war years there was no public building going on here, we are not as flush of architects and draughtsmen as we would have been if our building program had been so extensive as to provide work for them. A great many of our architects at that time went across to the United States. Our requirement is that they must have resided here for three years to qualify for a position. The present staff is fully occupied on buildings with regard to which the estimates have been passed and there is no question of their going on.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I assume that the usual fair wage clause will be inserted in the contract and that as much as possible local labour will be employed?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We will advertise for tenders. There will be no doubt about the fair wage clause, but I do not think it would be fair to the contractor to say that he must take labour from any particular district. He will have to be his own judge to a considerable extent as to that. Naturally labour will come from the district pretty largely.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I think that as far as possible the tradesmen and labourers should be local people, and that outsiders should not be brought in to lower the wages.

Mr. IRVINE: I wish to express my appreciation to the government for having listened to those eloquent appeals which I made some years ago for this post office, and for having decided ultimately to take action. I see now the proper way to go about these things, and I shall know better in the future how to proceed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In spite of what my hon. friend says, this building is going to be put up shortly.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The hon. member for Wetaskiwin says he knows how to proceed to get these things. I think for the benefit of the house he might tell us a little more as to the proper procedure. I should like to know.

Item agreed to.

Coutts—building for immigration and customs purposes, $2,500.

Mr. MANION: What kind of a building is the minister getting for $2,500?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is to provide for the construction of a shelter over the highway and accommodation for cars on either side, and also two small offices, one for customs and the other for immigration officials.

Item agreed to.

Redcliff—armoury accommodation, $1,200.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the armoury at Redcliff?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is to provide for the purchase from Mr. H. O. Wheeler of a building for which we are now paying an annual rental of $240. It is not a very elaborate building, but it was thought better to buy it at $1,200 than to rent it at $240.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the entire purchase price?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: And next year the building will have to be rebuilt?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No; that remark arises from the suspicious mind of my hon. friend, but it is absolutely unjustified. The building is a two-storey brick structure one hundred feet by twenty feet with a floor area of 4,452 square feet.

Mr. BENNETT: Twelve hundred dollars?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, it is only because it is a bargain that we are buying it.

Mr. MANION: It must be a bargain.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What repairs are needed on the building? You do not get gifts of that kind without there being something behind them.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I must say that at the price for which we are getting the building the vendor is not doing the repairs.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not wonder at there being a suspicious mind on a proposition of that kind.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Of course, I would not object if it was limited to propositions of this kind.

Mr. CHAPLIN: We had better get more particulars about it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be very glad to give my hon. friend particulars, because he always asks for them in such a courteous manner that it is a pleasure to give them.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Thank you.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The following repairs are required to put the building in first-class condition:

Re-cover roof with standard specification tar and gravel. The present roof covering has deteriorated to such an extent that patching would be poor policy. Owing to water entering the building the upper floor ceiling would require replastering. The heating plant also requires some overhauling and other minor repairs throughout the building. The total cost of above items I would estimate at $1,000. The main work of the structure is in good condition, and if these repairs were executed I would consider the replacement value of entire building would be $12,500.

Item agreed to.

Red Deer public building—addition and alterations, $2,000.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am glad to see the item for Red Deer, although it is rather small. Is it possible that part of this vote is to be donated to filling the unsightly excavation which has been the subject of correspondence between the minister and myself for the past two years?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No. This $2,000 is required for the construction of a small addition at the rear of the Red Deer public building to provide adequate accommodation for the public.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am very glad to hear it because during busy times the building does not provide proper accommodation for the public.

Mr. BENNETT: I am rather familiar with that section of the country. I lost considerable money in ventures not far from there.

Mr. ELLIOTT: You are not the only gentleman who enjoys that distinction.

Mr. BENNETT: Are the taxes to be paid out of the $1,200, the price of the Redcliff property?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We can get a clear title. When the question of renewing the lease was brought up the owner offered to sell the whole property to the government for $1,200 cash, stating that the revenue did not meet taxes and insurance, and as he could foresee little chance of conditions improving he hesitated to spend more money on it.

Mr. BENNETT: So that the taxes and insurance are more than $240 a year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I should imagine so. But my hon. friend knows we do not pay taxes.

Mr. BENNETT: I know that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What purpose has the government in buying it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We already occupy it as an armoury.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Have you a corps there?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think so. The Department of National Defence have requested that the building be obtained.

Mr. GERSHAW: I did not know that this vote was to be brought down until I saw it

in the estimates. This building has been used for a long time by the government and as the rent paid is insufficient the owners are anxious to dispose of it. I can assure the committee that the government is not assuming any great responsibility in the matter. There are well established industries in Redcliff and the government will always require a building for the military unit and for other purposes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Who is the owner?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Mr. R. O. Wheeler.

Item agreed to.

Vegreville—public building, $35,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister might explain this item.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Vegreville is 75 miles east of Edmonton. This amount of $35,000 is required for the erection of a public building on the corner of Main street and Second avenue in the town of Vegreville for postal and customs purposes. The proposed building will be a one and a half storey brick structure, 45 feet long by 34 feet wide, with a one storey annex 11 feet by 18. It will provide accommodation for the postal service and living quarters for the caretaker. Requests for the building have been received, at various times, from Mr. White, M.P. in 1910, the Hon. Mr. Calder in 1919, the Vegreville board of trade in 1919, the Vegreville Liberal Association in 1924, the Vegreville board of trade, transmitted by Mr. W. T. Lucas, M.P. in 1924. Requests have also come from other sources.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How large is the place?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The population is 1,852, according to Heaton's Annual. The postal revenue for 1927-28 amounted to $11,529.36 and the customs revenue for the same period, $11,116.91. The department have asked for the facilities.

Mr. CHAPLIN: This will be used as a customs building also.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: The town of Vegreville is a very beautiful place and I am glad to see the item in the estimates this year. The post office building at the present time is a miserable affair, and in view of the importance of this town and the significance of such a building to the community I am pleased that the minister has submitted this item. The hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Blatchford) knows the town very well; he makes an annual airplane trip there. I am sure the hon. member for West Edmonton (Mr. Stewart) also knows a little about about the place. He knows it is an excellent town and needs this accommodation very badly.

Item agreed to.

Wainwright—public building, $28,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: There was an item in 1928-29 of $35,000. What is the total cost of the building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This $28,000 asked for includes a revote of $18,000. It is to complete the construction of a public building under contract with the Permanent Construction Company Limited of Edmonton for the sum of $37,500; also fittings, lock boxes, sidewalks and so forth. The building will be a two-storey brick structure, 67 feet 4 inches by 33 feet, and will provide accommodation for postal and customs services, as well as living quarters for the caretaker.

Item agreed to.

British Columbia

Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc.—$40,000.

Esquimalt—general repairs and improvements at R.C.N. barracks and H.M.C. dockyard—$20,000.

Kimberley—public building—$25,000.

Port Alberni public building—improvements and alterations—$1,500.

Trail—public building—$50,000.

Vancouver—public building—to meet one year's interest at 5 per cent on mortgage of $400,000—$20,000.

William Head quarantine station—improvements, repairs, etc.—$4,000—Total, $160,500.

Mr. ESLING: The vote of $50,000 for the Trail building, is one item to which the government has given its serious consideration. The minister has certainly carried out his intention of providing additional postal and customs facilities in a community where he knows the accommodation has not been adequate although the need has been urgent. Trail is the greatest metallurgical centre in the British Empire, as hon. members know, and last year we were honoured with a visit from the Governor General, who officiated at the laying of the cornerstone of perhaps the handsomest city hall in the interior of British Columbia. I only hope that the Minister of Public Works will similarly honour us during the coming summer. I am sure he will be convinced, when he sees the place, that the vote is not quite large enough to meet the needs of the community. I should feel remiss if I did not acknowledge, on behalf

of the citizens of Trail, the wisdom of the minister and of the government in providing this much needed accommodation.

Mr. POULIOT: At least this one is polite.

Mr. POWER: And that is very refreshing.

Mr. BARBER: I agree partially with what the hon. member has said in regard to the recognition on the part of the government of the requirements, in the matter of postal facilities, of such places as Trail. But there are other places in British Columbia which have been brought to the attention of the government in the last two or three years and which so far have not received serious consideration. This again brings up the question of the policy being pursued by the government in the construction of public buildings for postal purposes. Last year I brought to the attention of the house the requirements of a very important point in the Fraser valley; I refer to Mission City. The board of trade of that district has been continually communicating with members of the government, particularly the Minister of Health and the Minister of Public Works, on this matter, and last year I showed that Mission City is a very important point in a fast growing district in the Fraser valley. At that time I pointed out that a pre-war grant was voted by this house amounting to about $30,000, to provide for the purchase of a site and the construction of a building in that place. Of that amount $4,000 was expended for a site and the balance was re-voted at the next session, but owing to the war the matter was dropped. The revenue of this post office has been increasing continually; in 1927 it amounted to $6,669.21 and last year it increased to $7,323.45. The rented quarters at present occupied by the post office are very inadequate, and I believe something should be done for this district.

I would like to place on Hansard some votes which were passed during last session and this session for public buildings at other points:

	Revenue	
	1924	1928
Rosthern, Saskatchewan..	$6,429 00	$6,871 00
Durham, Ontario..	7,145 00	5,950 00
Waterloo, Quebec..	6,673 00	5,928 00
Canora, Saskatchewan.. .	.....	6,673 46
Wilkie, Saskatchewan.. .	.....	7,265 24
Transcona, Manitoba.. ..	.....	5,187 60
Exeter, Ontario..	.....	5,899 64
Wiarton, Ontario..	.....	6,250 00
Gretna, Manitoba..	.....	2,329 00

Each of these places has a lower revenue than that of Mission City, so that I would ask the minister to give serious consideration to this request in his supplementary estimates, because I feel sure he has overlooked this very important centre. In comparison with these other places I think Mission City is entitled to something.

Item agreed to.

Experimental farms—replacements, repairs, improvements, etc., $100,000.

Mr. MANION: I should like to ask the minister where the Dominion experimental farms in Canada are located.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The farms are at Charlottetown,, Summerside, Kentville, Nappan, Fredericton, Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, Cap Rouge, St. Joachim, Lennoxville, Farnham, L'Assomption, La Ferme, Kapuskasing, Harrow, Morden, Brandon, Indian Head, Rosthern, Scott, Swift Current, Lethbridge, Lacombe, Windermere, Summerland, Agassiz, and Sidney.

Mr. MANION: The reason I ask is this: I notice there are a number of these farms in the maritime provinces and in Quebec while in Ontario the farm furthest west is at Kapuskasing. The other day I received a resolution from a farmers' organization in my constituency or at least in that section of the country recommending that the government establish an experimental farm on the north shore of lake Superior.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friends laugh at that; they laugh at anything which does not affect their own constituencies, but perhaps it is not so easy to laugh when we are dealing with a government that is not very anxious to do anything in our constituencies.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does my hon. friend think that is a fair statement for him to make, representing the constituency of Fort William?

Mr. MANION: I think that is a fair statement. My hon. friend is rather touchy; he thinks I should be content because there is a little dredging being done in the harbours of Port Arthur and Fort William this year. As a matter of fact the money being spent there is being expended for the national welfare of this country, to facilitate the handling of the wheat of my hon. friends from the west. I am not unresponsive to that; I am glad it is being done for the good of the whole country, and naturally one does not object to money being spent in his riding, but as a matter of fact this is a national undertaking.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend referred to the expenditure of money in the ridings of hon. gentlemen on this side of the house.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friends opposite had a hearty laugh when I mentioned the need for an experimental farm in that thousand miles of territory extending from Kapuskasing on the east to Winnipeg. According to the list read by the minister there are experimental farms every two or three hundred miles or less in the eastern provinces, but here is a long stretch of country without one. The supporters of the minister laughed at my request, and I think I have a right to take exception to that. When I look at these estimates I find that a large proportion of hon. gentlemen opposite are looked after much more carefully than are the members on this side of the house.

Mr. ELLIOTT: They do not say so.

Mr. MANION: The estimates say so. However, I wish to point out the need of my section of the country as put forward by the farmers who have gone into a bush country, as compared with the farmers who have gone to the prairies where farming is much easier. The last experimental farm in Ontario is at Kapuskasing; I do not know where the first experimental farm is in Manitoba, but I believe it is in the neighbourhood of Winnipeg.

Mr. FORKE: It is at Morden.

Mr. MANION: That is southwest of Winnipeg, and that leaves an area of perhaps 800 miles without an experimental farm. That is a section of the country where it is very difficult for men to cut out their homes, because it is bush country. We all know they have to meet greater problems than the farmers on the prairies; their problems are those which were met years ago by the farmers in eastern Ontario, in Quebec and in the maritime provinces.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): And in the prairie provinces also.

Mr. MANION: No, they are not in the same class at all; the men who go into these bush lands in northern Quebec, northern Ontario, the maritime provinces or in British Columbia have a much more difficult time than the men who go to the prairies, where the lands are cleared to a large extent by nature.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): They are not cleared in the northern parts.

Mr. MANION: I differ with my hon. friend.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think you are right there.

Mr. DUNNING: I think you are wrong.

Mr. MANION: I am very glad to get the support of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) in this regard.

Mr. DUNNING: He has never farmed there so he does not know.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I do not think the hon. member knows what he is talking about in that particular.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend appears to be the only one who does know what he is talking about in this particular or any other particular.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I know what I am talking about.

Mr. MANION: The farmers in the northern sections of Ontario should receive some consideration with regard to an experimental farm.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I do not object to that, but I was simply giving some information to the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion). His comparison was hardly fair because he was dealing with a condition with which he is not familiar.

Mr. MANION: Well, I am not absolutely familiar with the conditions in the prairie provinces, but I do know that people seem to think it is easier to go there than it is to go to northern Ontario and northern Quebec. It is quite obvious that bush lands are much difficult to farm, and I should not have to explain that to the hon. member.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member forgets that there is just as much bush country in the northern prairie provinces as there is in northern Ontario.

Mr. MANION: I am speaking of the prairie sections.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member for Melfort (Mr. McLean) is cutting that bush and he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. MANION: I wish he would stay there and go on cutting the bush.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I will reciprocate by saying that I wish the hon. member for Fort William would take up farming on the rocks north of lake Superior. This point is really out of order because the hon. member knows that it is the Department of Agriculture which conducts these farms.

Mr. MANION: It is the Department of Public Works which pays for the repairs.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I was just going to call the attention of the hon. member to a fact

which he has evidently overlooked, that the Department of Public Works does not have the selection of the localities where these farms are to be placed. As the hon. member for Melfort has said, that is decided by the Department of Agriculture and I think the hon. member, when he thinks it over, will realize that that is quite correct. Requisitions are made to the Department of Public Works for buildings in such sections as the Department of Agriculture has decided to establish experimental farms in. I would call the hon. member's attention to the fact that there is an experimental farm in northern Ontario, at Kapuskasing. It is quite true that that is some distance from the territory which he mentioned, but that farm is in operation.

Mr. MANION: That is 700 miles away.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That territory is not so very sparsely settled, so far as farms are concerned.

Mr. MANION: Or is very sparsely settled.

Mr. Chairman, I will admit that it is the Department of Agriculture which decides to put these experimental farms in certain sections, but I am doing preliminary work for that department with the Department of Public Works. I am not objecting to this item in the least because I am glad to see the farms getting the assistance and the repairs required. But when the Department of Agriculture does approach the minister, as I am endeavouring to have them do, I do ask him to give every consideration to this matter. The territory I have mentioned is rather a long overnight's walk from Kapuskasing, and it is a territory where it is very difficult for pioneers to go in and farm at the present time. The minister has been there and he knows it very well.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know it quite well.

Mr. MANION: When this matter comes before the minister I am sure that he will give it fair consideration. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Lapierre) is sitting right beside him at the present moment and he usually supports me in any request for northern Ontario. I know if the minister will ask the opinion of the hon. member to his right he will back me up in what I am asking for that section of the country.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will tell the hon. member that the hon. member for Nipissing always supports any sugestions which are made for that part of Ontario.

Mr. MANION: We always stand together; I help him out too.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: He has been perhaps even more successful than my hon. friend from Fort William, but I think he is rather surprised to hear that he is still a bit dissatisfied.

Mr. MANION: The minister nearly made a slip then.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The decision as to where an experimental farm is to be located is a matter for the consideration of the Department of Agriculture and I would suggest to my hon. friend that his remarks would have had more weight if the Minister of Agriculture (Mr Motherwell) had been present in the house.

Mr. MANION: I will do it over again when he is present.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will be very glad to pass it on to the minister.

Mr. MANION: I am afraid that is a left-handed compliment which the minister has paid me, and I think he paid me another left-handed compliment when he pointed out to the house that the member for Nipissing is always more successful than I am.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would like to ask the minister if these are really experimental farms. The minister read a long list to the house and if they are all experimental farms, it is something new to me.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We are learning something every day.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have not an intimate knowledge of all of them, but a list of experimental farms and branch farms was given to me.

Mr. McGIBBON: If the minister will look into that matter I think he will find that a large number of them are nothing more than demonstration farms. We have not that number of real experimental farms in Canada.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Probably so.

Mr. BENNETT: I know the one at Lacombe is called a demonstration farm.

Mr. SPENCER: Did the list which the hon. minister read include demonstration and experimental farms?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It included what are called branch farms.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond-West Cape Breton): Would the minister tell us how much of this $100,000 will be spent upon the experimental farm at Kemptville, and for what purpose?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The expenditures will be as follows: general repairs, $500; emergency

repairs, $200; special repairs, painting of buildings, $300; repairs to the ice house, $150; greenhouse repairs, $2,000; repairs to poultry house, $200; and office furniture, $100.

Item agreed to.

Flags for Dominion public buildings, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT: In my movements about the country I have observed flags flying at night, and the result is that the flags are destroyed. With respect to flying flags there are instructions that should have been in force in this country for a very long time. I have noticed, for instance, the flag on the post office building here is frequently put up until it falls to pieces and another one is put in its place.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What post office does my hon. friend refer to?

Mr. BENNETT: I have observed this one at times. The situation has been remedied recently.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does my hon. friend mean in Ottawa?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does my hon. friend say that he has seen the flag flying after sundown?

Mr. BENNETT: I have certainly seen it flying after sundown.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think he is forgetting.

Mr. BENNETT: What is more, I have noticed the same thing many times in other places in the country. Hon. members will remember passing through communities and seeing flags flapping to pieces against the poles. Last year we spent $5,000 in buying new flags and this year we are going to spend another $5,000. Why should we wear out flags by leaving them up at night? I have gone into communities from the train late at night and seen flags flying, and I made my mind up to speak to the minister about the matter. I forgot about it and I decided that I would speak to the house about it. The deputy minister has, I understand, issued instructions with respect to the matter, and if they are not observed, and flags are permitted to be simply destroyed by the action of the wind, it strikes me that someone should be responsible in dollars and cents for them. To vote $5,000 every year for new flags to be destroyed is not sound economy.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If my hon. friend, or any other hon. member, or any other individual can give me the dates at which any flag on a public building in Ottawa has been left flying after sundown or at a time when it should not be flying, I shall be glad to have the matter looked into.

Mr. BENNETT: I mentioned Ottawa only as one instance.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The instructions are positive that flags shall fly from sunrise to sundown. I am not out very much at night to be able to say what is being done. I have never seen the flag flying on the post office in the evening. I think my hon. friend is really under a misapprehension. I know he thinks he is right.

Mr. BENNETT: I have no doubt I am right.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If he can give me the date, I shall be glad to have the matter looked into.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend from South Wellington, beside me, says that he recalls the same thing. There is just a tendency on the part of the Minister of Public Works, in the language of the street, to get "a bit too gay." His reply about not being out at night is absurd. Let us get down to business.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am listening to what my hon. friend is saying and I will answer him as soon as he has finished.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps an appropriation of $5,000 does not appear to him as being important, although it may be that somebody in London or somewhere else can supply the flags. That is not the question. The question is: Are we to have flags destroyed by flapping against poles and by the action of the elements, and then new ones put in their places. I did not limit my observations to Ottawa, and if I look at my papers I think I can fix dates and places where I have seen flags flying at night last year, not in one province but in several. My hon. friend who sits beside me says that he has frequently noticed instances of this kind in Ontario.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am just a little surprised at my hon. friend's attitude. I do not think it adds to the dignity of debate in parliament for the leader of either party or any other hon. member in the house to resort to such expressions as he has done this afternoon.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend started it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Just wait until I have finished. I intend to answer my hon. friend now. When he refers to an hon. member as "getting a bit too gay," he knows he is on

weak ground, and he is on very weak ground when he refers to flags flying in the city of Ottawa after sundown. If he or the hon. gentleman who sits beside him can give me specific instances of flags flying on public buildings in Ottawa after sundown, I shall have the matter looked into.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not mention Ottawa.

Mr. BENNETT: I made to the Minister of Public Works an observation that in the common, ordinary, everyday expression he was "getting a bit too gay." This afternoon he has been regaling the house with cheap witticisms in his answers in regard to public business. In fact, hon. members have remarked it. We think the time has come when he should treat the matter seriously. If he thinks the dignity of parliament is raised by the remarks recorded in Hansard both yesterday and to-day, I am content, but I am directing attention to the fact that last year $5,000 was voted for flags and we are voting another $5,000 this year. If these flags were properly taken care of, the country would not need to be asked to spend $5,000 in renewing them. Incidentally, I said that I had come into this community and seen a flag flying on the post office building on a rainy night. I had come in on the train from Montreal. That is my recollection of what occurred. My memory may be defective, but I have remarked upon the same state of affairs in other places. I know in Alberta there are places where flags have been flying at night and flapping to pieces by the action of the elements. I mentioned the matter in the best of good faith, hoping that it might do something to save a little money. Then my hon. friend says: "I am not out at nights," and that is his answer to a serious question propounded in good faith to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I apologize to my hon. friend if I have interfered with his monopoly of cheap witticisms. I just want to say to him that I do not think he is doing himself justice this afternoon.

Mr. CANTLEY: I can give the minister some information in regard to flags. I can take him to towns where the flag has not come down for twelve months on end and, indeed, more than twelve months on end. I refer to public buildings. I have seen cases where a flag has been left flying until there is not one-third of it left. That is the situation as to some public buildings, there is no doubt about the matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Will my hon. friend give me the name of the town?

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. CANTLEY: I will a little later.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps he might do so now?

Mr. CANTLEY: I will not do it now. Before I am through, I will satisfy the minister that my statement is quite correct.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I do not know just how serious the matter is about flags flying for possibly a few moments after sundown. I have not witnessed that myself, but I am more than surprised to hear the leader of the opposition criticize an item of $5,000 in connection with flags on public buildings for the Dominion of Canada, when the same hon. gentleman is trying to get the house to say that we should spend $200,000,000 on a highway.

Mr. BENNETT: This exhaustive criticism ends the matter.

Item agreed to.

Military buildings — repairs, fittings and additions, $50,000.

Mr. QUINN: Is any of this appropriation of $50,000 for repairs to the citadel at Halifax?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think so.

Mr. QUINN: At this time last year I drew the attention of the minister to the disgraceful condition of the citadel at Halifax. As hon. members know, Halifax is one of the first British possessions in Canada. Since 1749 it has been the headquarters of the British army and navy in this country until the Imperial forces withdrew from Halifax and were replaced by Canadian forces. During the regime of the Imperial authorities, the forts, barracks and buildings controlled by the army and navy were a source of pride to the people of Halifax and of the whole Dominion, but I regret to say that since they have been taken over by the Dominion authorities, these buildings have gradually sunk into decay. I pointed out to the committee a year ago that the walls of the fort at the citadel had tumbled down, and that they were being braced up with wooden braces. I drew that to the attention of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of National Defence, who is not now in the house, and I asked if they would take into consideration placing an item in the estimates for this year for the reconstruction of the walls of the fort in the ancient citadel of Halifax. Halifax is the eastern gateway to this Dominion, and thousands of people pass through its portals during the year. Nova Scotia has built up an

ever-increasing tourist trade, and citadel hill is one of the main points of historical interest that we have to show to visitors. As I pointed out twelve months ago, because of the disgraceful condition of the citadel hill, which has been neglected by this government since it has been under the control of the Department of National Defence, the service clubs of Halifax—the Progressive club, and others—feeling that the condition of the hill was a disgrace to the city have contributed out of their very meagre funds to try and give the slopes of the hill a decent appearance. I would urge the minister, in view of the historical value of the citadel at Halifax, to provide something in the estimates this year to repair the walls and give a decent appearance to the slopes of the hill.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That, again, is a matter that is not under the Department of Public Works; it is under National Defence. I believe, however, that certain consideration is being given to the very matter which my hon. friend mentions, but I will not speak positively as to that. I regret that my colleague the Minister of National Defence is not here at the moment, but I shall be very glad to forward my hon. friend's representations to him.

Mr. FRASER: How much of the appropriation of $50,000 for repairs to military buildings was expended last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There was expended up to March 31, $44,356.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): May I ask how much of this amount of $50,000 was spent on the military buildings in Kingston?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am sorry I am not able to give my hon. friend that information. I have the details of the proposed expenditure for this year.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will the minister supply me later with details of last year's expenditures, showing where it was spent?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be very glad to.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): At the same time will the minister tell the committee on whose authority the cover was removed from the Martello tower situated in the harbour at Kingston, in front of the old battery section? These old Martello towers are of great historical interest to visitors. I am very pleased to hear that something will be done in Halifax because that will, of course, open the way for consideration of work to be done in what is perhaps the next oldest city after Quebec and Halifax, namely, Kingston. The removing of the cover from the Martello tower in Kingston last year gave rise to quite a lot of criticism because it afforded some measure of protection to the tower. It has been a matter of criticism as to who ordered the removal of the cover. The minister having promised to give me the details of the expenditure on military buildings in Kingston, I would ask him if he can state to the committee now what work will be done this year out of this vote of $50,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think there has been any request for work at Kingston.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): This is just an amount placed in the estimates out of which requests that are made from time to time can be met; is that the idea?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, it would not be fair to my hon. friend to say that that was the case. Certain places have been indicated to us where the expenditure should take place.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Would the minister give the details?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The amount of $50,000 is to be expended as follows:

Toronto—Old Knox college, $10,200.
Montreal—drill hall, Craig street, painting, $3,000.
Montreal—drill hall, Craig street, installing plumbing fixtures, $4,700.
Montreal—accommodation for 3rd Victoria Rifles, $2,000.
Westmount—R.O.O.C. stores, pave land and erect roof over same, $3,100.
Chatham—armoury re-appropriate 2 basement rooms, $1,500.
Red Deer—gun shed—addition to armoury, $7,000.
Amherst—armoury—drainage, $4,000.
Prince Rupert—old immigration building R.C.N.V.R., $1,000.
Yorkton—new gun shed, $7,000.
Three Rivers—drill hall gun shed for 79th battery, $14,000.
Brockville—armoury—new floor, $4,500.
Gananoque—armoury—new floor, $2,600.
Napanee—armoury—new floor, $3,750.
Pembroke — armoury — new roof covering, $4,300.
Alterations, etc. to rented premises, $18,551.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That totals up to a good deal more than $50,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. They have asked for $91,201, and we are trying to get by with $50,000. With regard to the Martello tower at Kingston, that also is something over which this department has no jurisdiction; it comes under National Defence.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I would ask the minister to give me details of the work to be done out of this vote of $50,000. The work is done by the Public Works department?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I would like to get the details of the work to be done.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will the repairs and work in connection with the old Sydenham hospital, which is now the military headquarters, be done under this vote?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would not think that would come under military hospitals.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): No, it is no longer a hospital, it is military headquarters. A great deal of work has been done there.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If any request had come it would be in this list of requests, but apparently there has been no such request.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is rather peculiar because these are very old buildings, and every government has had to repair them year after year.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think they make repairs to the one building two years in succession. But I shall be very glad to furnish to my hon. friend all the information we have in regard to it.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): About what time may I expect to get that detailed statement? I should like to have it in time for the National Defence estimates.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I can get it for my hon. friend by the next sitting of the house I think.

Item agreed to.

Military hospitals—repairs and improvements, $80,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will the minister give the same details in this case? What military hospitals have been repaired?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The summary of requirements presented to this department for 1929-30 is as follows:

Ste. Anne de Bellevue	$17,500
Halifax, Camp Hill	9,500
Toronto, Christie street	6,500
London, Westminster	15,000
Winnipeg, Deer Lodge	5,000
Calgary, Colonel Belcher hospital	1,250
Vancouver, Shaughnessey	14,500
St. John, N.B., Lancaster	6,000
Contingencies	4,750
Total	$80,000

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): These are all hospitals under the Pensions department?

Mr. ELLIOTT: They are under Health, I think.

[Mr. A. E. Ross.]

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The Department of Health and Pensions. Then they are not really military hospitals; those come under military buildings.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is all we are taking care of.

Item agreed to.

Public buildings—generally, $45,000.

Mr. FRASER: What was spent last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The total vote was spent.

Item agreed to.

Purchase of stamp cancelling machines, $55,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, I think we should have some explanation of this item. The stamp cancelling machines used in Canada have in some instances been leased; in others, purchased. I dare say the hon. minister has received, as I have, a communication from a firm in the United States that was prepared to manufacture in this country and sell to postmasters stamp cancelling machines. They were not permitted to do so because the postal department would not permit the postmasters to use them. That, of course, is a matter for the Post Office Department, not the Department of Public Works. What stamp cancelling machines are being purchased for $55,000, where are they being used, and by whom are they being manufactured?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required to complete the payment on twenty-five stamp cancelling machines purchased by authority of an order in council passed on June 8, 1927, from Mr. G. H. Robert of Montreal at a cost of $2,500 for each machine. Delivery of three machines was made in 1928-29 and the sum of $1,500 was paid on account of the purchase price of same pending a final acceptance by the Post Office Department. The remaining twenty-four machines will not be delivered until 1929-30, and consequently it is necessary to revote the sum of $55,000 for payment of them.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Where are they made?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think they are manufactured in Montreal by the Robert concern. The information I have is that they are machines of the A type, manufactured by G. H. Robert of Montreal.

Mr. BENNETT: There has been a good deal of discussion about these machines. Have they proved satisfactory? I received a communication stating that only a few of them had been delivered, and that they had not

been entirely satisfactory, also that offers had been made from other sources but the department had said no. If these machines were required when the order was given for twenty-five, why is it that two years are allowed to elapse with only three delivered, and the other twenty-two not to be delivered until some time next year? It was also alleged that these machines were covered by an American patent and were assembled in Canada, not manufactured in the sense in which that term is properly used.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think there is something in what my hon. friend says as to these machines being largely in an experimental stage. The latest report I have from the Post Office Department is that for years the practice has been to rent stamp cancelling machines manufactured by the Postage Meter Company of Stamford, Connecticut. At present ninety-two machines are rented at an annual rental of $15,850. This company offered to sell these machines outright to the Post Office Department for the sum of $63,050, but the report on them was not altogether favourable. It was thought that it would be better to purchase these machines. I fancy the reason for the revote is that the department is trying the machines out to make absolutely sure that they are satisfactory before the balance of the purchase price is paid. The desire of the department is to buy a Canadian machine if it will fill the requirement, that is, a machine made in Canada, rather than continue the practice that has been followed in the past.

Mr. BENNETT: There is a contract or there is not. If there is a contract, we should see it. My information is that the machine parts are brought into the country and duty paid upon them and then they are assembled here. That may be inaccurate, but I do know that a firm in New York offered to establish in Canada a factory to produce stamp cancelling machines, which they said they could sell for about $250 apiece. They offered to sell them to postmasters throughout the country, the larger machines to be operated by power and the smaller by hand, but the Post Office Department declined the offer. It seems to me that we should have definite information as to whether or not these machines are being manufactured or assembled in Canada, and whether or not they are covered by an American patent. If the latter is the fact, then of course we are no further ahead than when buying an American machine.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The Postmaster General would be able to answer the question. We have only a limited amount of detail but I shall be glad to give such information as we have, and I think it bears out what the hon. gentleman has said. This order in council was passed authorizing the purchase of 25 stamp cancelling machines of a certain type, manufactured in Montreal, and the conditions of purchase included what he has mentioned. I have not the agreement here, but there was a stipulation that a quantity of parts should be kept in store in case replacements were needed, the services of a mechanic to be at the disposal of the department for one year free of charge. The memorandum I have from the Deputy Postmaster General states:

> The proposal of the Postage Meter Company is not favourable for the following reasons:
> Their products are not manufactured in this country.
> The duty, freight, sales tax, etc., are not taken into consideration.
> The speed of the Canadian machine is double the American type, and the date and time changes are automatic, eliminating the present handling of loose type and consequent delays in the despatch of mail; further, the centrifugal system of inking insures a gradual flow and precludes the damaging of letters as is common at the present time. . . . .
> Will you, therefore, kindly proceed to supply this department with the Canadian machine.

The reason why they have not been paid for during the last year are not here indicated, and the matter is still in a more or less experimental stage; it is being worked out.

Mr. BOYS: The machines were bought subject to their giving satisfaction.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: I presume also, from the fact of there being two revotes, that there must have been some reason why the money was not actually spent and the machines purhased. Perhaps it would indicate that up to that particular time the machines had not been satisfactory, and that it was felt the money should not be spent, but a revote asked for so that the department might be ready to pay when the machines were found to be satisfactory.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is about the size of it. We were asked to secure the revote inasmuch as the machines were still—

Mr. BOYS: Under test.

Mr. ELLIOTT: —being tried out.

Mr. BOYS: But surely it does not take two years to test machines like these. As a layman I should think that a month would do it. It is purely a matter of seeing that they stamp at the rate per minute called for

in the contract and that the work is not blurred but is done efficiently so that it can be easily read. It does not take two years to do that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My information is that certain changes have been found to be necessary in the machines and an effort is being made to work this out so as to render the machines entirely satisfactory. There is no question about the speed; they are much speedier than the previous machines. In certain other respects, however, they were not altogether satisfactory and attention is being paid to this aspect of the matter.

Mr. BOYS: What has been found to be wrong?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not know; all I can say is that we were asked to revote the money. The machines were being tried out and the purchase had not been completed.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why is the Department of Public Works concerned with this matter at all? This is a question of supplies for the Post Office Department; why does not that department look after it? Why charge this $55,000 to public works?

Mr. BOYS: The Department of Public Works does not buy mail bags.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is the type of office equipment which apparently has always been included in supplies furnished by the Department of Public Works to the Post Office Department. It is included among such supplies as lock boxes and office furniture.

Mr. BENNETT: Not mail bags.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No; but the mail bag is hardly office equipment in the same sense as a cancelling machine. The Department of Public Works, possibly, might very well have contended that the Post Office Department should supply these machines, but apparently equipment of this character has always been included as part of office furniture supplied by this department in connection with its buildings. I suppose that is the connection.

Mr. BOYS: What offices will get the benefit of these machines when installed?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The large offices, the city offices.

Mr. CANTLEY: Is it not a fact that this item and that of tractors are the only two items provided by the Public Works department for the Post Office Department?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There are such furnishings as filing systems, cancelling machines, conveyers, tractors, pick-up tables and so forth which we supply. I think it may be said generally that the list includes all mechanical equipment that goes into buildings we construct.

Mr. FRASER: What is the total amount in the estimates for the Post Office Department for the year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I can give the total for the purchase of these 25 machines.

Mr. FRASER: I mean, including all machines and other equipment such as pick-up tables, conveyers and so forth.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I cannot give that information.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Were any tenders called for in connection with the contract?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I should not imagine it was a contract that could be let by tender, because there is only one manufacturer in Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: There is a real complaint to be made in this regard. The Raymond Corporation offered to construct a factory in Canada to supply, not these identical machines but stamp obliterating machines, and the government declined to permit the sale of them to postmasters; at any rate, it declined to permit postmasters to buy them if they wanted to pay for them themselves, in face of the contract which had been made with the Robert Manufacturing Company. I understand, of course, that the Minister of Public Works in a sense is not responsible for that contract, which was made by the department under the control of the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot). But we should see the contract itself in order to arrive at some conclusion as to why an exclusive right like this should be given to a company—for it amounts to that when you decline to permit anyone else to sell similar machines to postmasters. You refuse to allow others who desire to establish a factory in Canada to sell large and small machines for use by country postmasters, and other equipment as well, such as power machines, hand machines and so forth. In the meantime these experiments are going forward and only three machines have been installed, according to the minister; I thought there were five. One of these machines, I am advised, is in the Ottawa post office. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not know. The fact that we have not been requested to pay the money but to revote it is perhaps the reason why we have not scrutinized the present status

of the matter as carefully as we should have done if we were asked to pass an order in council providing the money. Only $1,500 has been paid out of the whole vote—

Mr. BENNETT: No, $7,500.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There are three machines, and $1,500 has been paid on each.

Mr. BENNETT: That is only $4,500.

Mr. BOYS: Is there anything in the contract giving this company the exclusive right to supply these machines and preventing others in Canada from supplying similar equipment?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think the contract is exclusive; if any hon. gentleman wants to see the contract, so far as I am concerned all the papers in my department in this connection are available.

Mr. BOYS: At the moment I would not think my leader altogether right on this point; I would think the contract should have been made by the Public Works department at the request of the Post Office Department.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think we make all contracts where we have to pay the money.

Mr. BOYS: Then the minister might produce the contract, because the exclusive feature strikes me as rather serious. If the contract is to be in force for five or six years it means that the whole thing is in the hands of this one concern.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend will understand that this is a very different class from an article for which there is a very general demand all over the country. This is something which never has been manufactured in Canada, something we were unable to obtain here previously. If an industry can be built up in Canada the government are anxious that that be done.

Mr. BOYS: I am glad the minister is coming to that point of view; we have been advocating that policy for a long time.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We are agreed upon something, anyway. I think my hon. friend will see the fairness of saying to these people, "Go ahead and try to work it out and if you can get a machine equally satisfactory or almost as satisfactory as this machine you will get the business." In the meantime I think they should have a free hand and should be protected from outsiders, otherwise they would not enter into the contract.

Mr. BOYS: Without knowing what is in the contract and without the minister being able to inform us it would be improper and undesirable to offer any criticism, but it does seem to me that this is a matter which might well engage the attention of the committee. Perhaps before disposing of this item we should see the contract, so I think the minister might let the item stand until the contract is produced.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would direct my hon. friend's attention to the fact that this is a re-vote; the same item has been passed several times.

Mr. BOYS: That is one of the reasons for this criticism. If everything were satisfactory a re-vote would not be necessary; the money would have been paid long ago.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would rather pass the item now if possible, and I will undertake to supply my hon. friend with all the information.

Mr. BOYS: So far as I am personally concerned of course I take the word of the minister at once, but is it really vital that this item should be passed at this time? If all the estimates of the minister were going through I would not try to hold them up because of this, but I do not suppose they are all going through now. However, I will leave it to the judgment of the minister; it seems to me that the request is fair and might be complied with, but if the minister prefers to pass the item and produce the contract later that will be quite all right. When will the contract be produced?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will produce it at the next sitting, before my estimates are completed.

Mr. BENNETT: Then this item might be passed on the understanding that we can refer back to it if we wish to do so after the production of the contract.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Very well.

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 130; rents, repairs, furniture, heating and so on.

Ottawa public buildings and grounds—water, $45,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Would the minister give us some information as to the water supplied to the public buildings in Ottawa?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount of $45,000 is required to pay the corporation of Ottawa for water supplied to the various departmental buildings during the year 1929-30, by agreement between the Dominion government and the corporation of Ottawa as authorized by act of parliament passed June 4, 1925, and assented to June 12, 1925.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is the drinking water in these buildings now supplied by the city of Ottawa?

Mr. ELLIOTT: All the water coming from the taps is supplied by the city. There is a certain amount of bottled water supplied in the House of Commons and in several of the other departmental buildings but that is not provided under this contract.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Where does the bottled water come from?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is supplied by the Tally Ho Company.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What examination is made of the water?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does my hon. friend refer to the tap water or the bottled water?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The tap water.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The city bacteriologist tests the city water.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): And what about the bottled water?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I cannot tell you anything about that; we do not buy it and we do not pay for it. It is paid for through the estimates of the House of Commons.

Mr. BOYS: Can the minister tell us whether or not it is safe to drink the tap water at present? I am asking that question very seriously.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The city officials say it is safe, and I drink it every day.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am given to understand that the city water is not absolutely safe. What about this Tally Ho water? We should have some information; if that is perfectly safe water we should know by whom the examination is made.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I want to give all the information I can but that water is paid for out of the estimates of the House of Commons. My good friend the Sergeant-at-Arms tells me that the Tally Ho Company supplies certificates once a month showing the tests of the water which have been made, but the payment for the Tally Ho water is not made under the Public Works estimates.

Mr. McGIBBON: I think the question raised by the hon. member for Kingston is very important. This subject has been under consideration year after year and apparently no negotiations have been entered into with the city of Ottawa leading to an adequate supply of pure water. The very fact that the water must be chlorinated is sufficient evidence that we are taking a certain amount of risk when we drink it, and I think I am within the bounds of truth when I say there is great danger of this water being contaminated by sewage. Its very appearance suggests that; one almost dislikes to take a bath in it, let alone drink it. I have not drunk city water since I came to Ottawa; I have been afraid to do so, and when the government pays $45,000 a year for water presumably for this and other government buildings I think that should warrant us entering into negotiations with the city. I would ask the minister if anything has been done in that connection.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, I think not. The government has contracted for the best water supply available, and this is the water which is used by the citizens of Ottawa. According to reports which have emanated from the city council I understand that a filtration plant is about to be established, but we must remember that the water supply for this city has been a difficult problem. However, it is a municipal problem and this seems to be the best arrangement we are able to make at present.

Mr. McGIBBON: I am not criticizing the minister for his arrangement because all municipal governments have to have some pressure put upon them. It is a well known fact that the city of New Orleans, which takes its water from the Mississippi river, has one of the purest supplies of drinking water on the continent, while the city of Ottawa with probably 110,000 people is pumping its water out of the Ottawa river which carries the sewage from the northern country. They have nothing more than a chlorinating system and it is quite patent to anyone that if that system should be defective for twenty-four hours there is the possibility of a typhoid epidemic. The department is probably one of the largest contributors in the form of revenue and some pressure should be brought to bear upon the municipal government to have them supply pure drinking water to the people.

Mr. MANION: In fairness to the city authorities, I think it should be mentioned that there has been a commission investigating the problem and I think they have decided upon a filtration plant. What the member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) says is absolutely correct, but we should not forget that the city is considering this problem at the present time and has under consideration the construction of a filtration plant to properly filter the water.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is being done now?

Mr. MANION: It is being chlorinated.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I do not think the minister should be satisfied with the statement that this water is pathologically examined every day. I am rather surprised that a statement is submitted only once a month for the Tally-Ho water. That is not sufficient and does not give protection to the public. One or two cases of typhoid in the city of Ottawa might very well start an epidemic over the whole Dominion, when we consider that these are the days of quick transportation by automobile and train. I think there should be some statement from the minister that the water has been examined every day, and there should be a certificate of safety. There is no question that chlorination is quite safe, but the mere statement as to chlorination is not satisfactory unless it is regularly done. The minister should be able to furnish some statement of a safe water supply every day, or there should be a statement given on the days when it is not considered safe. The city can look after itself but there should be a statement issued in the house on the days when the water is found to be wrong. When we come to these estimates we can look into the matter of the Tally-Ho water and see that a statement is given more often than once a month.

Item agreed to.

Elevator attendants, $104,000.

Mr. CANTLEY: I notice this item is $7,000 more than it was last year. I may be responsible for this because on March 13—six weeks ago—I asked the minister regarding the operation of elevators in the building, especially on Saturdays. I understood the minister to say that these elevators would thereafter be operated on that day. The minister's statement was:

> However, if it is found that anybody is suffering inconvenience on account of inadequate elevator facilities, either going up or going down, we will endeavour to rectify it.

I would point out to the minister that this condition is not rectified as yet. His deputy minister is beside him and I understand he is the man in charge of the elevators and I expect him to carry out the distinct understanding which I had with the minister on that occasion. I trust that I will not have to bring this matter up again and that these elevators will be operated for the balance of the session.

Item agreed to.

Lighting, including roads and bridges, $100,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the minister will remember that we discussed last year the possibility of using the electric current from the turbines at New Edinburgh. One hundred thousand dollars represents interest at 5 per cent on $2,000,000, and I would like to know from the minister what progress has been made in connection with the utilization of these turbines.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The information is that the requirements for research purposes will take up practically all the power that we have at that site. It is the intention to utilize the power at the Edinburgh mills for supplying all power in connection with the research work, and the information is that there will be no surplus.

Mr. BENNETT: What does it cost per kilowatt hour for the government's requirements?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The difference between the rates charged the government and the ordinary city rates is that the government is allowed 15 per cent and 12 per cent discount against 10 per cent discount in the city rates. The alternating current lighting rate on meter is 5 cents a kilowatt hour for the first 30 hours' monthly use of the installed capacity, 2.2 cents a kilowatt hour for the next 70 hours, and one-half cent a kilowatt hour for monthly consumption in excess of the above. The discount when bills are paid within thirty days is 12 per cent if the transformers serving any building are owned by the company, and 15 per cent where such transformers are owned by the government.

Mr. BENNETT: The last figure of one-half cent is a very reasonable one, but the 5 cent figure is very high. Does the minister know the average we pay per kilowatt hour?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We use enough to get the half cent rate, and I understand it is the cheapest rate in Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh, yes, the half cent rate is very cheap.

Item agreed to.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I would like to refer back to the question of elevators, and to ask the minister what salaries the elevator attendants receive. I understand that most of the men are returned soldiers and that their salary is only about $80 per month. If that is so I would ask that that salary should be raised to at least $100 per month.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend is correct in regard to their being returned men. There are twenty-six operators at $105 a month, twenty-three at $100, two at $95 and fifteen at $90.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Why the discrimination if they are all doing the same class of work? Why should there not be a minimum salary of $100 a month?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We start them at a minimum and they rise to a maximum.

Mr. ADSHEAD: They can go up to $105?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. ADSHEAD: And those who have recently entered the service are at $90?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Are they mostly married men?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We do not have information as to that.

Mr. ADSHEAD: They ought to receive a salary of at least $100 a month, and I should like the minister to consider the matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT: They will after they are in the service a certain length of time. My hon. friend, I think, will agree with me that a new man who has just been hired, should not receive as much as a man who has been in the service for some time.

Mr. ADSHEAD: It does not take long to learn how to run an elevator. After a month's work I think, if they are returned men, they ought to get $100 a month.

Mr. McGIBBON: What do they do between sessions?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There are fourteen sessional men who are employed for seven months at $90 a month. All the rest are employed throughout the year.

Mr. McGIBBON: What do the fourteen do during the rest of the year? Are they off?

Mr. ELLIOTT: They are off.

Mr. McGIBBON: What do the others do?

Mr. ELLIOTT: They are employed all the time.

Mr. McGIBBON: What are they doing?

Mr. ELLIOTT: They are running elevators.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Is the salary paid once or twice a month?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Once a month.

[Mr. Adshead.]

Mr. ADSHEAD: I think it ought to be paid at least twice a month to workingmen.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My deputy informs me that it was paid once a month prior to the last payment, but they are now being paid twice a month.

Mr. McGIBBON: Does the minister not think the government might find some work for these men who are off at the end of the session? Could something not be found for them somewhere to give them an all-year-round job?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am sure that different departments, if they have anything on which they can use them, will try to use them, but I would point out that if you are to keep expenditures within reasonable bounds, you can pay the men only for the time they are actually employed; you cannot undertake to furnish employment for the balance of the year for what are called temporary employees. Many of them fit into other positions during the rest of the year, but there is no assurance of that.

Mr. McGIBBON: I quite agree on general principles with the minister, but in my opinion the working man or woman is the last person on whom to start economizing. After all, what would $90 a month for five months for ten or fifteen people amount to? These people have to live, and if we expect to have them here in the winter time as trained men, the government should endeavour to find some work for them in order to give them continuity of employment.

Item agreed to.

Heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen, $420,000.

Mr. MANION: How is the increase of $20,000 made up?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The increase is due to the employment of four men at the Sussex street property at a cost of $5,100 per annum, and to an increase in the quantity of coal at a cost of $15,037, due principally to provision for five new buildings.

Item agreed to.

Departments generally—char service, including $150 to E. Snowden for firing the noon gun.

Mr. SPENCER: I should like to draw the minister's attention to the fact that the char service is probably the lowest paid service in the government. I understand, although there is a slight difference between the char service engaged in the House of Commons

and that engaged in the public buildings in Ottawa, those in the public buildings in this city receive about $32.50 a month, or less than $400 a year. Their hours are not long, but they are very awkward. They make it nearly impossible for them to get other work during the day. I understand no allowance is made when they are sick, and they have no holidays. A large percentage of them are widows. Could the minister not see his way to recommend an increase in salary for this service?

Mr. McGIBBON: I think that is a fair question for the minister.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I might say that the question is a very live one. It is receiving consideration all the time. We are not allowed to forget about it any month in the year. We are trying to do what is fair, and at the same time keep the expenditure within reasonable bounds. I cannot make any promise with regard to the matter.

Mr. SPENCER: I agree with the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario that these people are the last ones on whom we should endeavour to economize. Like everybody else, they have to live. If we consider that their day is completely cut up by the work they do in the government service, I think the amount they are allowed is altogether too little to give them even a low standard of living.

Mr. BENNETT: How many char people are there?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There are over 900 charwomen.

Mr. BENNETT: I thought the number was 847.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Somewhere around 900. I have had interviews with them and I know something about their difficulties. Everybody has a good deal of sympathy with what has been said as to the person who has to earn a living cleaning an office and that sort of thing, but I am sure the house will agree with me that women who receive $1.25 for two and a half hours' work and many of whom have other work during the day because they are through at nine, are receiving all that can well be justified for persons in part time employment of that kind.

Mr. PECK: What difference would it make to give them $2 a day instead of $1.25?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The rate of $1.25 a day is for part time employees and they work only two and a half hours.

Mr. PECK: What would it cost to make that payment $2 instead of $1.25?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It would cost three-quarters of $900 or about $675; that is a day. Perhaps this is no answer, but there are very few public services for which the competition is as keen as for this one.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How many buildings are covered by these nine hundred? If you could cut down the number, perhaps you could give the rest decent pay. Can the minister give a detailed statement showing where these nine hundred are employed?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The number of buildings, as of November, 1928, was 71; the number of men, 101; women, 779, or a total of 880 employees. The area covered is 2,372,429 square feet.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister has accounted for 880 of the 900. Where are the other 20?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am not able to find the other 20. I was speaking approximately.

Mr. McGIBBON: Has the minister any charwomen employed as all-day employees, and what pay do they receive?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We have no charwomen who are all-day employees. We have six full-time men.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I would like to find out where the 20 are which the minister has lost.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have lost more than that.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Surely the minister can give us a little more accurate information than that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: When I said 900, I was speaking approximately; I was not attempting to give the figure accurately. The figures I gave were for November, 1928, and I fancy that 900 is probably correct or nearly correct for to-day.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How many are employed in this building and how many in the other buildings? This is rather a large number of employees.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The details are as follows:

List of Buildings and Areas Cleaned

Government owned:	Sq. Ft.	Charwomen	Charmen	Foreman
West block	166,296	42	12	1
East block	152,756	38	11	1
Langevin block	122,701	28	6	
Connaught building	137,882	49	6	1
Hunter building	225,000	75	9 2f.t.	1
Victoria museum	136,976	41	5 1f.t.	1
Daly building	149,300	52	6	
City post office	36,264	2	3 f.t.	
Printing bureau	10,000	5		
Archives	38,646	13	1 f.t.	
Royal Mint	8,675	2	1	
35 George st	3,800	2	1	
Mines, Sussex and George	22,147	11	1	
Supreme Court	18,000	8	1	
4 and 6 Cliff st	6,000	1		
21 Cliff st	3,700	1		
25 Cliff st	3,435			
27 Cliff st	1,129	2		
114 Vittoria	6,900	2		
115 Vittoria	3,790			
117 Vittoria	8,000	2		
239 Wellington st	8,208	2		
259 Wellington st. (Kennedy)	10,500	2		
265 Wellington st. (Trade and Commerce)	21,345	3		
279 Wellington st	3,646	1		
299 Wellington st	7,909	2		
389½ Wellington st	2,600	1		
Old Perley home	7,854	4	1	1
Comparator building, MacKay st	1,662	1	two days a week	
167 Queen St. (Harris Campbell)	26,142	7	1	
Green Island	70,777	27	2	
Rented:				
108 Wellington st	5,589	3		
Norlite building, Wellington st	42,516	18	2	
Union bank, Sparks st	66,863	24	1	1
Royal bank, Sparks st	17,283	7		
Birks building, Sparks st	10,822	5	1	
Booth building, Sparks st	19,739	8	2	
Free Press, Sparks st	12,667	4		
Motor building, Sparks st	21,174	11	1	
Imperial Garage, Sparks st	650	1		
Vimy building, Sparks st	26,500	7		
Bate building, Slater st	27,260	13	1	
Canadian, Slater st	100,600	31	4	1
Woods, Slater st	67,858	25	4	
Elgin building, Elgin st	47,160	24	3	1
Elgin annex, Elgin st	14,340	5		
66 Queen st	14,000	5		
Robinson building, Queen st	22,841	9	1	
McKenzie building, Queen st	27,000	6	1	
Regal building, Queen and O'Connor	24,226	8	1	
Bryson building, Queen st	9,000	3		
Trafalgar building, Bank and Queen	18,534	8		
Stephen building, Queen st	9,870	4		
Lamb building, 317 Queen st	16,900	5		
328 Queen st	2,976	1		
Earlscourt, Lyon st	14,055	1		
Federal Press, 47 Slater st	7,220	4		
Reclamation, Slater and Metcalfe	11,748	4	1	
Jackson building, Slater and Bank	66,115	30	3	1
Lowe-Martin, Nepean st	10,000	3		
Central station, Rideau st	23,761	11	2	1
Transportation building, Rideau st	41,648	15	2	
Plaza building, Rideau st	10,156	7		
Larocque building, Rideau st	14,500	6	1	
Labelle building, Dalhousie st	57,500	19	1	
67 Queen, Steele building	14,131	1		
68 Queen, Steele building	3,705	1		
Arcade building	22,000	6	1	
122 Wellington	1,200	1		
Sovereign building	15,048	7	1	
McDougall building	11,140	2		
Total	2,372,429	779	101	11

Mr. BOYS: How many of these buildings are private residences?

Mr. ELLIOTT: None.

Mr. SPENCER: I understand the charwomen working in the House of Commons are allowed sick leave pay up to four days on presentation of a doctor's certificate, but that the charwomen in the outside service, who are doing work which is more regular and of a permanent nature, are not allowed this privilege. It seems unreasonable that they should not be given the same consideration as the smaller number of women working in the House of Commons.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think the same applies to both.

Mr. SPENCER: But it does not.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am afraid I did not understand my hon. friend as clearly as I should. Is he referring to whole-time employees or to charwomen?

Mr. SPENCER: I am referring to charwomen in both cases. I understand that the charwomen employed in the House of Commons are allowed sick leave up to four days on production of a doctor's certificate. Will the same consideration be given to charwomen in the outside buildings?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The charwomen who are getting sick leave are under another jurisdiction. I am not going to criticize its action one way or another in this respect; but I do not think my hon. friend will say that we should establish the practice of granting sick leave to employees who are working only two and a half hours a day.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Who makes the regulation as to sick leave with regard to the charwomen employed here

Mr. ELLIOTT: The Speaker.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That seems very extraordinary to me.

Mr. PECK: Are these people under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. PECK: They are appointed by whom?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Those in the char service are appointed by my department; those engaged here are appointed by the Speaker.

Mr. PECK: Who determines their remuneration?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The Department of Public Works.

Mr. PECK: Do you not think you are paying them an extremely low rate? What is your opinion?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Had my hon. friend been listening he would have found my opinion to be that they are pretty well paid. What does he pay to a woman who comes to work at his house for two hours and a half a day? I think $1.25 is very good pay.

Mr. PECK: I just wanted to know your opinion.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I expressed it before.

Mr. PECK: The general opinion throughout the country is that the smaller employees of the government, those who have no professional training, are paid at much too low a rate. I think it is not consistent with the dignity of the government to pay such low wages simply because they can get away with it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know this is a matter in which my hon. friend is interested, and I am sure he wants to be fair about it.

Mr. PECK: That is why I spoke.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The very fact that the crowd of applicants is as great as it is is the best evidence that they can do better here than in any other place in Ottawa.

Mr. CANTLEY: I think that is simply evidence that there are a lot of unfortunate women in very poor circumstances. They have to get up at five o'clock in the morning throughout the cold winter months and come up here in all sorts of weather, and if they miss a day they lose their job. The amount is not extravagant; in fact I do not think it is enough.

Mr. KENNEDY: Has the minister forgotten about that prosperity statement?

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let the minister's statement go unchallenged that no consideration is to be given to these charwomen in time of sickness. I think he would do well to copy the example of the Speaker in allowing them sick leave for a certain number of days if they submit a doctor's certificate. Although they work only two and a half hours a day, the minister overlooks the fact that they often have to come a long distance, which means two journeys a day. These people should be given a little consideration in time of sickness.

Item agreed to.

Repairs, improvements, additions and maintenance, $700,000.

Mr. MANION: This is a large figure. Will the minister give us details?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This money is required for carrying out works of repairs, alterations, additions and improvements, and procuring furniture, fittings and other supplies in connection with the maintenance of Ottawa public buildings. Also for the removal of snow and ice from sidewalks and roads around the department blocks, parliament house, and repairing, maintaining and cleaning during summer months the pavements and sidewalks on Wellington street and government area, to the north, the plaza, Laurier avenue bridge, St. Patrick street in front of the Printing Bureau, Mackenzie avenue, sidewalks on Laurier avenue west, and Elgin street, fronting Cartier square, and all laneways, yards and areas adjoining properties rented or owned and occupied by the Dominion government. Also for keeping the grounds surrounding the Dominion buildings in Ottawa in proper condition. This is the estimate for 1929-30: Staff of 258 men, compared with 252 men in 1928-29. We require six more men. The estimated cost for these men is $417,466; for materials, supplies and extra assistance, $242,534; for Dominion observatory and Geodetic Survey building, $5,000; for standardizing electric distribution system, $35,000, making a total of $700,000.

Mr. BENNETT: What is meant by "standardizing electric distribution system"?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is necessitated through the general standardizing by the Ottawa Electric Company of its distribution system throughout the city.

Mr. MANION: In regard to supplies, what are the large items?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The $242,534 provides for the purchase of materials, supplies and extra assistance required in the maintenance of the various buildings.

Mr. MANION: That is general. I should like a few particulars. For instance, how much is paid for furniture and for any other large items?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think I can give my hon. friend that information.

Mr. BENNETT: We make direct appropriations for furniture, filing cabinets and various other matters in the way of general equipment, and now we come to a general vote of $424,000. That is my difficulty.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have not the details asked for by my hon. friend (Mr. Manion) but I shall be glad to get them. It will be noticed however that the amount is $175,000 less than it was last year.

Mr. MANION: I was curious to know what it worked out at.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Last year's figures should not count. If the minister looks back a year or two in his estimates he will see that the old figure stood for years at $650,000 and it was suddenly raised to $875,000, being now $700,000. So that there is really an increase over the vote of former years. I have the old estimates here and the amount in 1927 and 1928 was $650,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: You shouldn't keep those old estimates.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Oh yes, I intend to.

Mr. MANION: The minister will give later the items I asked for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Rideau Hall—allowance for fuel and light, $19,000.

Mr. SPENCER: How much of this was spent last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It has been about the same for years.

Item agreed to.

Telephone service, $105,000.

Mr. BENNETT: With respect to telephone service the inquiry is as to how many telephones are purely public and how many private.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount of $105,000 is required for the payment during the fiscal year 1929-30 of the rental of the Bell Telephone Company's connections throughout the several departments of government in the city of Ottawa.

Summary of Requirements for 1929-30

Residence telephones:				
Desk sets	68			
Wall sets	50	118		
Desk extensions	40			
Wall extensions	8	48	$ 5,167 08	
Direct connections office:				
Desk sets	29			
Wall sets	15	44		
Desk extensions	12			
Wall extensions	1	13	4,271 64	
Private branch exchange telephone connections:				
Desk sets	1,553			
Wall sets	86			
Desk extensions	481			
Wall extensions	19	2,139	$43,796 52	$53,235 24
House of Commons for sessional service: (approximately)		275		4,287 45

This brings the total number of telephones to 2,637, and the expenditures amount approximately to $108,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How many residence telephones are there?

Mr. ELLIOTT: 118.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What would they consist of? Usually, where residences are concerned, the people who have telephones pay for them themselves. In my business or any other business I know of, in connection with which communication is had with residences, the residents pay for the telephones.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The list includes ministers, deputy ministers and private secretaries.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why should private secretaries or even deputy ministers have telephones given them? Has that been always the custom? Is that one of the perquisites of office?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps my hon. friend will recall the discussion in this regard a year ago. For years this has been the system. At one time it was thought that it should be abolished so far as private secretaries were concerned; that was twelve years ago. Some of the private secretaries felt that inasmuch as these telephones were being used largely in communication back and forth in departmental business, and with the salaries they were receiving, they did not need telephones unless they were supplied. The telephones were consequently taken out and I believe the new order of things lasted about a week, after which they reverted to the present system. That was during the Meighen administration.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Did they go on strike?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, but they just were not so easily communicated with as before, and it was not advantageous to government business. I do not believe that if my hon. friend were running the office he would do with fewer telephones.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I run a business and I do not do what the government does in this regard.

Mr. BENNETT: Are long distance tolls paid for by the crown?

Mr. ELLIOTT: If on government business.

Mr. McGIBBON: Surely this is "a vicious principle," to quote the Prime Minister; it is worse than a vicious principle.

Mr. MANION: "A thoroughly vicious principle."

Mr. McGIBBON: Here are ministers receiving salaries of $10,000 and deputy ministers receiving the same, and the minister comes to parliament and seriously asks this house and the country to believe that the public business would be held up if these people were not supplied with this perquisite. The thing is ridiculous. If ministers need more money, if the deputies need more money, it is the duty of the government to come to parliament and say so and have the thing done openly. I think the one thing that is disgusting the public to-day with all people in public life—and we all have to contend with it—is the fact that these things are not done openly. We come here, and the general opinion in the country is that we are getting all kinds of perquisites, which I grant we are not, that are worth a great deal of money to us; in fact, we are looked upon more or less as a species of grafter. It is just things of

this sort, not done openly, that create in the country at large that misconception of our work and duties here. If these people need more money the government should come out boldly and give it to them, but not take the money out of the public treasury for things which after all are not in the public interest. Where is the minister or deputy minister today who would not have a telephone in his house, and where is there a telephone in anyone's house which is not used largely for domestic purposes? Once or twice, or three times in a week there may be a business call, but after all the telephone is largely for the convenience of the family and not at all in the public interest. I for one object to this sort of expenditure.

Mr. PECK: Will the minister tell us exactly what perquisites the members of the government get outside their salaries. What advantages do they receive? I might explain, as the previous speaker said, that a good many people talk about the perquisites of the ministers; for instance, I understand that they are all supplied with automobiles and chauffeurs at the public expense. Apparently they are supplied with telephones also, and I would like to know what other perquisites there are.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not know that I can think of any others at the moment; I think my hon. friend has covered them pretty well. He has a number of colleagues who are perhaps able to tell him just as well as any member of the government could. His question is quite proper and I do not object to it; there is the car, the chauffeur and the telephone.

Mr. BENNETT: Gasoline.

Mr. ELLIOTT: You cannot run a car without gasoline. As far as I am concerned, if there is anything the ministers are not given which my hon. friend could suggest and which would assist the ministers in carrying out their duties, I will be in favour of it. I will support anything which will increase the efficiency or conserve the time of the ministers, because I think that is necessary.

Mr. PECK: I do not want to be understood as saying it is wrong, but I want to point out that a minister would be just as efficient if he paid for his own car and chauffeur.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That would apply to telephones also.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is quite true, but probably he would not use them quite so much.

[Mr. McGibbon.]

Mr. PLUNKETT: Supposing I wish to call up the minister on the telephone tonight and his phone is busy owing to its use by the members of his family in connection with social engagements. Would that be increasing the efficiency of the minister? Are these telephones marked "for business only" or are they available for the social requirements of the entire family?

Mr. ELLIOTT: As far as my own telephone is concerned it is used for all the social engagements of all the members of the family. If my hon. friend or any of his colleagues wishes to call me up in a social way, so far as I am concerned that telephone will be always at his disposal. I should not think he would want any government to be carried on by ministers who would not allow their telephones to be used for social purposes. So far as I am concerned I shall be very glad to have him use my telephone any time he wishes to invite me out.

Mr. PLUNKETT: It is very easy to be gratuitous with the people's money; it is easy to spend it in this way, but the people must work hard for it.

Mr. GEARY: Is there any relation between the size of the motor cars and the size of the ministers concerned?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, I think they depend more on the size of the ministers' hearts.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Does the size of the car have anything to do with the efficiency of the minister?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think so.

Mr. SPENCER: Do any of the deputy ministers use government cars free?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, I think so.

Mr. SPENCER: How many?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think they all do, but if my hon. friend will refer to a return laid on the table a short time ago he will find all the details.

Item agreed to.

Fittings, general supplies and furniture, $175,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Here is an item which illustrates the principle which I was asking the minister to elucidate. We have the details of expenditures for fittings in various branches of the public service; why should we vote this amount of $175,000 without details and with no knowledge of what is covered by it? We voted an amount for a pick-up table for Saskatoon, another for Cal-

gary and another for Regina, but now we are asked to vote $175,000 with no details at all.

Mr. MANION: Before the minister answers that question I might point out another similar case. In this same item we have an amount of $420,000 for heating, salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen, and the item following the one now under consideration provides another $405,000 for heating. What is the reason for that?

Mr. ELLIOTT: One item is for Ottawa and the other is for outside places. With regard to the question of the leader of the opposition I might say that we must supply these fittings to the various offices during the year, and we can only judge the details by what we supplied last year.

Mr. BENNETT: That is exactly the point. What does this amount cover? Is it for filing cabinets and that sort of thing?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Furniture and fittings for offices generally.

Mr. BENNETT: Should not the requisitions be available before the estimates are submitted, in order that the government might know exactly what is required? That has been done in connection with the other items I have mentioned.

Mr. ELLIOTT: A great many of these requisitions come in from month to month.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Are there any new buildings to fit out? What is the reason for the increase? There is a very substantial increase over last year's estimate, and that was an increase over previous years.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I might answer that question by stating that the chief architect's memorandum, which was submitted some time before the estimates were prepared, suggested a vote of $200,000 for this year. We must rely very largely upon the requisitions of the chief architect, who has had a great deal of experience in connection with these matters. He recommended that the appropriation for 1929-30 be increased to $200,000, but we decided that we would try to keep it down to a minimum of $175,000. The vote for furniture and fittings for buildings was $135,000 for 1928-29.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And what amount was spent?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We spent $134,909. According to the memorandum submitted by the chief architect, as far back as June 30 the vote was over-engaged by $3,662, to meet the demands. Since that date the over-engagement has been steadily going up until on the 14th instant the very best we were able to do was something around $19,000. In addition to this over-engagement the chief architect says he is holding requisitions which are estimated to cost approximately $23,000 to fill, and there are further orders which have been placed on condition that the parties wait for payment until the next fiscal year, which amount to approximately $4,000. There are accounts outstanding amounting to $3,700.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would point out to the minister that this item was only $125,000 in 1926-27 and $125,000 in 1925-26; the further this government goes along the more extravagant it seems to get.

Item agreed to.

Heating, $405,000.

Mr. MANION: That is for the outside buildings?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, outside of Ottawa.

Mr. MANION: Are tenders called for the supplying of this coal?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, by public advertisement.

Item agreed to.

Power for running elevators, stamp cancelling machines, etc., $85,000.

Mr. SPENCER: There was an item covering a cancelling machine in vote No. 129, and I see it again in this vote. Is there any connection between them?

Mr. CHAPLIN: This is for power to run the machines.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is it the intention to use the power in the new Sussex street project?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would say to the hon. member that this matter was discussed when he was absent from the house. It is hoped that this power will be utilized for the research building which is now being constructed.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE

Bill No. 63, respecting The Toronto Terminals Railway Company.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 70, respecting Joliette and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Ferland.

NIAGARA FALLS MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMPANY

On the order.

House in committee on Bill No. 22, to incorporate Niagara Falls Memorial Bridge Company.—Mr. Pettit.

Mr. MANION: I notice that neither the mover of the bill nor the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin), both of whom are very much interested, is in the house. I think the bill should stand.

Order stands.

EFFIE MARGARET HILL

The house in committee on Bill No. 85, for the relief of Effie Margaret Hill.—Mr. Clark —Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the sponsor of this bill present?

The CHAIRMAN: Stand.

WILLIAM HENRY BLACKWELL

The house in committee on Bill No. 99, for the relief of William Henry Blackwell.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. MARCIL: When these bills were read a second time, I understood that we would take up the evidence when the bills were reported to the house and we went into committee. I notice the hon. member for Carleton is present. I should like to know what evidence there is in support of this bill.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): The evidence in this case is that William Henry Blackwell was married to Blanche Gregory. I am not quite sure of the year, but some six or seven years after they were married a child was born to this couple. They lived together for some months after that. The wife deserted the husband, who is maintaining the child, and she took upon herself to live with another man from which union a child was born. She is still living with this man and this child.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask whether there is in the recommendation from the Senate anything about giving the child into the custody of the father?

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): The child is in the custody of the father, who is quite satsified to let it remain there.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. MARCIL: Has the private bills committee of the House of Commons heard any evidence in connection with this bill, or has it merely accepted the evidence given before the senate committee?

Mr. ADSHEAD: I do not intend any criticism of those members of the private bills committee who are supposed to attend the sittings of the senate committee, but I asked some of them if they had attended any of the sittings of that committee and heard the evidence given before it. They acknowledged that none of them had attended the sittings of that committee or had heard any evidence. They said they had had no time to do so, and I am not censuring them on that account This shows what an utter farce it is for members of the House of Commons to be appointed on the senate committee when they have no time to attend, and yet we are led to believe that because they have attended the House of Commons is represented and therefore members of the House of Commons know something about the evidence. I take this opportunity to urge the government to implement their promise next session or as soon as possible to ensure that the granting of divorce will not be the farce it is at present.

Mr. MARCIL: I would ask the hon. member if the members of the commons who were asked to attend the meetings of the senate committee go there merely as spectators to witness what was going on, or do they take part in the deliberations of the committee?

Mr. ADSHEAD: I do not think they have any vote, but they listen to the evidence so as to be able to report back to the house.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: When we consented to have these bills given their first and second reading it was understood that there would be the fullest consideration in committee, but I am informed by members of the House of Commons committee on miscellaneous private bills that these bills passed the committee en bloc; so that so far as the House of Commons is concerned, not one tittle of evidence has been given to any member of the house other than is contained in the evidence as sent over from the senate.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I might say that the question was asked, "Is there any objection to this bill going through?" If there was no objection, the bill passed. That is all there was.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: These bills were passed through the committee without the evidence being brought up in any manner what-

soever. Therefore we have the curious situation that we are asked now, not on the second reading, but in committee, to pass these bills without their having been considered by any committee of this house. I would simply point out again that that is a very slipshod way of doing the business of the house. The sponsor of this bill has given us practically no information as to the reasons for this divorce other than that it has been recommended by the senate committee. There is one other question I would ask: Has the hon. member information as to whether the mother is satisfied that the father should have the custody of the child?

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): I would hardly expect that the child would want to live with the mother.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not think that would settle the matter in any court.

Section 1 agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: On division.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported on division.

JOHN WILLIAM TELFER

The house in committee on Bill No. 107, for the relief of John William Telfer—Mr. Garland (Carleton)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—marriage dissolved.

Mr. MARCIL: May we have some explanation of this bill?

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): As soon as I get the evidence I will send it over to my hon. friend.

Mr. MARCIL: I do not think that is the way to proceed in this house. The promoter of the bill ought to give an explanation and reasons why the bill should be adopted. Otherwise, I would ask that the bill stand.

Section 1 agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: On division.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported on division.

Mr. GARDINER: You might explain, Mr. Chairman, what you mean by calling "on division." I do not see any opposition at all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am opposing all these bills, even if I do not say so every time.

Mr. GARDINER: If there is any opposition, it is all right to call "on division," but if there is not, I object to it.

JAMES ROSS CURRY

The house in committee on Bill No. 109, for the relief of James Ross Curry—Mr. Garland (Carleton)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. MARCIL: May we have an explanation of this bill?

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 carry?

Mr. MARCIL: The public expect that when this house passes legislation relating to any matter it shall be done in the ordinary way. It has been a time-honoured custom in this house to give an explanation why the bill under consideration should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 carry?

Mr. MARCIL: I am waiting for an explanation, Mr. Chairman. Is it to be published throughout the whole of Canada that we pass these bills blindly without any explanation whatsoever I wish to register my protest against proceeding in this way. If the hon. member in charge of this bill wishes it to pass, he should at least give us some explanation.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no debate on the section, I shall have to call it carried.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, we are not going to allow matters to go through that way. The hon. member for Bonaventure has asked for an explanation of this bill, and I think we have a right to have the details. We are not prepared to adopt this legislation until the sponsor of the bill gives us something on which to base a judgment. The evidence has not been before a committee of this house, and we have right to have it here.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no debate it is the duty of the Chair to call the clause carried.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In the case of any other bill, Mr. Chairman, when an hon. member asks for an explanation it is forthcoming. That is all that has been asked for here.

The CHAIRMAN: I might point out that the Chair cannot force the sponsor of the bill to give an explanation.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then we shall have to vote down the bill.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): On the 9th of May, 1910, the petitioner, James Ross Curry, was lawfully married to Cora Lorine Curry. The license was duly obtained, and the marriage celebrated in the city of Buffalo, in the

United States. At the time of the marriage the petitioner and the said Cora Lorine Curry were domiciled in Canada. In 1927, the said Cora Lorine Curry deserted her husband, and obtained on December 30, 1927, in the state of New York, a decree purporting to be a dissolution of her marriage. On July 28, 1928, she went through a form of marriage with one Gordon W. Loney, and has since lived with the said Gordon W. Loney. On February 13, 1928, in the city of Buffalo, the said Cora Lorine Curry committed adultery with one Gordon W. Loney, and the petitioner ever since he discovered that fact has lived separate and apart from the said Cora Lorine Curry. He is now applying for a divorce, which has been recommended by the senate committee.

Mr. MARCIL: Was this evidence brought before a committee of this house or a committee of another house?

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): This evidence was brought before the senate committee. I am not a member of the private bills committee of this house, so I do not know whether the evidence was brought before it or not.

Section 1 agreed to on division.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported on division.

JANET GEE

The house in committee on Bill No. 120, for the relief of Janet Gee—Mr. Garland (Carleton)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1.

Mr. MARCIL: May we have some information in respect to this bill?

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): The petitioner in this case Florence Velma Strachan, was married on May 2, 1921, to Alexander Swinton Strachan at Toronto. At the time of the marriage the parties were domiciled in Canada. In 1926 or 1927 in the state of Florida the said Alexander Swinton Strachan committed adultery. His wife is now applying for a divorce, to which she is entitled. This evidence was taken before the senate committee.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, what bill are we dealing with?

The CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 120, letter N1 of the senate.

Mr. GARDINER: I understood the hon. member was giving evidence relative to the next bill, No. 123.

[Mr. W. F. Garland.]

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): This petitioner is Janet Gee.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, we cannot hear at this end of the chamber.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): In this case Janet Gee was married to Sidney Walter Gee in April, 1922. In October, 1928, in the city of Toronto, the said Sidney Walter Gee committed adultery and has since then on divers occasions committed adultery. The petitioner, Janet Gee, is now applying for divorce from her husband.

Section 1 agreed to on division.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported on division.

FLORENCE VELMA STRACHAN

The house in committee on Bill No. 123, for the relief of Florence Velma Strachan—Mr. Garland (Carleton)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to on division.

On the preamble.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, before the preamble carries I want to know if there are any children involved in this case.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): Yes, one child. The information will be found on page 7 of the evidence.

Mr. EVANS: In this case, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the following amendment:

That the said bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole for the purpose of amending it as follows:

1. That section one of the bill be amended by adding the following words thereto:—

"and the said Florence Velma Strachan shall have the custody of their child, and the said Alexander Strachan shall pay annually to the said Florence Velma Strachan for her support and maintenance, the sum of five hundred dollars, so long as she remains unmarried; and the sum of two hundred dollars annually for the support and education of their child."

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman's amendment is not in order according to standing order 113:

No important amendment may be proposed to any private bill, in a committee of the whole house, or at the third reading of the bill, unless one days' notice of the same has been given.

Therefore I rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances I would ask that the bill be held over. Under the present method

of handling these bills there is no possible way of knowing what particular bills will come up on any particular day. I suppose a hundred of these bills have come to us in this way. I spent some little time during the dinner hour going over a certain number of the bills that appear earlier in this list, but the sponsors not being in their places the bills were allowed to stand. Consequently we are skipping down the list to other bills which we have not had an oportunity of considering, and we did not know whether or not they would be called. Under these circumstances I think we should be given the right to move an amendment in committee of the whole, especially as the bills have not been considered in detail in the private bills committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Is my hon. friend making a motion?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am making a suggestion that under these circumstances this bill be held over until we have a chance to deal with it.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the desire of the committee that the bill should stand?

Mr. MARCIL: Mr. Chairman, it is only fair that this amendment should serve as a notice of motion. The custody of the child is the question raised now. It is too important to be set aside without consideration. I think the motion intended to be moved by the member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans), in fairness to the parties concerned, should be considered as a notice of motion.

Mr. VALLANCE: Does the private bills committee print its proceedings? It is not the privilege of every member of the house to be on that committee, and so there is no way in which they can follow its proceedings. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is a member of the private bills committee, I would judge that he is derelict in his duty if he does not know what has taken place there.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The hon. member is assuming a good deal when he assumes that I am a member of that committee. I am not.

Mr. VALLANCE: I said, if you were.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: But the whole point is in the "if." I am not a member of the committee, and therefore have no opportunity to attend its meetings.

Mr. VALLANCE: I still ask the question, Mr. Chairman, if the proceedings of the private bills committee are printed. If not, there is no way whereby this house can have the evidence in this case other than as it was adduced before the senate committee.

Mr. MARCIL: These bills were taken en bloc by the private bills committee and there is no evidence submitted to this house from that committee; we are going on the assumption of evidence heard in another chamber.

Mr. VALLANCE: If the bills are passed en bloc by that committee the responsibility is theirs; it is not the responsibility of this house.

Mr. MARCIL: The responsibility of this house consists in endorsing that procedure.

Mr. VALLANCE: It is endorsing the procedure of a responsible committee of the house appointed for the purpose. The hon. member (Mr. Woodsworth) has been objecting to all these bills and his whole complaint has been in regard to the evidence, which he has been neglecting to read. The evidence has been placed in his box and he has not read it. We have no other evidence to go on than that submitted by the senate committee.

Mr. ADSHEAD: As a member of the private bills committee, I told the house a little while ago that as each bill was taken up the question was asked by the chairman of the committee whether there was any objection to it.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): A short time ago I was one of those appointed by this house to attend the divorce committee in the senate. So far this session I have not had much opportunity to attend, but in other sessions I have attended on several occasions, and I can say that they have done their work, in my judgment, very satisfactorily. A short while ago when some of these divorce bills were before the house I protested against the procedure we had been following, and I am still of the opinion I then expressed. In my humble judgment the proper course to follow is for this house to pass a bill granting Ontario the right to have a divorce court. Practically every member of this house, I fancy, believes that this is the only way in which these divorce cases can be satisfactorily heard. As every member knows perfectly well, the private bills committee of the House of Commons does not hear any evidence at all; we accept the printed evidence submitted by the divorce committee of the senate. I have no doubt whatever that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and others who have raised objections in the course of

the consideration of these bills have objected only to the procedure which we follow, and which is not thorough. We cannot deal satisfactorily with these cases in this way. As I pointed out the other night, when a marriage is dissolved the question arises as to how the wife is to be provided for and how the children are to be taken care of. The amendment moved to-night is at least evidence of a desire on the part of some hon. members to provide some protection for the women and children involved in divorce suits. At the same time, although I do not agree that this house and the senate should be devoting their time to the consideration of divorce cases, instead of passing a bill to establish a divorce court in Ontario, from which province most of the divorces come, I am of the opinion that now that we have served notice on the house and to the country at large that the present procedure is unsatisfactory, we can do nothing better this session than grant the divorces that have come before us, disposing of the cases in the best manner we can. In my view that would be the best course to follow. On a previous occasion I objected to this procedure because I felt that there should be an expression of opinion on the part of the house that in its judgment, after several years' experience, the present practice had proved unsatisfactory. In many provinces, including the province in which I live, there are divorce courts, and I can say to every hon. member that divorces are very much better disposed of in those courts than they are by the method which we are obliged to follow in this house. I cannot see that we are going to gain very much by simply blocking the passage of these bills, although I do not suggest for a moment that anyone is blocking intentionally. As I see it, the motive is to bring more forcibly to the attention of the house and of the country the undesirable character of the present procedure which we are obliged to follow in passing divorce bills. I think it would be better for us to allow these divorce bills to go through this year. There are some hon. members who are strongly opposed to the principle of divorce, but I do not think the principle is at all at stake in the discussion of these bills.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): There seems to be some doubt in regard to the children in this case and as I do not want to do any injustice I would ask that the bill stand.

Preamble stands.

Progress reported.

[Mr. A. MacG. Young.]

WILLIAM HENRY LAVERTY

The house in committee on Bill No. 126, for the relief of William Henry Laverty.—Mr. Bothwell—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. BOTHWELL: In this case the petitioner and respondent were married in the year 1911 and subsequently lived in Fort William, Ontario, until 1921, when the respondent left home. In 1925 she was found living in Vancouver under the name of Mrs. Edgar D. Casseday. Evidence was given before the divorce committee of the senate by an independent witness, a former resident of Fort William, who happened to be residing at Vancouver, as to the circumstances under which the respondent was living there. She had apparently obtained a divorce in Minnesota and had married this man, and they were living together as man and wife.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I must thank the hon. member for such a clear statement; it is one of the best we have had. I am satisfied except on one point. I understand this woman obtained a divorce in the United States. Are not United States divorces recognized in such cases?

Mr. BOTHWELL: No.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to have the legal point explained.

Mr. BOTHWELL: American divorces are not recognized in this country. The petitioner and respondent were domiciled in Fort William at the time the wife left home. Apparently she went to Minnesota and there acquired domicile which enabled her to obtain a divorce according to the laws of that state. But that divorce is not recognized in Canada, and, so far as our laws are concerned, she has in fact committed bigamy in remarrying.

Mr. MARCIL: A judgment to that effect was rendered in Montreal in the past month, in which it was held by Judge Lacroix that Canadians securing divorces in the United States remained, in the eyes of Canadian law, married to the first partner.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We ought to have some statement of the case from the Minister of Justice. There are literally thousands of Canadians who have obtained divorces in the United States. In the phrase used in these bills, are they all to-day, "living in adultery"? Is the second marriage unrecognized and are their children by such marriage illegitimate? There are far-reaching consequences involved in the question.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They are taking their chance.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to have a statement from the Minister of Justice, who is an authority on matters of this kind, as to the position of these people according to our Canadian law.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would not like to say what position these people are in to-day, but I may tell my hon. friend that under the law a British subject desiring a divorce must secure it in the jurisdiction of his own domicile.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Does that necessarily invalidate a marriage which has taken place in the United States after a divorce has been secured in that country?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is not recognized here.

Mr. VALLANCE: It seems to me after the explanation given by the sponsor of the bill that this is the only place where this man may secure redress, the only court to which he can appeal as a resident of his province. The evidence as submitted by the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Bothwell) is conclusive; the only ground for divorce in this country is adultery and that adultery has been conclusively proved by the bigamous marriage of the other party.

Section 1 agreed to on division.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Preamble agreed to on division.

On the title:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask again whether, as a matter of law, that will mean that the other party will have the right to marry again?

Mr. VALLANCE: She is married now. You have no jurisdiction over her; she is married and in the United States.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: She is not married according to Canadian law.

Mr. VALLANCE: She is not here.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I understand she obtained a divorce which is not recognized in Canada, and subsequently she contracted marriage with another man. Just what her legal status may be at this time I am not prepared to say, but as far as the petitioner is concerned he is seeking the only redress he may obtain.

Title agreed to on division.

Bill reported on division.

JAMES CLAYTON POWELL

The house in committee on Bill No. 145, for the relief of James Clayton Powell—Mr. Garland (Carleton)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Explain.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): The explanation for this bill is found at page 5 of the senate evidence. Bernice Law was married on June 13, 1923, to James Clayton Powell by Reverend H. Caldwell in the city of Toronto. They lived together for some time in the city of St. Catharines; then they moved to the village of Drayton, in the county of Wellington, after which they moved to the village of Markham, and from there they moved back to Toronto. Three children were born of this marriage. The petitioner follows the vocation of a preacher and teacher, and the conduct of his wife made it impossible for him to continue in that work. She finally took it upon herself to live with one Kenneth Koehler of the city of Toronto; she lived with him for some time, and the petitioner is applying for this divorce.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children involved?

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): Three.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What provision is being made for these children?

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): The petitioner, being a preacher would very likely look after these children.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: So far as this bill is concerned there is absolutely no provision for their custody.

Mr. FORKE: I would like to ask the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre if he would be prepared to grant a divorce on the evidence to which he has listened to-night. Is he satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to justify the granting of a divorce?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not granting these divorces; I am simply asking for some little explanation, as I think I have the right to do.

Mr. FORKE: But my hon. friend wants the house to sit in judgment and say whether or not these people should get divorces.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am simply asking that we have at least an outline of the details as we have them in connection with every other bill presented in this house. I think I am quite within my rights in asking that.

Mr. FORKE: Perhaps I do not get the point, but it seems to me that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre wants this house to sit in judgment and to decide whether or not these bills should be passed. I would like to ask him now, after he has heard the evidence, whether he is satisfied that it is sufficient.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have said repeatedly that I do not think we are a proper court. I have said that approximately one-third of the members of this house on their own confession, are absolutely disqualified as jurors because they say that whatever the merits of the case they will not vote in favour of divorce. They are not considering these cases on their merits, and I cannot be satisfied with such a court. So far as I am concerned I am asking only for an outline of the case, and I should like to be sure that when a bill is under consideration we shall not have read the evidence pertaining to another bill, as happened once to-night. That instance alone reveals clearly the slipshod method we have been following in these matters.

Mr. FORKE: I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman has said, but I want to know what is the use of going through all this farce of making a pretence of examining these bills. We are not gaining anything by it; we are not obtaining sufficient evidence. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre wants to get sufficient evidence in this house would he like to have all these bills discussed in detail? Then all this evidence would be published and scattered all over the land from Halifax to Vancouver. If we are to adopt that course the evidence will be printed in Hansard and will find its way into every corner of the country. Would that make for morality and good living?

I have been with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre up to a certain point; I admit that the whole thing is a farce and that it is ridiculous that this house should be called upon to make these decisions. But the hon. member has made his protest; he has made it clear that we have come to a place beyond which we cannot go and that before another session comes round something must be done to meet the situation. He has gained his point; I think the country and this house realize that he is right, so why continue this thing? As the hon. member for Saskatoon has suggested, why not let these bills go through for this year, because they will go through anyway; then next year perhaps we will get something to meet the situation in the right way. I cannot see the use of wasting all this time.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Minister of Immigration has admitted frankly what we have been contending for a considerable time, that this whole procedure is a farce. The minister has made that statement to-night, and I think it is no small advance toward reform when a minister of the crown will openly make that confession. Now what are we to do about it; shall we continue the farce indefinitely? The other day we were urged to permit these bills to be given second reading without details being demanded. We agreed to that, but at that time I said I thought the least we could do in order to maintain any semblance of dignity and decorum in this house was first, to abandon the custom which has prevailed in this house of passing these bills en bloc; second, that the member who is sponsor of the bill should be in his place; third, that we should have at least an intelligible outline of the main facts connected with the bill. I suggested that the other day when a number of bills were before us for second reading. I am not trying to block these bills to-night, but I am simply carrying out the procedure suggested at that time. I am not going back at all on our understanding. I simply ask that when these bills are called there should be given, as was given by the member for Swift Current (Mr. Bothwell), a clean-cut, succinct statement of the case. In that particular instance I felt that the senate committee had done its work well and personally I felt that I was justified in voting for the bill. I raised no objection after I had heard the statement; I do not see how we can get along on very much less.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) will agree that the member for Swift Current was merely citing the case from the evidence. The hon. member pointed out that one-third of the members of this house were opposed to the principle of divorce, and until over fifty per cent of the members of the house are opposed to this procedure there is no other method of relief offered to these people. The Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) has raised a point which is very well taken, that in spite of the opposition raised by the member for Winnipeg North Centre these bills are going through. This procedure is giving a lot of publicity to something which the press of this country chooses not to make public, but apparently the hon. member desires to give publicity to it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, Mr. Chairman, I cannot let that pass. As I said some time ago, if we were to discuss these matters we

would have to ask that the galleries be cleared; we would have to hold secret sessions because Hansard could not print the evidence. The evidence which is placed before us could not go through the public mails; it would be stopped as obscene literature. I do not desire to have all the details brought before the house, but I do think that we should have a short statement as was given by the member for Swift Current.

Mr. VALLANCE: He gave it out of the evidence as submitted before the senate committee.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported on division.

CLARE DOUTRE WALTERS BERTRAM

The house in committee on Bill No. 147, for the relief of Clare Doutre Walters Bertram —Mr. McPhee—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. McPHEE: The evidence proves that the petitioner was married to Harry Alexander Bertram in 1916. There were two children by the marriage, now in the custody of the applicant. The evidence shows that on July 1, 1928, the husband, Harry Alexander Bertram, went to Val Morin, near St. Agathe, in the province of Quebec. He went to the home of one Bernard Adolphe Pfister, accompanied by Marcelle Morin, a young lady who was not his wife. They lived at this place for two days and they occupied the same bedroom at night. This evidence is substantiated by Charlotte Bigras who assigned them the room, as well as by two other parties who were living at the house.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If that is the evidence as given before the committee it seems to me that we should grant the divorce. But I should like to ask what provision is being made for the two children.

Mr. McPHEE: None whatever.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The father is not being required to support the children?

Mr. McPHEE: The applicant does not ask for that.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There is no provision whatever?

Mr. McPHEE: The applicant does not ask for that.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It seems to me that we ought not to allow a divorce of this character without making some provision for the children. The father is responsible for bringing these children into the world and the least he can do is to support them until they are able to maintain themselves. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we allow this bill to stand until we can bring in an amendment which would make provision for the support of these children.

Mr. VALLANCE: Even in a common law court unless the applicant asks for what is suggested by the member for Winnipeg North Centre it is never granted. The applicant makes no such suggestion here, so why hold the bill up?

Section 1 agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported on division.

MARGARET DUFFIELD

The house in committee on Bill No. 148, for the relief of Margaret Duffield—Mr. McPhee—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What is this?

Mr. McPHEE: The applicant in this case is Margaret Duffield. She was married to William A. Duffield on October 10, 1913. The evidence proves that on September 19, 1928, the said William A. Duffield was living in adultery with one Mrs. Yapp, in the city of Hamilton.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported on division.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Dominion public buildings—rents, $1,800,000.

Mr. MANION: I should like to have the minister give us a list of these rents. This may take a few minutes, but we are continually asking about them in the house and it would help if the list were placed in Hansard.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The item is a large one and I think my hon. friend's request is reasonable. This amount of $1,800,000 is required for the payment of rents for the year 1929-30 of buildings leased for the various departments of the Dominion government, including the London, England, Canadian building, and to pay for the rental of buildings used exclusively by the militia department, also for the payment of taxes both at

and outside Ottawa and the payment of telephones outside Ottawa. The requirements are made up as follows:

Rents	$1,691,972 66
Taxes	45,000 00
Telephones outside Ottawa	5,500 00
Contingencies	57,527 34
Total	$1,800,000 00

This is an increase over last year of $148,500. The increase is due to fifty-five new leases entered into during the year 1928-29, the principal ones of which are as follows:

1. Queen building at Halifax for the archives	$ 1,080
2. Mutual Realty building at Halifax for the Public Works	10,600
3. Aluminum Company building at Arvida, Quebec, for the post office	1,440

Mr. MANION: Are those the increases that are being given or the total number of rented buildings?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am giving the increases over last year.

4. Williams Machine Company building at Montreal for Post Office garage	$ 1,200 00
5. Building at 182 Shearer street, Montreal, for Pensions and Health	6,735 00
6. Accommodation at McGill University for Forest Products laboratory	10,000 00
7. Accommodation from Messrs. Doran at Niagara Falls for Post Office	4,800 00
8. Accommodation from Messrs. Doran at Niagara Falls for Customs	3,600 00
9. Knox college at Toronto for Militia	25,000 00
10. Accommodation from Canadian R. & H. terminals at Toronto for National Revenue	18,837 50
11. Duffield building at Hamilton, for Post Office, National Revenue and Health Departments	20,000 00
12. Farr building at Weston, Ontario, for Post Office	1,800 00
13. Bank of Toronto at Le Pas, Manitoba, for Interior Department	1,500 00
14. Canadian Pacific Railway at Regina for postal accommodation	6,750 00
15. Gibson premises at Drumheller, Alberta, for Post Office	1,100 00
16. Canadian National Railway at Edmonton for postal accommodation	5,200 00
17. Canadian Pacific Railway at Vancouver for postal station A	2,100 00
18. Canadian Pacific Railway at Vancouver for Post Office storage	2,805 00
Total	$124,547 50

The leases are, in all, 455, placed as follows:

	Number of leases
London, England	1
Nova Scotia	25
Prince Edward Island	6
New Brunswick	22
Quebec	72
Ontario	106
Ottawa	49
Manitoba	33
Saskatchewan	47
Alberta	48
British Columbia	44
Yukon	2
Total	455

Mr. MANION: I had intended to ask the minister to read the whole list, but as it is such a large one I do not wish to do that. Perhaps the minister could table the list and, if it does not take up too much space, if it could be placed on Hansard it would be of interest to the whole house to have that done.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would be glad to table the whole list. It comprises many pages, but I think we have absolute details of everything.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why is there an item for taxes? I was under the impression that government buildings did not pay taxes. Is this for street taxes, local improvements and things of that kind?

Mr. ELLIOTT: My idea offhand is that while we do not pay taxes ordinarily for a building we occupy—

Mr. BENNETT: A building you own.

Mr. ELLIOTT: —if any building or any part of a building belonging to the government is leased to somebody who is not in the government sedvice, we must pay taxes, but certain of our leases provide for the department paying the taxes, and this amount of $45,000 includes both of these items.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I assume that this building and also the frontage of this property on Wellington street are under the control of the Minister of Public Works. There has recently been installed on Wellington street a red light signal system for motor traffic, but I am sorry to say that, so far as I have observed, motorists pay little attention to the signals. I have had one or two very narrow escapes myself, and perhaps for that reason I look more carefully than other people. To-day on three occasions I noticed cars running through at a pretty good clip, absolutely regardless of the stop signal. I notice also there are two representatives of the mounted police stationed at the gates I use. Why do these police officers not take the license numbers and

institute prosecutions? One or two prosecutions would settle the matter. At the present time many motorists pay no attention to the signals. We have had accidents at this crossing, and members of the House of Commons have suffered. I just want to direct the minister's attention to the matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I quite agree with my hon. friend and I hesitate either to join with him or to differ from him in the criticism of the city police. I think there is a good deal in what he says about the matter.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I was refering to the mounted police.

Mr. ELLIOTT: But we have no jurisdiction over Wellington street.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They could easily take the license numbers of motorists who break the law, and hand them over so that prosecutions might be instituted.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That was what I was going to suggest. Any citizen has a perfect right, if he notices the law being violated, to take the license number and lay an information.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But citizens, as a rule, do not go to that trouble. I could have done that, too, but I do not want to pursue a prosecution in a police court.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What my hon. friend says is quite true, and the police who are not specially charged with that duty and whose jurisdiction does not extend to the street in question also hesitate to lay information in regard to a matter that is outside their jurisdiction. That is the difficulty.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As there are no city police on Wellington stret, so far as my observation goes—

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, there are.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, very rarely are they on duty on Wellington street. If the mounted police, who have the custody of these grounds and this building and who, I suppose, are interested in the safety of members of the House of Commons when they cross that street, would give the license numbers to the city police, I think the traffic could be regulated.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I agree with my hon. friend except for just this one thing: I think it is desirable that the best possible relations should be maintained between the federal and the municipal authorities.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Even if you kill off a few members in the meantime.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am not objecting to our police laying the information. My hon. friends laugh. I do not want to be misunderstood. I did not say, "I am not objecting to killing off a few members," but that I do not object to our police laying the information.

Mr. FORKE: What law governs the traffic lights on Wellington street?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The municipal law.

Mr. FORKE: Is there a municipal by-law or regulation in regard to those traffic lights? I have been told that there is not.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It was passed recently, I understand.

Mr. FORKE: I have heard several times that there is no such by-law, but I may be wrong.

Mr. MALONEY: The sum of $1,800,000 is a fabulous amount to pay for rents. Capitalized at the ordinary bank rate, that would mean an investment of almost fifty million dollars, and fifty million dollars to be paid out by the government of this country for office accommodation seems ridiculous, particularly when we are spending millions and millions on the construction of buildings in this city and millions more for the construction of buildings in other parts of the country. This vote should he held over for very careful consideration, because the people of this country will find it hard to believe that we need to spend almost two million dollars in renting buildings throughout Canada, in small places as well as large.

Mr. BIRD: How much rent is paid for the government offices at The Pas, Manitoba?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The government pays $3,600 per annum to T. Creighton for the Post Office Department; $900 to the Royal bank for the lands and mines branch, and $1,500 to the Bank of Toronto for the Interior department.

Mr. McGIBBON: What is the government's policy going to be in regard to renting buildings in the future? Year after year we have been voting large sums for rent, and pointing out the folly of it, but apparently we do not get anywhere.

Mr. ELLIOTT: How does my hon. friend mean? With regard to getting buildings of our own so as to get rid of paying rent?

Mr. McGIBBON: Certainly.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend will see from these estimates that a considerable number of buildings are being constructed by the government.

Mr. McGIBBON: But the rent is not depreciating to any extent.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The number of people required to carry on the service and the accommodation required is increasing. We are trying to put up buildings as fast as seems reasonable.

Mr. McGIBBON: Last year's vote was $1,651,000, and this year we are paying $1,800,000. The vote is not decreasing at all.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend was present when I read details as to the additional services and the additional accommodation asked for by the various departments in order to enable them to carry on their business, which accounts for the difference.

Mr. McGIBBON: Cannot the government expand its building capacity to keep pace with the growth of the service?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We are endeavouring to, and that is the idea of these new buildings. But my hon. friend will find that the cost for buildings owned by the government throughout the country will on the whole be greater than the cost of renting buildings.

Mr. McGIBBON: Then how does the minister account for private individuals erecting buildings and renting them to the government? They must do it at a loss, according to the minister's argument. It is ridiculous.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister surely does not intend us to believe that owning the buildings would be worse than renting them. Here we are paying $1,800,000 in rent, which represents a capital of $30,000,000 for interest and sinking fund. With $30,000,000 you could construct a great many buildings in Canada. If by saying that the cost of upkeep of new buildings would be more than we pay in rent the minister means that in some cases we pay larger rents than we should, I can understand it. But in this city there has been in recent years a new building occupied in its entirety by one department, and the company putting up that building have circularized the Canadian public stating that they expect from the rents received to pay off the bonds in a limited number of years and own the building free of encumbrance.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What building is that?

[Mr. McGibbon.]

Mr. BENNETT: The Norlite building. What about the Confederation building? What is it going to cost? It seems to me that it will not accommodate so very many offices. It may go up in the air quite a distance, but it is not very long in street frontage. How many tenders were received for the construction of that building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know my hon. friend will not expect me to carry all the details in my head, but I think I can give him nearly all the details in regard to the Confederation building, which is a building of more than ordinary interest. My recollection is that it will be from seven to nine stories high, with the tower a little higher. The frontage on Wellington street will be 200 feet, and on Bank street, 150 feet. The actual space that we will have for offices, after providing for corridors, rest rooms, elevators and that sort of thing, will be 175,000 square feet. There is in addition 7,500 feet of storage space.

Mr. BENNETT: That is in the basement?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. I think if my hon. friend looked at the figures he would be satisfied that that building, although it will give better space I hope than we have anywhere else in Canada, and although we do not pay any taxes, will not be a great saving. There were, I think, five or six tenders received, the lowest being from Lyall and Company, amounting to $2,460,000 odd, which was substantially below the next tender.

Mr. BENNETT: Was it the usual form of contract?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: When do you expect to occupy it, and when it is occupied, will that decrease the vote for rentals the next year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The vote for rentals should decrease when we get into the building. It is not definitely settled by whom it will be occupied. We have a number of applicants for the new space. The contract calls for the building being completed on April 8, 1930. That is making a reduction of six months in the time originally estimated by the architect. According to the progress report we had a week or ten days ago, the contractors were up to schedule, and if that rate of progress continues the building itself ought to be completed by April 8, 1930. Of course the offices will have to be installed after that date, before the building can be occupied.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How many tenders did you receive?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think five or six. I would refer my hon. friend to the vote in connection with it, when the whole matter can be discussed. We have not reached that yet.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What vote will it be under?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Vote 117 at page 30, new departmental building, $1,500,000.

Mr. McGIBBON: Does the minister realize the significance of the statement he has just made to the house?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I hope he does.

Mr. McGIBBON: Then it is a travesty on the intelligence of the government. In effect it is this: Private individuals can erect buildings and rent them to the government cheaper than the government itself can do so for its own use. What greater condemnation could we want of the inefficiency of any government than the statement just made by the minister?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does my hon. friend want to be taken seriously? Let us consider for a moment what I have said and what he has said. I said you will get no space in the city of Ottawa like the space we will have in the Confederation building. For one reason it is more valuable. But the cost I expect will be higher than we are paying for the kind of space we are occupying now. My statement with regard to being able to rent buildings cheaper than build them does not apply nearly as much to a building like the Confederation block, which is a large building, as it does to the small buildings such as those contained in the list I was reading to my hon. friend a few moments ago. Of course, in that case we require quite a number of feet of space, but in a great many places where our requirements are more limited it is to our advantage to rent rather than build.

Mr. BENNETT: It certainly will be a paying investment to build in Calgary.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is an example showing that where a large amount of space is required to house all the departments it justifies the erection of a large buildings; but my statement that it was cheaper to rent than to build applies, I suppose to two-thirds at any rate of our buildings.

Mr. GEARY: On the southeast corner of Wellington and O'Connor streets is a factory building. It is called an office building, but is built to factory specifications and looks no better than a factory in the industrial section of any city. The factory building to which I have referred has been erected very little more than a year, and I suppose the need for further accommodation was present to the mind of the government when the permit was allowed to go through for the Edwards building on the corner of Wellington and O'Connor.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend is a former city solicitor and, I hope, has not forgotten that completely. Does he think we could have controlled the utilization of that corner?

Mr. GEARY: If this government in their desire to beautify Ottawa had even ordinary common sense they would not have allowed the Edwards building to go up. They were told before it was commenced that they might have the property. It is a reproach to the government that while trying to improve the immediate surroundings of this Confederation building they should allow the erection of the eyesore to which I have referred.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What does my hon. friend mean by saying that we could have had the property?

Mr. GEARY: Surely the minister knows what I mean.

Mr. ELLIOTT: You mean we could have bought it?

Mr. GEARY: Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We could have bought anything down the whole street.

Mr. GEARY: Then I say if the government desired to beautify the surroundings of this building they wasted their money in tearing down buildings on the south side of Sparks street and allowing an eyesore like this Edwards building to go up immediately next the parliamentary grounds. I am quite sure the minister will find out that long before the Edwards building was put up the government might have had the site as vacant land. As soon as the Victoria chambers were destroyed by fire the government should have seen to the acquisition of the site.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does my hon. friend think the Victoria chambers were destroyed by fire? They were torn down to provide a place for this building.

Mr. GEARY: Whatever happened to them.

Mr. McGIBBON: They were antiquated and useless.

Mr. GEARY: If I understand the Minister of Public Works correctly, he is saying now that the government had no option but to

allow the Edwards building to go up. That is not sense. If the government had desired to get that property, I wager it could have been acquired before a dollar had been expended in the way of new plans.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. GEARY: Across from these grounds, on the south side of Wellington street, from the Rideau Club westerly the buildings are of very decent appearance; from Metcalf street easterly the government building is of very good appearance; but until that factory building on the corner of O'Connor street and Wellington is acquired at an expense, I suppose, of a million and a half—because the building is occupied and there is a growing value—until that building is acquired the surroundings of parliament hill cannot be improved. How much better the Confederation building would have been on the corner where the Victoria Chambers used to be. I cannot claim that I know as a fact that the government was offered the site, but I say the site could have been acquired before a dollar was spent on the new building. I think the minister has made a mistake that will not be repaired in the next fifty years, and in the meantime he has destroyed all opportunity of beautifying these surroundings by allowing that eyesore to go up.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The question of the land on which to place government buildings was not decided last year or the year before. I think back in 1912 it was considered advisable to construct government buildings under some definite scheme and to obtain quite a substantial amount of land for this purpose. The building on the corner to which my hon friend referred could have been purchased, of course, much more cheaply at that time than within the last year or two. I think all the buildings down to and including what is called the old Perley home were purchased in the year 1912 or thereabouts at a cost of about three million dollars. I will not quarrel with my hon. friend as to whether or not the wise thing at that time would have been to buy the property opposite the parliament buildings and grounds, but the government in its wisdom, in acquiring a site for a general scheme of government buildings, made a selection which included the property on which the Confederation building is now being constructed. I quite agree with my hon. friend that probably it would have been good business to have prevented the erection of any unsightly building in the vicinity of the property on which we intended to put up any

of the buildings which we should construct; because the Confederation building is only one of a series. The same thing applies to all buildings on the other side of Wellington street right down as far as our property goes. There are many buildings down there which probably will be opposite very respectable government buildings to be constructed in the life of this government, within the next few years. The hon. gentleman suggests now that this government should go out and obtain all the property facing the buildings which it is intended to construct. I really do not think my hon. friend considered his argument before delivering it.

Mr. GEARY: You have not considered it since.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I always consider any argument which my hon. friend presents because I have the greatest respect for his views, but I must say that this respect has not increased with his last argument. As regards the purchase of this property cornering our present building, does my hon. friend suggest that, first of all, this government had a right to say what kind of building should be put up? He has already admitted that we could not. In the second place, does he suggest that we should have been justified in assuming that a bad building would be put up—a building that would not be a credit to that part of the city?

Mr. McGIBBON: You should not let any building be put up there.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Who should not?

Mr. McGIBBON: The government.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It could have been prevented by the purchase of the property.

Mr. CHAPLIN: There is a better way.

Mr. ELLIOTT: How?

Mr. CHAPLIN: By arranging with the city so that unsightly buildings would not be put there. They are always ready to concede that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am glad my hon. friend takes so generous a view of what the city is always ready to do. The city, I presume, has passed upon that particular building.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Without protest.

Mr. GEARY: I have listened to the minister's speech, frequently interspersed with "I agree". Of course he does not agree with anything. The whole object of the minister's speech is to try to get rid of the difficulty that has arisen because of a mistake the gov-

ernment has made in the last two or three years, and he does so by referring to purchases made in 1912. I have no doubt the purchases made in 1912 were fairly reasonable, but no one will say that because the government bought property in 1912 it is tied to that property in respect to the structures it erects in 1928. The minister during the last day or two has cited to the committee case after case where sites were purchased for post offices away back before the war, and there are still vacant sites upon which post offices have never been built. I do not say that the city would have listened to the government, but I have every reason to expect that it would have done so, and the city architect would have held his plans over, as is the usual course in connection with structures of this sort, until such by-laws had been passed as would provide for some control over buildings to be erected. But that is not the point. The point is this: the Victoria chambers were coming down. At the moment none of the other structures along there are coming down. But, as I say, the Victoria chambers were coming down, and I venture to say that the minister will find, if he does not know now, that before one dollar was spent on the present building the government had an opportunity to buy that land. That is the common report. The minister may deny it, because he has declined to get the information. But the government or the Prime Minister must know. It is known to some member of the government that that property, in a vacant state, was available to the government for purchase, and the government passed it up and allowed this other building to go on the premises. The minister talks about buying properties when the buildings fall down. The government did not wait for the buildings to fall down when they bought other property. They bought other buildings which were going concerns. There was for instance a theatre which they acquired, being obsessed with the idea of a memorial square. I fancy that the people of Ottawa or anyone who visits the city will say that the appearance of parliament hill will be much more seriously impaired by the Edwards building now on the corner of O'Connor street than it will ever be improved by the purchase of the property on Sparks street. I will not go over that argument because the money has been appropriated and the property bought. But no one will say that the property south of Sparks street was a good purchase; it was an extravagance that cannot be justified. And here is a property, costing probably less than half a million, which the government needed and on which there could have been erected a building in keeping with those that lie opposite parliament hill, instead of which the whole of parliament hill is ruined for the next half century despite the obsession of the government for beautifying the city. The fact is, they have not used common sense.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): There is one danger that suggests itself in connection with the argument of my hon. friend. The hon. member says that the government could have bought that land before building took place on it. Of course they could have bought the property if they had paid the price, but what would that entail? Other people with old properties along that street and desirous of turning them over would be in a position to go to the government and say, "You bought the Victoria Chambers and paid the price. We intend to build on our land and we think you had better buy our property also". It might be a very serious matter; it would be the beginning of a campaign to induce the government to spend a great deal of money along that street. It might be deemed desirable in the long run, but until the government and the house decide that it is, it would not be wise to follow the course my hon. friend suggests when so much land has been already bought and paid for. It is much more desirable to use land already owned than to buy more. At any rate, there would be that factor to consider in the case, that if a good price were paid for certain property the owners of other property would seek to justify the purchase by the government of such property on similar terms. They might even threaten to put up undesirable buildings in order to induce the government to purchase their land. I have heard violent attacks on this particular building in the last two years and I do not think they are altogether warranted. The building may not be covered with marble and sandstone outside, but it is apparently a high class office building. I noticed an item in the press to the effect that hon. gentlemen opposite had rented an entire floor, and I must say that I think they used good judgment in doing so. The building seems splendidly fitted for office purposes.

Mr. GEARY: It is a most excellent building for office purposes.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend (Mr. Geary) is referring to a building which we shall reach eventually in the estimates. But I would point out that that building appears at page 30 and we are now at page 35, which

has to do with an altogether different matter. I have no objection however because I realize that the Confederation building is one of interest to every hon. member of this house, and I do not know that anyone should object to the discussion of this matter whenever any hon. member feels disposed to bring it up.

Mr. GEARY: I was not discussing the Confederation building; I was discussing the piece of property across the road from it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That piece of property is not in the estimates at all.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not know whether it is in order to discuss this monstrosity down here in front of the parliament buildings, because I do not know whether it comes under this item of rents, and I do not care.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It certainly does not come under this item.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Very well, I will say nothing more about it now but I will have occasion to say something at another time. In respect to the item of rents, a few minutes ago the minister was kind enough to tell the house that these rents have gradually increased despite the fact that we are providing new buildings all the time, and he also told us that probably they would continue to increase. I can say to the minister that both he and other ministers who have occupied that position have told us that as new public buildings were constructed the rents would decrease. What is the history? Let us go back to 1926-27. In that year the rents amounted to $1,410,000. In 1927-28 the item had increased to $1,440,000; in 1928-29 it increased to $1,651,000 and this year it is $1,800,000. I do not know when the decrease is to take place, but I think it should come soon with all the buildings we are putting up.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): What buildings have we put up in Ottawa?

Mr. GUTHRIE: We are talking of the whole of Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): For that matter, how many new buildings have been put up throughout Canada?

Mr. CHAPLIN: We have been buying them.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Not very many.

Mr. CHAPLIN: There was the Daly building.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That was purchased long before this government came into office.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What about these other buildings?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Very few buildings have been bought or erected by the government since we came into office.

Mr. MANION: Perhaps this whole question is out of order—

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not object to the discussion.

Mr. MANION: Since the hon. member for South Toronto has brought up the matter I have a couple of suggestions to make. I well remember, when the building was being erected a couple of years ago, bringing up the whole question in this house, and I have since not changed my opinion about its appearance. I remember I was rather severe about it at the time and termed it a ghastly architectural monstrosity, which perhaps was rather strong language. However, as one stands in this beautiful square and looks around only to find the whole effect ruined largely by the colour of that building, one metaphorically weeps. Again and again I have walked down the square and have felt sorry to see the whole effect ruined in this way. My hon. friend from Melfort has brought up the point of the high prices which might be charged the government, but the government has the right to expropriate; and if at any time the erection of a building is threatened which will ruin the beauty of this city the government would be quite justified in expropriating the land for its own purposes. But I have another suggestion to make, and perhaps this is something which should have been done before this; I believe I suggested it when I brought up the question a year or two ago. My suggestion, which I think should receive the attention of the minister and of the government, is that the city council of Ottawa should be approached by the government on behalf of the people of Canada, and asked to make such regulations as will prevent the erection of any building such as the one under discussion which would spoil the beauty of this city. I do not know whether any action has been taken in this regard; if this has been done I know nothing of it, and the minister has not referred to it. This government, representing the people of Canada, is spending vast amounts of money to beautify the city of Ottawa; with that we on this side have quarrelled on a number of occasions, because we have thought that the purchase and the pulling down of a number of fairly good

buildings was an unnecessary extravagance. At any rate, that has been done, and since it was done for the purpose of beautifying the city—and to Ottawa's beautification no one on this side of the house objects, so long as it is not done at too great an expense—it should be the duty of the city council to cooperate with the government and put in force building regulations which would not permit buildings of this kind to be erected and so ruin the beauty of this city. To-day no doubt the city of Ottawa has fire regulations, and other forms of buildings regulations, but certainly the city never should have permitted that building to be erected in its present form. It is an eyesore to all who appreciate the beautification of the city, and it is an eyesore to every visitor to Ottawa. This is the second time I have brought up this matter and I sincerely hope that the minister will be able to tell next session that some action of this kind has been taken by the government. I do not know whether or not that has been done already; if it has I offer them praise for it, but if that action has not been taken I think the government should approach the city council of Ottawa to see if some regulation cannot be put into effect so that in future another building such as this may not be erected.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not know that I am at liberty to say what has taken place with regard to certain interviews between the civic authorities and representatives of the government and of the federal commission, but interviews such as my hon. friend has suggested have taken place. The two parties are working together very cordially, I believe, and in the best interests of both. I know my hon. friend wants to be fair to the city council who permitted this building to be erected and to the corporation which built it. He has already stated that his objection is largely based on the colouring of the upper part of the building, and I think he will be one of the first to agree that that is something which the plan submitted to the city council would not indicate. I think the trouble is only temporary; probably the mixing of the mortar has something to do with the colour which my hon. friend finds objectionable.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Does the minister say that the city architect would not be able to appreciate what the specifications called for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I did not catch my hon. friend's question; I was trying to answer another question and it is rather difficult to answer one and appreciate another at the same time.

Mr. MANION: I have no desire to be unfair to the city council of Ottawa; I knew nothing of any approach having been made by the government. I compliment the government for making these efforts, but I believe the government is in a position of authority, spending as it does millions of dollars to make this city one of the most beautiful on this continent. I think the government would be absolutely justified if they insisted on these regulations. I have no desire, as I have already said, to be unfair to this city, and certainly I do not wish to be unfair to that hon. member of this house who is one of the owners of this building. He is a personal friend of mine and I regret to say anything concerning a building in which he is interested, but I have my duty to perform also, and my duty, as I see it, is to endeavour to assist the government and the city council in beautifying this city. Much as I regret hurting his feelings, or perhaps impugning the methods of the city council, I think it is time the government took a pretty strong position, if necessary, in order to bring about that result which the minister and the government profess to be anxious to obtain.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is another point which I might mention, and perhaps this is another matter which should not be stressed unduly. This question of jurisdiction should be avoided as far as possible. The government has jurisdiction to authorize the city of Ottawa to place building restrictions upon any particular street.

Mr. GEARY: Not this government.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, the provincial government. I think the hon. member for South Toronto knows that the city of Ottawa did approach the government at Toronto. A bill was presented there asking for the very authority and the very control which was required, but that bill did not pass the Ontario house. I am not finding fault with the provincial legislature for that, because objections were raised by property owners in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. McGIBBON: May I ask the minister a question?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps the hon. member will wait until I have answered the last question. They were not able to get legislation through the Ontario legislature which would give them the control which would have enabled them to prevent the very thing to which my hon. friend objects.

Mr. GEARY: It was a very poor bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Will the hon. member say that it did not provide for this very safeguard which he now says should have been taken?

Mr. GEARY: Yes, it did, but the area dealt with by the bill which was proposed by the city of Ottawa, and which I suppose was backed by the government, went all the way down to government house; it stretched across Connaught place and up Sparks and Wellington streets and tied up many properties which would never be used for beautification purposes. I think you will find also that the chairman of the beautifying commission at Ottawa was very heavily interested in a good many properties, and many owners thought that the bill should not pass.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The bill did not pass.

Mr. GEARY: There is no trouble in getting ordinary building restrictions passed by the Ontario legislature. We have such restrictions in the city of Toronto, perhaps to a greater extent than we need them, and the city of Ottawa, with streets immediately adjacent to parliament hill, should have no trouble at all in getting the legislature to provide safeguarding measures. But the important point is that the government had a chance to stop the erection of that building and did not do it. The government and the city of Ottawa prevented the sale of the Russell house because they were willing to go in and spend money on that site. The crux of the matter is that the government deliberately neglected the opportunity to acquire that property at a cost of probably a quarter of a million dollars or a little more.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I certainly do not want to prolong this discussion, and I am ready to drop it any time anyone suggests that it should be dropped. The hon. member who has just spoken has had a great deal of experience before the private bills committee of the Ontario legislature.

Mr. GEARY: You did not help me any.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I helped you a lot at times, much more than you are helping me to-night. I always admired the way in which the hon. member got legislation through, some of which I approved of and some of which I could not entirely agree with. He knows that there were objectionable features in nearly every bill which was presented to that committee. The committee was directed by officials who had been doing that work for many years and they nearly always pointed out objectionable features which they asked the promoters of the bills to have deleted so that the measures could pass in a reasonable way. I do not think his statement that the bill contained unreasonable features is any answer at all.

As to the other question, that we should have purchased all the property adjoining that which we now own, I am not saying that it would not have been a good thing, but I do say that it is much easier to defend our action to-night than it would have been had we purchased that property at the time it was available and given as our explanation that we intended to build on it so that a poor building could not be erected there. We would be leaving vacant that property which after a great many years of study all governments have been agreed should be the site for the erection of a series of buildings.

Mr. BIRD: I should like to stress the significance of the figures which the minister gave a short time ago. It appears that the department is paying $6,000 per year for rental in the town of The Pas in northern Manitoba. At 4½ per cent that represents a capital of $135,000, if my arithmetic is correct. It seems to me that a building could be erected there at a figure much less than that, which would house all Dominion government offices, and if so it would be in the interests of economy to erect such a building. I have been bringing this matter to the attention of the minister for the past two or three years and I must say that he has always met me very graciously. One thing I admire about the minister is the very charming way in which he turns one down. He kicks one downstairs with such inviting grace that you would really think he was helping you up. I like that, and I reciprocate that feeling. I understand the difficulties he has to contend with, but the total vote for public buildings is not a very big one considering the widespread necessity which exists for that kind of project. Speaking in a general way, I am strongly in favour of spending money on public buildings so long as their utility is proven.

Referring to The Pas, I want to take a minute to impress upon the house the very urgent character of the requirements there. Of all the towns in Manitoba there is not one other in which the requirements are so urgent. The committee will understand that this town is the hope of Manitoba at the present time. All eyes in that province are turning northward and are being focused upon this quickly growing community. Those members who have their daily meditations before the black-

boards in the brokers' offices will know something about Flin-Flon and Sherritt-Gordon. These mines I am proud to say, are situated in the constituency of Nelson, representing one of the most promising mineralized areas in the whole of Canada. The Pas is the jumping off place for those two important points; and not only that, but The Pas is the base for all that romantic development which is going on up the Hudson Bay railway. In addition to all this, The Pas for many years has been the centre for administrative purposes for the whole of northern Manitoba, almost a continent. There is not another point in the whole of Manitoba that is more necessitous than this one. Almost every other concern, private or public, has generously recognized this necessity. Commercial companies, such as banks and wholesale companies, during the last year have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in building up substantial and permanent buildings in that town. During the last year there has been erected a building housing a daily paper which is now operating. There has also been erected one of the finest hospitals in the west outside of the big cities, and numerous other buildings, wholesale houses, business houses have been constructed. Last year the building program amounted to over a million dollars, and I am informed that it will far exceed that this year. As I say, every important public body except the Dominion government has recognized the necessity of The Pas, and the Dominion government least of all should be in that position, because The Pas for many years has been the administrative seat for the Dominion government and the importance in that respect will be realized from the amount of rent that is being disbursed there every year.

I do not want to detain the committee and I do not think it is necessary to do so, because I feel certain the minister is fully apprised of all I have said. As I said at the beginning, I am not going to pester him. This is a business matter; this is not a small, political matter at all. It is a matter of meeting the legitimate necessities of a very important part of our Dominion at the present time. I should like to see in the near future, without naming any dates, a modest yet adequate building erected in that town. I do not want to see that building plastered with unnecessary ornamentation: I would like to see it based on strict utility. I am sorry I cannot agree with some of my friends in their aesthetic and artistic views as to architecture. I was not able to follow them in their cry that the building on Wellington street is an architectural monstrosity. I think our views on this matter are somewhat second-hand. If I were building an office building, I would build an office building: I would try to achieve the result in the most direct manner, and I would feel confident that if I followed strict engineering principles and stayed true to the laws of utility, I would be more likely in the long run, to achieve something beautiful that would harmonize with its surroundings than I would by aiming at something that was falsely artistic. If you set out with some false idea of beauty by plastering a lot of Gothic gimcracks around parliament hill, you may in time arrive at an architectural monstrosity

For my part, I would like to see, within the next year or two in The Pas, a building that would be worthy of some of the buildings that are already there; for instance, the Catholic hospital, the provincial community building, which has stood there for a dozen years, and other buildings which I could name. Last fall at the board of trade banquet there I had to sit ashamed, representing the Dominion house, as I heard speaker after speaker point his finger to the neglect of the Dominion government in this matter. I did not altogether join with them in their criticism, and I do not do so yet, because I realize that most of the departments—and I am not altogether excluding the department of my hon. friend—have within the last few years responded fairly generously to the necessities of that northern country. But this is a demand that is somewhat different. This is something which is urgent, and it cannot be put off for a long time to come. I should like the minister to tell me not only that he is still considering the matter, but that he is considering it a little more earnestly and favourably.

Mr. BENNETT: I desire to make just two observations with respect to the acquisition of the site west of the supreme court building. When the Borden administration came into power in 1911, one of the first difficulties that confronted them was with relation to the acquisition of office space in this city. The minister has doubtless seen in his own department the plans which were prepared many years ago looking to the construction of a very fine series of buildings on the far side of Wellington street from the Rideau club down to the Bank of Montreal corner. I am not quite certain who prepared those plans, but my memory is that it was a very distinguished architect, and the late Mr. Ewart used to exhibit them with some degree of pride. After they had carefully considered the situation it was found that that site on Wellington street from the Rideau club to

the Victoria chambers would cost a great deal of money, because banks, the club building and other buildings were in occupation, and the space would be somewhat less than what was available on the land west of the supreme court building. Those buildings were acquired partly by agreement and partly by expropriation, if my memory serves me aright. For the moment I am speaking only from memory. It gave the government a great deal of concern as to whether they should endeavour to take the property in front of the parliament buildings or the property west of the supreme court building. But if I remember correctly, in view of the fact that there was nearly twice as much property west of the supreme court building as there was from the Rideau club to the Victoria chambers, it was thought desirable to acquire the former property having regard to future requirements and the fact that you could not carry the Wellington street property out to Sparks street without expending too much money, whereas the property west of the supreme court building was between the river and the street. Accordingly that land was acquired, extending west of the supreme court building a considerable distance—I do not know how many feet it is—and a complete scheme worked out for a series of buildings. I presume the Confederation block, so-called, is the first unit in that building scheme.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think I have in mind the scheme to which my hon. friend refers. After several contests by different planners and architects, the scheme of which the Confederation building is the beginning was finally decided upon, but it is not exactly the same as that referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT: No, but the general terms are much the same. It will be recalled that a commission was appointed headed by Sir Herbert Holt to make a report upon the city improvement generally. It will be recalled what the government did. This is the point of the criticism. The government undertook improvements and the beautification of Ottawa, and to carry out those improvements and that beautification spent something like $3,000,000 acquiring the property comprising the square near the post office, the Russell hotel building, and other buildings in that locality. But if the object is to beautify and improve, the government did just the exact opposite of what it had in mind when it let the structure on the corner opposite the Bank of Montreal, on the site of the old Victoria chambers building, be erected. When this vast scheme of building west of the supreme court buildings was undertaken, the government then had in mind the provision of office accommodation for all the public service in Ottawa, looking forward for half a century. That was the general conception of the undertaking. Then when the town planning commission made their report—it will be remembered that an engineer came from Chicago to Ottawa—the commission at the head of which was Sir Herbert Holt made certain recommendations, and in a broad and general way this park that you now have in front of the post office follows the report of the commission, though not in detail. The difficulty—I confess I have never been able to solve it—is how you can talk of the beautification and improvement of Ottawa when in front of this magnificent ten million dollar structure you permit that building to be placed on the corner. The minister says that it could not be prevented, but the hon. member for South Toronto has made it perfectly clear that there was an opportunity, and that opportunity should have been grasped instead of spending three million dollars on the acquisition of the properties to which I have referred.

May I say this further? I think it is abundantly clear that the property between the Rideau Club and the Victoria chambers would not be sufficient to give effect to the plans that were in mind at that time for the accommodation of the public service of this country, and the location of the buildings on the site west of the supreme court buildings became a necessity because there was no other site to which you could easily go, unless you did as was done in Australia, move the capital entirely away from the city.

While on the subject of the Confederation building, and to obviate the necessity of speaking again, may I say, although the matter is perhaps not strictly relevant to the item under discussion, that something should be done with respect to the building in which the Supreme Court of Canada is housed. The Minister of Public Works is a member of the legal profession, and is no doubt aware that there are very valuable books in that library that cannot be replaced with money. The building was an old carpenter shop in 1878, and it is now the home of the highest court in Canada. I cannot but think that, finding money as we have done for many other purposes, we should not permit this condition to continue. The present structure is finished inside with highly inflammable wood—white pine—much of it hand-carved and covered with shellac which will burn practically if you put a match against it. The greatest possible care must be exer-

cised on the part of everybody about the premises to prevent the building being burned down. Such a loss—I am speaking merely as a member of the legal profession—would be very hard to contemplate; for there are books there that cannot be replaced. It is also very unpleasant to reflect on the fact that the home of the highest court in Canada, what we speak of as being the court of last resort in this country, should be housed in an old carpenter shop, to which some improvements, very few, have been made since 1878. If I were asked to-day to say what public service in Ottawa I regard as being most in need of a new public building, I would say that it is the Supreme Court of Canada. That is my profound conviction. I have been over most of that building. It is neither fire proof nor commodious. The minister this afternoon said that it took eight charwomen and one foreman daily to look after it, just keeping it in shape. Look at the floors and everything connected with it! If governments are trustees alike for this generation and the next, I would say that no greater trusteeship rests upon them than that of providing decent facilities for the Supreme Court of Canada. I was surprised to find in the estimates no appropriation for this purpose. I would strongly impress upon the minister and through him upon the administration, the necessity of taking action in this matter. After all, in the ultimate analysis law and the maintenance of the rule and reign of law is what all governments must have in mind, and if you do not house in decent premises, an institution such as the Supreme Court of Canada, you are going to have an unfavourable reaction in the matter of the general conduct of litigation and the maintenance of law and order in this country.

Mr. MALONEY: I really think that this item should stand, Mr. Chairman. We are asked to vote $1,800,000 a stupendous sum, for rentals. Further, we are asked to vote that amount without being furnished with any information worth mentioning. For my part I would like to have a list of all the properties leased, with the amount of the rentals, the ownership of the properties, and so on, before this vote carries and for that reason I object very strongly to this item going through to-night.

Item agreed to.

Public buildings—water, $83,000.

Mr. BENNETT: That is outside Ottawa?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Victoria, B.C. — astrophysical observatory (Little Saanich mountain) — maintenance, repairs and improvements, $3,000.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Leading up to the observatory at Saanich is a winding road, I should judge about a mile long. At intervals there are wide places where cars can pass, but for the most part the road is very narrow and anyone driving up there in a motor car is in great danger of an accident. It would take only a small amount to widen the road, and it is a work that should certainly be done, because many people who would visit the observatory are deterred by the fear of an accident. With the coming of the stage coaches and tourists from the United States, traffic has become very heavy, and it is absolutely necessary that this road should be widened. I would ask the minister if any work of that kind is contemplated under this item.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The details do not show anything for a road. The $3,000 is made up as follows: Painting the exterior of the dome of the building, painting the interior floor, repairs to the engineer's residence, painting and decorating of the director's residence, electric light and water supply, painting exterior posts, gates, and so forth, and contingencies.

Mr. PLUNKETT: The condition of this road endangers public life. There are very bad spots at intervals of from 200 to 400 feet, and as the road winds it is impossible to see an approaching car. Should a driver lose control of his car coming down this mountain road there is certain to be serious loss of life. The people in the vicinity are expecting an accident any day. I would ask the minister to consider this and make the necessary provision in the supplementary estimates.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and Rivers—Nova Scotia, $750,200.

Mr. BENNETT: A number of Nova Scotia members did not think this item would be reached this evening and they are not in their seats. Perhaps the minister would take some other province.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would suggest that we take up public buildings at page 30, item 117. This vote deals with the new departmental building in Ottawa, which has been pretty well discussed to-night. I am entirely in the hands of the committee.

Item stands.

Ottawa — new departmental building, $1,500,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Has the minister anything to say about the supreme court building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think anyone feels the necessity of a new supreme court building more than I do. I can hardly agree with all my hon. friend has said about the disgracefulness of the present building.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not use the word "disgracefulness".

Mr. ELLIOTT: I take it back; but his general description pretty well got to that point. It was built originally in 1878,—

Mr. BENNETT: It was built prior to that date and taken over in 1878 for the use of the supreme court.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. It was used as a carpenter shop while the parliament buildings were being erected. The exterior of the building is in fairly good shape. But I am not going to defend it. It is not the proper kind of building for the housing of the supreme court of Canada. I quite agree with that. But I do not believe the supreme court is as badly housed as some of the other services.

Mr. CANTLEY: The post office at New Glasgow, for instance.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen will say that there are many places where the services at any rate are not any better housed. I think an expenditure of twelve million dollars on public buildings could be fairly defended; that is, an expenditure in addition to what is already being expended; but the necessary funds are not available at the present time. My hon. friend referred to this as the greatest court in Canada. I would call his attention to another court which is the greatest court in the empire, the privy council. It is housed in a very humble building.

Mr. BENNETT: A fireproof building, though.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. There is no question that when you have a lot of books and other inflammable material a fire would be very disastrous. Every possible precaution is being taken along this line. The question of a new building has been brought up from time to time, and I do not think a month goes by that somebody does not draw it to the attention of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. DUNNING: It has been drawn to my attention oftener than that.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think I can say anything further.

Mr. MANION: What special precautions are being taken against fire in the parliamentary library? It is a very beautiful building and contains a very fine collection of books and manuscripts. A fire would be very difficult to control in that building with its inflammable contents.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is equipped with automatic fire protectors and hose. Every possible precaution is taken to guard against fire. In addition to the equipment a man is on duty there all the time.

Mr. MANION: Twenty-four hours a day?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, day and night. Only the other day I went over the library with some of the officials of my department with regard to the very question that my hon. friend has raised. The old floors are very inflammable.

Mr. SPENCER: I understand that smoking is not allowed there.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. MacLAREN: Has a sprinkler system been introduced?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. MacLAREN: I think that might be well worth considering. A sprinkler system is the main source of protection in the records office. Still more, I think, would it be of advantage in the library.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am obliged for the suggestion and I shall be very glad to have it looked into.

Item agreed to.

Ottawa—parliament building, $90,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Will the minister be good enough to explain to us exactly what this means?

Mr. ADSHEAD: This item refers to the parliament buildings that we are in?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Has the minister taken into consideration the desirability of improving the acoustic properties of the chamber? Many times we do not know what is going on, especially when exchanges are taking place between the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition. We do not want to sit here and be dummies, we want to know what

is going on. It is rather annoying to any hon. member who has the floor to be told to speak louder, and it is still more annoying to us to have to cry "louder."

Mr. ELLIOTT: If we all had as good voices as some of my hon. friends opposite there would not be as much difficulty about the acoustics of this chamber. And if those members who talk almost continuously when discussion is going on would desist it would obviate a lot of our difficulty. The matter has received a good deal of attention. In 1922 a report was submitted regarding the acoustics of the chamber by Professor F. A. Saunders, of Harvard university, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Mr. BENNETT: I thought it was Cambridge, England.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Before reading his memorandum I might observe, having been in another legislative chamber for some time, that this difficulty occurs periodically in every such chamber in the country. I know of none where complaints of this kind are not made, arising from the fact that the speakers are not arranged as they are in the ordinary auditorium. The arrangement in any of these legislative chambers is particularly difficult, but it has never been considered advisable to adopt the auditorium style. The statements which I shall read to the committee were made by the man who is considered the highest authority on the subject. He submitted his report in 1922 and again on June 26, 1926. He suggested that heavy curtains be hung in front of gallery openings and the openings under the side galleries, and that a heavy carpet be placed on the floor. This was done. Heavy insulating paper was also put under the carpet. The suggestions Professor Saunders made at that time were carried out. Complaints again arose regarding the acoustics, and Professor Saunders further reported after examination that he did not see how the acoustics could be further improved. Writing to the architect, he states:

As I have just returned from a visit to the houses of parliament at your suggestion, to consider the acoustical properties of the Commons chamber especially, I desire to send in a report of my investigation.

Four years ago you asked me to look over these same chambers, and I found at that time that they were not quite satisfactory. The acoustical treatment which had been recommended for them eight years ago by Mr. C. M. Swan, of New York, to Mr. Pearson had not been completely carried out. . . .

My conclusion is that both of these chambers are now entirely satisfactory and I strongly recommend that no further changes be made.

The acoustical requirements of such a chamber are particularly exacting. The room must be large, and the speakers placed in all possible positions with respect to the hearers; yet it is expected that a man speaking often only in a conversational tone will be audible from any point on the floor, or perhaps in the whole chamber.

It is a well known fact that sound produced in a room reaches the ear of a hearer by many paths. The direct line from the speaker is the ceiling, etc, and if these surfaces are hard, and reflect a large proportion of the sound energy falling upon them, the listener hears a much louder sound than otherwise. It is obvious, however, that this loudness is due to sound arriving late. . . . .

He goes on with a scientific dissertation on sound which is not very intelligible to me. Then he continues:

In my opinion this process has been carried out to just the right extent in both chambers. . . .

As a result of the tests, I feel sure that the house chamber is unusual in the clarity with which speech of very moderate volume can be heard and understood in it. When the house is not in session, an ordinary conversational tone is loud enough to be audible if one listens, and if one is not disturbed by extraneous sounds.

I submit that the greatest disturbance in this chamber comes from those who are talking while someone is trying to make himself heard, and no arrangement anyone can make will overcome that difficulty.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Perhaps it might be overcome if those in control would keep better order.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, and we are all in control more or less.

Mr. BENNETT: Mostly less.

Mr. ELLIOTT: He continues:

It would hardly be wise, however, to count on so small a volume of sound being satisfactory when the house is in session. Yet, it was obvious when I was there that many of the members do not raise their voices materially above the ordinary conversational level in addressing the house. It may be an effect of the extraordinarily good acoustical qualities of the room that the members may sometimes think a low tone is sufficient, but when the press representatives and the public in the gallery are to hear, it seems to be absolutely necessary that the speakers should use as loud a tone as they would in any other hall, addressing an equal number of persons.

At your suggestion, I have also considered the question of supplying the house chamber with microphones and loud speakers. On the whole, my recommendation is decidedly adverse.

The report is quite lengthy and he refers later on to the curtain arrangements. The curtains of course should be kept as nearly as possible closed in order to facilitate hearing. And they are usually left partly open at any

rate. On the whole the best information we can get on the subject from the highest authority rather indicates that for the size of the building the acoustic properties are fairly satisfactory.

Mr. SPENCER: In connection with the forty minute rule the suggestion was made last year, as a means of obviating a member's being cut short in his speech by reason of his being unaware of the time, that some device might be placed on the table whereby the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker could notify the member on his feet, say ten minutes beforehand. What has been done in that respect?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That question was considered and it was decided that while it might be advantageous to install some such system we had not yet reached the time here when it was necessary to resort to a device of that kind. It was felt that it would be better for the member to depend upon the clock in front of him and the clock to his right and to endeavour to follow the time as nearly as he could. In certain cases, of course, the forty minutes do seem to go very quickly and possibly if there were a bell which could be rung shortly before the expiry of his time it might help the member. I doubt it, however; perhaps it would disconcert more than it would help him. Moreover, it was thought that it would not add to the dignity of debate in the chamber to have anyone calling time five minutes before the end of the period.

Mr. SPENCER: Does it make for satisfactory debate to have a large percentage of the members cut short in their speeches?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It depends on the kind of speech that is being made.

Mr. SPENCER: Probably ninety per cent of the ministers have been accidentally cut short.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): The minister might try to equalise the time; the time goes so much more quickly when one is speaking than when one is listening.

Mr. MANION: This discussion only shows the difference of opinion that exists, because I have never regretted seeing any of the ministers cut short in their speeches.

Item agreed to.

Ottawa — National Research Council laboratories, $750,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Will the minister explain this item.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is a revote from last year, and there has not been any great change in conditions since then except that Messrs. Rolph and Sproatt of Toronto have been engaged to prepare plans and work out a scheme not only for the first building but for the research buildings in general.

Mr. BENNETT: On the New Edinburgh site?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, but the plans have not been presented yet.

Mr. BENNETT: What about the statistical department; has that been completely removed to the new location?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Ottawa—addition to central heating plant, $200,000.

Mr. MANION: Might I ask for an explanation?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is to extend the heating plant in order to provide the additional facilities required for the new Confederation block.

Mr. CANTLEY: May I ask the minister what type of heating plant it is proposed to install?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is just to connect with the present heating plant, and I assume that my hon. friend is familiar with that plant.

Mr. CANTLEY: Yes, I understand that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The proposal is to tap in on the present heating plant for the new building. The cost will not be nearly so much in proportion to the additional heating accommodation since we already have this central heating plant in operation. I do not know whether my hon. friend has ever visited the central plant from which these various buildings are heated, but I would recommend that every member of the house do so. The work proposed under this item is an addition 45 by 56 feet and the installation of two 500 horse-power boilers with mechanical stokers. This is estimated to cost $200,000, made up as follows:

Addition to building..	$90,000
Boilers and mechanical equipment.	90,000
Contingencies..	20,000

Perhaps for the benefit of the house I might read the chief architect's report which was received on December 18, 1928, and which I found particularly interesting. The present heating plant consists of four 500 horse-power boilers capable of developing 650 horse-power

per boiler without forcing. One of the four boilers is always kept as a spare boiler in case of a breakdown or for use when one of the other boilers is being cleaned. The three available boilers are therefore capable of supplying 1,950 horse-power under normal working conditions. The present working load on these boilers is 1,600 horse-power, so that 350 horse-power are still available for other uses. The new Confederation building, which will be heated from the central heating plant, will require 600 horse-power, with the result that additional boiler capacity will be required.

Then the chief architect goes on to recommend that two 500 horse-power boilers with mechanical stokers be provided. Though only one of these would be of use at present, the other boiler would be required when the next building is erected, and one boiler could be used as a spare in the meantime. It is considered economically advisable to provide two boilers at present, however. If my hon. friend thinks it desirable I should be very glad to read the whole report in order to show the manner in which the present boilers are fed. The coal is dropped from above, and I believe the designers of the present heating system deserve very great credit; I think it is one of the most efficient and economical heating systems to be found anywhere. At present the parliament buildings, the west block, the east block, the Langevin building and the post office are all heated from the one heating plant, and this stoking is done with a comparatively small amount of help.

Mr. BENNETT: Due to the overhead automatic feed, I presume.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, and of course that reduces the cost. I have no doubt the day will come when some scheme of that kind, on a much larger scale, will be put into operation to heat practically all the large buildings in this district.

Mr. CANTLEY: The information given by the minister is about what I desired. I thoroughly agree with him in the advantages of a central heating plant; there can be no question of that, and the system we now have was quite up-to-date when it was installed. Now, however, the minister tells us that it is proposed to install two additional boilers of 500 horse-power each with mechanical stokers, and that is where I part company with him. Mechanical stokers firing boilers of that character in my judgment are a thing of the past. I would strongly urge upon him that he put in equipment which will use pulverized fuel. I would point out the great advance which has been made in that direction in the old country within the last two years, and particularly within the last year, during which very large installations of that character have been made with the very best results. I do not need to go into my reasons for advocating this system, but I would urge the minister to take the matter into very serious consideration before committing himself to another installation such as we have to-day, good though it may be. Its day has gone by; a much better and more economical system can be put in, and I think it should be considered.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If an entirely new system were being installed now I think my hon. friend's argument would be very good, but the serious objection to heating with pulverized fuel is that the whole plant we have at present would have to be changed.

Mr. CANTLEY: I am not advocating the change of the existing plant; I am advocating the adoption of powdered fuel in the two new units which are to be installed. There is no reason why the two systems should conflict at all; it will not be necessary to disturb one single unit of the existing plant if you equip the new plant to burn powdered fuel.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Well, much as I value my hon. friend's opinion in the matter, the advice of my engineers hardly corresponds with his suggestion. Then there is the objection with regard to the smoke or soot being greater if pulverized fuel is used.

Mr. CANTLEY: If the minister will pardon my saying so, the smoke or dust will be very much less. To begin with, there will be practically no smoke and I doubt if there will be 5 per cent of the ashes and cinders which must be handled to-day. Those are known, proven and demonstrated facts.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We have a heating plant in the city of Winnipeg which uses pulverized fuel and we do not have any difficulty with regard to smoke.

Mr. CANTLEY: You can get complete combustion, which is not possible with bituminous coal used by any other system.

Mr. SPENCER: Last year the house passed a resolution asking the government to test out pulverized fuel in one of the public buildings at Vancouver. I would like to ask the minister if that was done.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think that was done by the Mines department. I know some-

thing about the results but not enough to justify my taking up the time of the committee with an explanation.

Item agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT: I think we have accomplished a very good day's work.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the third reading of Bill No. 130, to amend the Canadian National Railways Act.

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

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Monday, April 29, 1929.

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Second report of the select standing committee on marine and fisheries.—Mr. Duff.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 170, respecting juvenile delinquents.

He said: This bill is a revision and at the same time a consolidation of the old act of 1908, incorporating certain changes which have been suggested by the conference which was held last summer of judges of juvenile delinquent courts and others interested in social work. The amendments relate largely to procedure and are of a nature to make the act work more smoothly.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CAPE BRETON NORTH-VICTORIA—DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton North-Victoria):

1. How many postmasters have been dismissed in the county of Cape Breton North-Victoria, since the present postmaster general assumed office?
2. What are their names?
3. Why were they dismissed?
4. Upon whose recommendation were said dismissals made?

Mr. VENIOT:

1. 25.
2, 3 and 4.

Postmasters dismissed in the County of Cape Breton North-Victoria, since the 25th September, 1926

Post Office	Postmaster	Why dismissed	Recommended by
Bay Road Valley	N. J. McDonald	Political partisanship	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Benacadie Pond	Jas. Smith	Interest of service	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Boulardarie East	Neil McPhee	Political partisanship and better location.	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Boulardarie West	P. McIntyre	Change of site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Bucklaw	J. A. McIntyre	Change of site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Dalem Lake	Alex. McDonald	More convenient site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Eskasoni	J. A. McAdam	More suitable site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Gairloch Mountain	A. D. Campbell	Change of site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Ingonish	J. P. Nunn	Political partisanship and change of site.	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Inlet Baddeck	H. Crowdus	Improved site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Ivera	Malcolm McRae	Change of site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
McNeil's Vale	J. J. McNeil, Jr.	Improved site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mine , N.S.
Matheson	N. McLeod	Non-residence of postmaster	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.

Postmasters dismissed in the County of Cape Breton North-Victora, since the 25th Sept. 1926—*Conc.*

Post Office	Postmaster	Why dismissed	Recommended by
Meat Cove	D. D. Fraser	Unsatisfactory management	Based on report of District Supt.
New Harris	Alex. Gunn	More convenient site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney N.S.
North Harbour Cape North.	J. A. McLeod	Political partisanship	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
North River Centre	N. J. McLeod	More convenient site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Plaister Mines	J. P. McKenzie	Improved site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Ross Ferry	Mrs. J. Fraser	More convenient site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
St. Ann's	D. Y. McLeod	Political partisanship	A. McDonald, Commissioner to investigate charges of political partisanship.
South Side Boulardarie	A. G. Fraser	More convenient site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Sugar Loaf	Mrs. H. L. MacDonald	Improved site	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Sunset Cape North	Philip Fitzgerald	Political partisanship	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.
Tarbot	Neil Carmichael	More convenient site	Authorized by Postmaster General on inspector's report.
Upper Middle River	Mrs. Annie McLennan	Change of site in the public interest.	Michael Dwyer, Sydney Mines, N.S.

OTTAWA BEAUTIFICATION—POST OFFICE SQUARE

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. Regarding the property bounded on the north by Wellington street, east by post office building, south by Sparks street and west by Elgin street, did the government enter into a contract for the removal of the buildings?

2. If so, what sum was paid or received by the government under such contract?

3. Were the grounds to be levelled by the contractor?

4. What sum has been spent to date on this property exclusive of purchase price?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1, 2 and 3. Yes, with the Betcherman Iron & Metal Company, the contractor to pay the government $8,311 for the buildings. The grounds were to be graded evenly to the contour of sidewalks and lane.

4. $2,026, this sum was for grading preparatory to sodding, and sodding same, putting in a water supply for sprinkling the grass, laying out flower beds and providing proper soil, and for the purchase of plants.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton):

1. Has the railroad been completed to Churchill on Hudson bay?

2. Will the road be available for the transportation of passengers and freight by July 1st of this year?

3. What accommodation is there for visitors at Churchill?

4. What is the total cost of the road to date, and what amount has been expended since 1926?

5. Are there any facilities for shipping at Churchill?

Mr. DUNNING:

1. Winter track has been laid to Churchill, but remains to be graded and ballasted and brought into shape for operation at all seasons.

2. No.

3. None.

4. (a) On the railway itself, $25,920,890.44 to March 31, 1929.

(b) Since 1926, $8,872,058.76.

5. Present facilities consist of temporary wharves and lighters.

ALFRED PEAT PLANT

Mr. CANTLEY:

1. Has the Department of the Interior finished its experimental work at the Alfred peat bogs, and, if so, what conclusion has the department arrived at with regard to the feasibility of producing and marketing peat fuel upon a commercial basis?

2. Is the plant which has been assembled at Alfred now completely efficient for the recovery of peat fuel and is it an adequate commercial unit for economical operation? If not, what remains to be done, and what alterations or additions does it require, and what will be the cost of necessary additions?

3. Will the government operate the Alfred peat plant this year?

4. If so, what tonnage of commercial fuel is expected to be recovered from the season's operations?

5. Has the peat bog plant at Alfred been transferred by the department to Peat Fuels Limited? If so, at what date and under what terms and conditions of lease, sale, operation or otherwise?

6. Is it the intention of the government to merchandise and market the production of said plant or will the same be handled as prior to 1927 or by Peat Fuels Limited?

7. Has the government considered the policy of paying a bounty based upon tonnage to be payable to producers who might embark in the industry?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): As the hon. gentleman who asked this question is in his seat, I might point out with respect to a number of these questions that unless we can secure an adjustment the matters will be referred to the exchequer court. I would like to ask my hon. friend to allow the question to be dropped, except that I will indicate to him a certain number of the questions which I can answer. The others cannot be answered without placing the department in an embarrassing position.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Dropped.

Mr. CANTLEY: No, I understand that my hon. friend is going to answer some of the questions.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I will answer such as I can.

Question stands.

COAL DRAWBACKS

Mr. CANTLEY:

What were the sums refunded by way of 99 per cent rebate of duty on imported coal used by iron and steel makers and/or other industries in each province of Canada during each year since these rebates came into force?

Mr. EULER: There is no record kept of amount of drawback paid, by provinces:

1908	$17,268 71
1909	24,466 98
1910	11,974 71
1911	174,330 42
1912	173,881 34
1913	135,142 07
1914	158,810 57
1915	141,995 22
1916	176,427 46
1917	215,201 86
1918	261,245 20
1919	451,007 04
1920	498,946 25
1921	324,609 29
1922	176,316 14
1923	354,678 75
1924	302,792 62
1925	462,105 53
1926	635,049 50
1927	757,431 72
1928	1,060,096 16

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

TRENT CANAL WATER-POWERS

Mr. PECK:

1. What water-powers, developed or otherwise, on the Trent canal system, are still undisposed of and in the hands of the government?

2. What action, if any, is the government taking to sell or otherwise dispose of these powers?

3. What applications, if any, have been received by the government for the purchase or leasing of these powers respectively?

PEACE RIVER DISTRICT—HOMESTEADS

Mr. KENNEDY:

1. How many homesteads were filed on in the years 1926, 1927, 1928, respectively, in: (a) the Grande Prairie land district; (b) the Peace River land district?

2. What number of these homesteads, filed in 1928 in each land district, were second homesteads?

3. What amount of land has been disposed of in the Grande Prairie land district, and the Peace River land district, respectively, by: (a) homesteads; (b) grazing lease; (c) sale?

4. What townships in each of these two land districts have been surveyed and open for settlement?

5. What is the total acreage of land surveyed and still open for homesteads?

6. What additional land will be surveyed in 1929 in: (a) Grande Prairie land district; (b) Peace River land district?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

OUTSTANDING SURVEY ACCOUNTS

Mr. J. A. FRASER (Cariboo) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence and documents relating to the following payment in the Auditor General's report, 1927-8, part K-31:

Outstanding survey accounts of previous years, for particulars see Auditor General's report, 1922-23, and correspondence in Auditor General's report, 1908-9, page K-151-155, $22,-743.55.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): A number of these questions have been coming up from time to time with reference to the Auditor General's report. I think it would be well if the question was put more specifically and a statement given, rather than referring to the Auditor General's report. There is no objection to bringing down the papers.

Motion agreed to.

MORRISBURG—PROPOSED PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CASSELMAN:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, petitions, and other documents in the possession of the government, in connection with a proposed dock and/or customs house at or near the village of Morrisburg in the county of Grenville-Dundas.

IROQUOIS POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. CASSELMAN:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, petitions and other documents in possession of the government (including civil service advertisements) in connection with the post office at Iroquois, in the county of Grenville-Dundas, from the 1st day of January, 1925, to date.

POST OFFICE AT MORECAMBE, ALBERTA

Mr. SPENCER:

For a copy of all correspondence and documents relating to the opening (during 1929) of a post office at Morecambe, Alberta, and the appointment of a postmaster in relation thereto.

TORONTO TERMINALS RAILWAY COMPANY

On the motion:

Third reading of bill No. 63 respecting the Toronto Terminals Railway Company.—Mr. Hocken.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Toronto West Centre (Mr. Hocken) is ill and will not be present again this session, and as this is merely a matter of form, may I be permitted in his behalf to move the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time, and passed.

PRIVATE BILLS

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 99, for the relief of William Henry Blackwell.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 107, for the relief of John William Telfer.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 109, for the relief of James Ross Curry.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 120, for the relief of Janet Gee.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 126, for the relief of William Henry Laverty.—Mr. Bothwell.

Bill No. 145, for the relief of James Clayton Powell.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 147, for the relief of Clare Doutre Walters Bertram.—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 148, for the relief of Margaret Duffield.—Mr. McPhee.

Motions for third readings agreed to on division.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 92, for the relief of Edward George Croucher.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 112, for the relief of William Greig Green.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 121, for the relief of Sylvester Wilfred Kerr.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 129, for the relief of Ernest Carl Bouck.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 151, for the relief of William Thomas Taylor.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Motions for third readings agreed to on division.

ANTOINE JOSEPH BOURDON

On the order:

House in committee on bill No. 85 for the relief of Effie Margaret Hill.—Mr. Clark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Clark moves that the house resolve itself into committee of the whole on private bills.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move an amendment:

That bill No. 113 (Letter G1 of the Senate), intituled: "An act for the relief of Antoine Joseph Bourdon" be not now referred to the committee of the whole, but that it be sent back to the select standing committee on private bills, with instructions that they have power to make further investigations.

Mr. CLARK: The hon. gentleman's amendment relates to a bill that is not before the house.

Mr. BENNETT: We have not reached Bill No. 113 yet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The amendment is quite regular, but the motion is to go into committee on private bills. If the hon. gentleman will make his motion when Bill No. 113 is under consideration we can deal with it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We cannot deal with it then. It has been the practice of the house for some time to go into committee on a number of bills. I suppose the older practice was that the house should go into committee on each particular bill, but it is now generally accepted that when the Speaker leaves the chair the house shall consider in committee a large number of bills, and there is therefore no further opportunity to deal with any one particular bill. So that the only recourse I have, if I wish that a particular bill shall not be proceeded with, is to move now such an amendment as I

have indicated to exempt that bill. I should like to say a few words on this matter when the question of procedure is decided, but I think I am acting in harmony with the rules in moving the amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is quite within the rules in moving the amendment now. However, if he permits us to go into committee on all the bills on the order paper preceding the bill to which he has referred, the house can make progress. Of course, if he wishes to press the amendment now he is in order.

Mr. CLARK: May I speak to the point of order? The hon. member's amendment relates to a bill which is not at all before the house. It has reference to order No. 18 relating to Bill No. 113. The house is now dealing with Bill No. 85. As I heard the motion, it was that the house should go into committee on Bill No. 85.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Standing order 110 provides:

> All private bills reported to the house by any committee may, on one motion, be referred together to a committee of the whole house and such committee may consider and report one or more such bills at the same sitting.

Under that rule the amendment is in order at this stage.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): But the motion has reference only to Bill No. 85. If the motion included all these other bills the amendment would be in order, but that motion has not yet been made.

Mr. MARCIL: As the Speaker has pointed out, under rule 110 all private bills reported to the house by any committee may on one motion be referred together to a committee of the whole house, which committee may consider and report one or more such bills at the same sitting.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But has that motion been made yet?

Mr. MARCIL: The motion is to go into committee on private bills, and the bill to which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) has taken exception is one of those bills. So that the amendment is in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the amendment?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: This, Mr. Speaker, was the case to which I referred the other day. The house may remember that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Boys) and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown), interpreting, I think the spirit of the house, stated that if the facts were in accordance with the extracts from the letter I read they would oppose this bill in committee. Now the trouble is that this bill went to the committee with a whole grist of others. As I understand it, neither the hon. member for North Simcoe nor the hon. member for Lisgar was present in the committee when this went through; nor did I know it was going through until the next morning after we had had the discussion. I was therefore unable to follow it up before it had passed the committee on private bills. It is for this reason that I take the rather exceptional method, but one quite within the rules, of asking that at this stage we do not press the consideration of this bill but refer it back to our committee for further investigation.

According to the evidence as presented to the senate committee, I notice that this was an uncontested bill. The respondent was not present. The petitioner made certain statements which were corroborated by the statements of two of his friends. The respondent was said to have lived at a rooming house, with one Arthur Hacking, and that, as far as I read the evidence, is the only direct testimony of her being guilty of the offence alleged. Further than that, the petitioner and his two friends state that the woman made admission of having had improper relations with the correspondent. That is about as far as the evidence before the senate committee goes; and I understand it is customary that when the petition is uncontested there is not a great deal of attention given to further inquiry into the case.

Only a day or so ago I received a second letter from the woman involved. I should gladly have avoided giving any publicity to her name in this connection, but since I am making a plea that this divorce bill be refused I think perhaps the only course I can follow is to take the house into my confidence and read this personal letter. Let me preface it by saying that I have no independent knowledge of the facts in the case. It may very well be that the woman is guilty; I have had no opportunities for making investigation. But I do think that when statements and charges are made, such as are contained in this letter, the least that can be done is to provide that the woman has a chance to be heard. If her allegations prove to be false, very well; if however, they should prove on investigation to be true, then I think that

we should have done a very gross injustice had we passed a bill of this character without further inquiry. This is the letter:

Mr. Woodsworth,
Member of Parliament,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,

Received your very kind letter for which I thank you sincerely.

I noticed your reference to my letter in the Montreal Star and I wish also to thank you and Mr. Boys for your decision to vote against the bill.

My lawyer received the report of the senate committee the day before I wrote you and your letter has made it quite clear to me that there is no provision for custody of children and it is not within the powers of the federal parliament to deal with questions of alimony.

My first lawyer did not seem to take much interest in my case and the one I have now tells me that the Quebec law is very unsettled as to alimony and guardianship of children when a divorce has been pronounced, because the civil law of this province does not deal with divorce but only with separation as to bed and board.

In any case as you tell me that the federal law cannot help me as to alimony and as I have no money to go to Ottawa and appear before any committee, I will ask my lawyer to do everything possible, but I think the child is so young that he could very well be given to me by parliament especially now that circumstances cannot be interpreted as being unfavourable to me in my way of living.

My husband is trying to make you believe I was living with this man, if I understand the report correctly, but I was living with his mother as a boarder. The little money I did make I gave to Mrs. Hacking with the exception of money for my carfare to work, to keep the home going.

I sold my diamond to pay her rent and now she is trying to keep my few moveable belongings because she says I owe her money. I haven't even my clothes and have not the money to pay to get them. If it were not for these kind people I am with who are willing to wait until I can pay my board, I should be on the street entirely.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know whether I should rise to a point of order, but I do not think it is proper to read private letters in this house having regard to a matter which is under consideration here. In view of the fact that my hon. friend is in favour of a divorce court, and since his only objection here is that parliament voted against such a court, I would ask him if he thinks anyone would be allowed to send a judge private letters of this kind, and whether he believes such letters should be read in a court of justice in opposition to the evidence which has been produced.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I know of no rule of this house which prevents me from reading this private letter. As to the propriety of my action, let me say this: Undoubtedly I believe in a divorce court; that is my only reason for having taken this matter so seriously, but the Minister of Justice was one of those who prevented the establishment of such a court.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My point is that no judge would permit such a letter to be read in court.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am sure the Minister of Justice will agree with me that if in reality we are a court we should have the evidence before us, but that is not the case here. The senate committee did not have this information, and in our own private bills committee there was no consideration whatever of the details of this case. I am not putting forward this letter as evidence in the case; I am bringing it before parliament simply as the appeal of a poor woman for a chance to be heard. I ask that we send this case back to our committee where evidence may be heard, and then we will not need to depend upon this letter; we can summon the woman and other witnesses. Let her charges be carefully sifted. I am simply bringing forward the plea of this woman, and I know of no other way in which I may attain the object desired.

Mr. STEVENS: This case was brought to the attention of the house by my hon. friend the other day before the bill was referred to committee. Why did he not take advantage of that opportunity and bring these matters to the attention of the house?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I made an explanation a few minutes ago, but perhaps my hon. friend was not present. This bill was considered by the committee the following morning, when the members of the committee who had spoken in favour of rejecting the bill if the woman's statements were true, the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys) and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown), were not present. I was not present either; I did not imagine it would come up so soon. I immediately called the attention of the hon. member for Simcoe to these facts in a letter which I wrote him, and as a matter of fact this fuller information, contained in this second letter, has come to me since that committee met, so I could not have presented this information before the committee. I wrote this woman immediately on receipt of her first letter; subsequently I received this second letter on which I now make an appeal to parliament. I could not have presented the

second letter before the committee; I did not have it at that time. I think that very well illustrates the fact that because of the hasty way in which we grant these divorces we are not dealing fairly with all the people concerned.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Since my hon. friend says he knows of no rule which would prevent him from reading the letter I would quote rule 306, page 101 of Beauchesne:

It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the house and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the house.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I submit there is nothing in that rule which is relevant to the matter under discussion.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Certainly the rule applies; my hon. friend says the evidence is not sufficient, and he reads a private letter complaining about the evidence which has been taken with regard to this matter.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Surely the Minister of Justice is not arguing the point seriously.

Mr. CLARK: If my hon. friend is finished with that letter may I see it?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not finished with it; I was interrupted while I was reading the letter. I will send my hon. friend a copy later. Now I will finish the letter:

If necessary, I can give the name of the doctor who performed my operation, also the hospital in Ottawa. I do not wish to do this unless it will help materially in my case, as the doctor was wonderful to me professionally and I would not care to give him undue publicity.

I heard my brother-in-law admit he had offered to get Mr. Hacking a good job if he would take me to a hotel and put me in a compromising position in order to get evidence enough for the divorce.

Also he has boasted to me that his brother would never have gone so far as to divorce me if it were not that he had made his brother do it.

He says he worked night and day trying to get evidence. I was grateful for what Arthur Hacking had done in refusing to help their plans so when he requested me to live with him and his mother I readily consented. I thought the money might as well help her as anyone else. I did not realize then that I was playing into their hands.

As I was not in Ottawa to defend myself, naturally they had the opportunity to put things in the very worst light possible.

My brother-in-law and his mother kidnapped the baby. He held me while his mother ran out with my baby.

After he was returned to me, my brother-in-law never let my husband rest until he made him leave me again.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. Bourdon refused to listen to me and he and his brother took the child away again.

I told him he could look after the baby better than I could but when I said that I thought he would come back to me.

During our trouble I thought Valmyre would be better away from it all. I did not realize things were as serious as they were. Please believe me when I say if I lose them both, I lose everything worth living for.

I have been very foolish and have done things which seem to be worse than they really are. Since this trouble started I hardly know what I am doing or saying. Arthur Hacking is very revengeful as he has sworn to do everything he can to make me lose my husband and child. He has told Mr. Bourdon some terrible things and he believed because he wants to believe.

I know if he did not get the divorce he would come back to me and I could make him forget all these terrible nine months. Will you not do all you can to give him back to me? Will you not give me the chance to make him forget and be happy once more with our little one? Our child needs most of all his mother, but he loves his daddy and needs him too. I am begging for life itself, will you give it to me?

Perhaps all this seems foolish when read with impersonal eyes but only God knows how my heart is torn for my two loved ones.

Are all my prayers and suffering these nine months to go un-answered and unheard? If it is not possible to do much for me, even a little will be appreciated more than you will ever know. As I said before, you are my last hope.

Please don't let them take my precious baby from me.

Again I thank you sincerely for your kind letter and efforts in my behalf, and shall wait for a favourable answer.

Sincerely,

(Sgd.) Mrs. Antoine Bourdon.

I think that letter makes it own appeal. This woman did not appear before the committee. I understand that if she had made application to the senate committee they would have given an order on her husband compelling him to pay sufficient money to permit her to appear and give her side of the case. Apparently she did not know anything about that; apparently the lawyer whom she consulted was very indifferent and did not inform her of her position. In any case, the matter came before the senate committee and she was not present; all the evidence was received from one side, from the petitioner and two of his personal friends. Under our procedure this matter has gone through the various stages until now it has passed our own committee, where it received no consideration of any kind. This is the last opportunity to do anything in the matter, hence the rather unusual procedure I have been forced to adopt. I cannot think that any member of this house will deliberately deny this woman the chance to be heard, and that is all I ask. She may be an imposter; she may be guilty; it may be that her statements

are quite untrue. It may be that her charges with regard to the illegal operation are not well founded; I do not know nor am I in position to know, and I do not think anyone can know until she is called before our committee to prove her charges. I do not know whether our committee has ever investigated a case in this manner before, but I am quite sure it has the right to advance money to the women for her expenses. If the senate committee could have ordered the husband to advance money to bring his wife here to appear in her own behalf I do not know why our committee cannot do the same. In this case I am not holding up the business of the house because of the general procedure at all, but because I consider it a serious matter and one in which the rights of a citizen of this country are not being safeguarded, and I appeal to the house to permit an investigation by our own committee before we take a vote on this bill.

Mr. IRVINE: I rise to express the hope that the house will permit this bill to be sent back for reconsideration by the private bills committee. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) brought this case to the attention of the house the other day, and I determined to do the best I could to have this matter investigated by the committee. However, for some reason or other, I did not receive my notification for the meeting of the committee. I do not suggest for a moment there was anything deliberate in that, I am sure it was purely an accident, but the fact remains that I did not receive that notice and hence I was not at the committee and had not the opportunity to direct the attention of the committee to this particular case. The hon. member is only asking that this woman be heard before our committee and that we ourselves judge her claim; I think that is a fair request. It has been said, and I believe it is true, that the expenses of this woman can be paid in order to permit her to give evidence in her own behalf.

Mr. DUFF: She had an opportunity to appear before the senate committee.

Mr. IRVINE: So far as I know this woman had no opportunity to appear before any committee, and I do not think she was aware of the fact that she could appear and have her expenses paid. Having no money herself she evidently did not know that she could make application for her expenses.

Mr. DUFF: She must have been notified.

Mr. IRVINE: I do not know anything about notification. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, the only thing to do is to bring the woman before the committee and investigate the case.

Mr. CLARK: If there is any doubt in the mind of any hon. member as to the facts not having been proven, or that there are any additional facts which should be brought out, I certainly have no objection to it going back to the committee.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

EFFIE MARGARET HILL

The house in committee on Bill No. 85, for the relief of Effie Margaret Hill—Mr. Clark.—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 2—Right to marry again.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children involved in this case?

Mr. CLARK: No.

Section agreed to on division.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

ELSIE ALICE HERVEY

The house in committee on Bill No. 93, for the relief of Elsie Alice Hervey—Mr. Clark.—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children involved in this case?

Mr. CLARK: One child.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Does the sponsor of this bill know what provision is being made for the child?

Mr. CLARK: The child is with the petitioner.

Section 1 agreed to on division.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

HUNTER WILBERT FAULKNER

The house in committee on Bill No. 97, for the relief of Hunter Wilbert Faulkner—Mr. Clark.—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On the preamble.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children in this case?

Mr. CLARK: No children.

Preamble carried on division.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

FLORENCE VELMA STRACHAN

The house in committee on Bill No. 123, for the relief of Florence Velma Strachan—Mr. Garland (Carleton).—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. EVANS: I wish to move an amendment to this bill, notice of which was given some days ago, as follows:

That section 1 of the bill be amended by adding the following words thereto:
"and the said Florence Velma Strachan have the custody of their child William Swinton Strachan, and that the said Alexander Swinton Strachan shall pay annually to Florence Velma Strachan for her support and maintenance the sum of five hundred dollars, so long as she remains unmarried, and the sum of two hundred dollars annually for the support and education of their child William Swinton Strachan."

The CHAIRMAN: As this amendment raises a question of constitutional law questions, I must ask the hon. gentleman to let it stand until the matter is given proper study. It is a question which might be held to interfere with civil rights of those residing in the different provinces, and I would like some time to consider the question before giving a ruling as to whether or not the amendment is in order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I point out that this notice was given several days ago, and is quite regular. The proposal is advanced in this particular bill simply in order that this may be a test case. We took the first bill that seemed to be suitable, and if this amendment is in order and if legislation of this kind is within the competence of parliament, we propose to move similar amendments in connection with other bills. It does not seem fair that you, Mr. Chairman, should ask that this stand and that we should proceed to other bills where we would then have no opportunity whatever of making similar amendments. As the Chairman knows, we have to give notice before amendments can be made. We thought this would be a test case. Now you say that you reserve your decision whether or not the amendment is in order, and yet you wish us to go on with other bills. I do not think that is quite fair to those of us who are anxious to expedite business but who nevertheless desire to insist that it be given due consideration. If this amendment that we provide for the support of the children and alimony for the wife, is in order, then it ought to be placed in every bill of this character right down the list. If you, Mr. Chairman, let this case stand and then go on with the other bills, we would be quite in order to ask that other bills of this character should also stand until this principle is decided.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Has the wife asked for that provision for alimony?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. members are doing this out of the kindness of their hearts.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: As is known, alimony was granted and the support of the children provided for only in the first cases brought before the Canadian House of Commons. It has not been the custom to ask for this, and in the ordinary petitions it is not included. The women in such cases do not know they have the privilege of asking for it, and the lawyers do not so inform them. Indeed, the lawyers do not know; no one knows, as a matter of fact.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But if we granted this, we would be granting more than the petition asked for.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, but why not? If there is a case of substantial injustice: if a woman has married in good faith and if for some reason her husband proves to be a worthless fellow or unfaithful to her, and after some years deserts her, she is thrown upon the world with no opportunity whatever of providing a living for herself. Marriage has at least some elements of a civil contract, and a wife under those circumstances ought to have some claim upon her husband. It is within the competence of this house to grant or not to grant this divorce; it is also within the power of the house to say under what conditions that divorce shall be granted. That can be done whether or not we go beyond the original terms of the petition.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): I should like to be quite clear upon what authority my hon. friend suggests that the house is empowered to make any such order as is now sought. I cannot get the authority for it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not a lawyer. My hon. friend is a lawyer and probably he knows more about the legal side of the matter than I do. I must confess that I am relying largely on the general principles of justice. But I would point out that divorces are not being granted under statutory provisions; that there is no law under which we are acting in this matter; that it is the common law of Great Britain, and that we are simply following precedent. I am subject to correction,

but I understand that it is competent for parliament to grant divorce for any reason whatsoever. It has been customary to grant divorce only on the ground of unfaithfulness or impotence. I think those are the only two grounds that have been recognized by the house, but I do not see any reason why we should not go beyond them. In other words, there is no statutory limitation, therefore I suggest it is open to us to say under what terms the divorce shall be granted. I submit that it is quite within our power to refuse divorce until such time as suitable provision is made for the children and the wife.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): How are we to know that?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We are discovering that we have no knowledge with regard to these matters. The evidence given before the senate committee does not reveal to us whether the wife has an independence or not; it does not reveal to us who is to take care of the children or whether the mother to whom the children are left is capable of caring for them. Under those circumstances, it seems to me that we in this house have a perfect right at least to make inquiries concerning the circumstances of the wife and children before proceeding to grant a divorce.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Does the amendment of the hon. member for Rosetown not provide for alimony and for the custody of the children?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is quite a different thing from what my hon. friend is arguing for. The amendment interferes with property and civil rights, but the hon. member is not arguing on that ground at all.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If the hon. member had followed me closely, I said that I thought we were within our rights; at least that we were following the precedent of the first case dealt with in the House of Commons if we provided for alimony and for the support of the children. That was done in the Campbell case, and that case has never been contested in the courts.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am not denying that, but I think my hon. friend would be on stronger ground if he would confine his argument to his proposal, namely, that the house do not act until assured alimony will be granted.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Well, we may proceed in that way later on. In the meantime I suggest that since the action in the Campbell case has never been contested in the courts, we are on fairly safe ground in following that precedent. I was further answering the hon. member for West Hamilton when I said that there lay, even beyond that, the right of insisting that a divorce should not be granted until such time as adequate provision could be made for the wife and the children involved.

Mr. MARCIL: It must not be forgotten that divorce bills are sent to the house by people wishing to be exempted from the general law. The general law in Ontario and Quebec is the indissolubility of the marriage tie. These people come here and ask for a favour; they ask for special reasons, to be relieved from the operation of the general act. We deal with each particular case, but according to Bourinot it has been held in the past:

> In case, however, the house is not satisfied with the evidence on which the senate has passed the bill, it is always competent for the committee on private bills to go into such further examination of the facts as may be deemed desirable in the interests of justice and society.

I am opposed to divorce on principle, but in this case the hon. gentleman has certainly the right to ask that these bills be dealt with according to the principle of justice. If there are children born of any marriage, and if the applicant wants to be relieved from the obligations which he contracts when he becomes married, some way should be provided by which he may not be permitted to throw his wife and children out on the street without making provision for them. That is a matter of elementary justice.

This question of divorce is essentially a matter that affects civil rights, just as marriage does, and both marriage and property come within the purview of the province. The fathers of confederation, not desiring to implant divorce on Ontario and Quebec as it existed in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but not knowing what to do with the child found on the doorstep, said: We will relegate this matter to the central authority to make it more and more difficult for divorce to take place in this country. The results showed that they were wise in their generation, for during the first ten years after confederation only seven divorces were granted by this parliament, and up until 1879, special committees were appointed by the House of Commons to deal with each case. But what

do we see to-day? There have been 293 applications for divorce during this present session, and there are 80 divorce bills on this order paper for to-day. I think the time has come, therefore, when it is the duty of the House of Commons to look into this matter more closely with a view to discouraging people from applying to parliament for divorce, and to discourage the belief that all that it is necessary to do to secure a divorce is merely to send in an application and the divorce will be granted without any answer from the respondent. I hope that some means will be found next session to remedy this great evil. I do not want to delay the house on this bill to discuss the principle of divorce, but I may say that I was pleased to see in Saturday's Journal a pronouncement by the Church of England in Canada on this very question. It declares that divorce is the outstanding question for the Canadian people to deal with to-day. It reiterates the stand which that church has previously taken and calls on all its clergymen to bring this very important question to the attention of their people, and not to re-marry people who have been divorced either by the courts or by parliament. I was glad, I say, to see this pronouncement by the Church of England in Canada, because it shows that public opinion in this country is being awakened with respect to this matter.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I do not know the facts in this particular case, but apparently this woman believes that she is obtaining through parliament the redress to which she is entitled. We do not know at this time whether or not she desires an order for alimony against her husband, or whether she has the custody of the children, if there are any. But under this bill she is obtaining the redress that she has asked for, and while I am quite agreeable to the bill going back to the private bills committee for reconsideration, I do not think we have power to pass such an amendment as has been proposed. I do not believe it is within the competence of this house to make an order granting alimony to a person who has not asked for it, if indeed it is possible for us to grant alimony at all. It would appear to me to come under the heading of civil rights, and would therefore be under the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature. I think it would be better if the amendment were drafted in such a way that the bill be referred back to the private bills committee to reconsider the case; otherwise this woman may be deprived entirely of the divorce which she desires, and possibly rightly desires. If we have to act upon this particular amendment, it may mean that instead of the petitioner being granted what she has asked for, she may be denied any remedy whatever. I would therefore suggest that the amendment be altered so that the effect will simply be to refer the bill back to the private bills committee.

Mr. SPENCER: May I inquire of the sponsor of this bill who has the custody of the children, whether it is the father, the mother, or anyone else?

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): The petitioner who is applying for this divorce has the custody of the child and seems to be quite satisfied to look after her own child. I agree with the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Bothwell) that the question of alimony is one for the civil courts; under chapter 184 of the revised statutes of Ontario, being the Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, subsections 1 and 2, page 1904, redress to the petitioner may be given. I believe the motion of the hon. member for Rosetown is out of order. This bill was sent back before on the very same ground that it is now proposed to send it back. As far as I am concerned, I want to see everything done that can possibly be done for the child, but the petitioner seems satisfied to look after her own child, and she has as much right to look after her own child as the father.

Mr. EVANS: The amendment was moved in good faith, in the belief that we had the power to deal with this matter. I still believe that if parliament has the power to grant divorces, which is a most serious matter as between two married persons, it should have the power to say on what terms that separation shall be granted. The sponsor of the bill has told us that the woman has the custody of the child, but evidently he does not know whether she has the necessary means for its support. We know nothing about this case. Surely we have the right to amend these bills as they come before us. If we have not, then I say that the granting of divorce by parliament is simply a farce, and we have carried it on much too long. But as the suggestion has been made that the bill be referred back to the private bills committee, I have no objection, although I do not see that there is any need for it.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The object, as I understand it, is to provide a test case to ascertain if we really have the power to grant alimony. If the amendment carries and we are later advised by the law officers that we have not

the power, then the question will be settled so far as parliament is concerned. When I was speaking on this very question some time ago, the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) took directly the opposite view to that which has been expressed here to-day, he said that parliament has power to deal with this matter, that parliament has actually granted alimony. I think it would be well to bring up a test case to see whether or not that power is intra vires of this parliament.

Mr. STEVENS: I would like to submit to my hon. friends that that is not the proper way to bring a matter of importance of this character to a legal test, simply to move an amendment to a bill in the House of Commons. In the first place, the absurdity—I was going to say—of the position we now find ourselves in is this, that the party has already the custody of the child which we are now solemnly asking parliament to give. I submit that that is really not the right way to proceed. The whole thing arises out of a difference of opinion among the members of this house, in the first place, on the principle of divorce, and secondly, as to the procedure under which divorce has been granted by parliament for a number of years. I have listened here for weeks now to very lengthy addresses by hon. members, particularly by my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre, my hon. friend from Labelle, and others, in which it seemed to be implied that those of us who have been more or less silent are entirely in favour of divorce being granted in a most reckless manner. I wish to say, and I feel impelled to say this by the continuity of these debates, that as far as I am concerned I am absolutely opposed to divorce. That is my personal feeling, but I do not come to parliament merely to give expression to my personal views on matters of this kind. I realize that it is accepted throughout the Dominion that divorce may be granted. The practice in two or three provinces has been to grant them through a petition to this parliament and an act being passeed; in other provinces, divorce is granted by the courts. It does not seem to me that we are discharging our duty properly, simply because we have personal prejudices in this matter, to seek to interfere with the redress that other people claim is their right as citizens. I admit to my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre that it may appear to some that the manner in which divorce has been granted by parliament has been, we will say, somewhat rapid, but I do feel that he has been a little unfair, in fact I think very unfair, to the senate committee, because my experience in the last twenty sessions is that the senate committee, of all the committees of parliament of either house, has given its time to the consideration of its duties, and given it ungrudgingly, and I think to most, if not all, of the members the work has been most distasteful. Therefore I think it is rather unfair to them to be constantly insinuating, or at least leaving the impression in the minds of the public, that that committee is a callous body without any particular consideration for the rights of women and children, and that it deals with the petitions carelessly and recklessly. For instance, my hon. friend moved a certain bill back to committee a few moments ago. I sent out for the evidence and I have been reading it, and I must say that I can see very little reason to question the decision of the senate committee. However, we are quite willing, if a member brings forward the question of the safeguarding of the rights of one of the parties to the suit, to give further opportunity for dealing with it.

But coming to the matter immediately before us, I do not think that this parliament, without much consideration, should immediately adopt a system of granting alimony and the custody of children, when these matters are not cited in the petition, and when it has not been the practice of parliament to deal with them, and when we know that in the provinces there is a very elaborate procedure set up whereby deserted wives and mothers may obtain redress, and children be cared for. I do not think that as a matter of theory or to further some idea of abstract justice we should plunge into these matters and give a decision without consideration.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I do not think my hon. friend is correct. This is only a test case and the hon. leader of the opposition said parliament has the right to grant alimony.

Mr. STEVENS: I think in this case it is abstract justice. I believe I quote my hon. leader's opinion corectly when I say he holds that parliament, having the right to grant divorce, has also a perfect right to deal with all matters that arise out of the granting of divorce—the Minister of Justice might agree that that is a sound principle of law—and perhaps had done so in the past. But we are not calling that in question. For years and years a certain practice has been followed, and the Prime Minister declared the other day—I think a little tardily, his declaration should have been made last session; however, he did so, and with a degree of graciousness that my hon. friend ought to recognize—he declared that the government would take this very difficult problem into consideration and endeavour to find some solution.

Now my hon. friend is asking me to vote on an amendment which frankly we are not in a position to discuss. The proper place to have raised the question would have been before the senate committee when the case was first considered. It was not raised there, it does not appear in the petition, and it occurs to me that my hon. friends would do well to let this testing of a principle, as they describe it, be considered and determined in connection with the whole question which we understand the government is now going to take into consideration. I think it rather too bad that my hon. friends have felt that the course taken by them was necessary. I agree it is a pity that the government did not last year take notice of the accumulation of these cases, and endeavour to lead parliament into some solution of the difficulty of the administration of this branch of law. I am not saying that by way of censure of the government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The only solution that was proposed was rejected by the house.

Mr. STEVENS: I quite agree with my hon. friend; but it has been shown by the discussion in the house that the problem is still here.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know.

Mr. STEVENS: The Prime Minister has told us very frankly that he recognizes that the problem exists, and he is going to find some way of adjusting the difficulty. I do not think my hon. friend should ask the house to deal with what I again say is an abstract principle of justice. It is not involved in this bill, the petitioner does not ask for it; therefore it is merely a question of whether we should carry on the practice in this way or not. The whole subject is to be considered by the government, and personally I do not think we should be asked to give an opinion on it at the present time.

Mr. SPENCER: The hon. member for Vancouver Centre said that at the present time the mother has charge of the child. The amendment asks that the mother shall have charge of the child legally. To-day there is nothing to prevent the husband from taking the child away.

Mr. STEVENS: How does my hon. friend know that?

Mr. SPENCER: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre earlier this afternoon pointed out a case where a child was forcibly taken away from the mother. Therefore I think there is some reason in the amendment.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): As I pointed out to my hon. friend a few moments ago, Mr. Chairman, if it were a mere matter of objecting to the passage of this particular bill on the grounds that alimony and the custody of the child or children had not been decided, one could understand the motion, but to make a motion for these specific purposes—something which we have never been asked to express an opinion on, during the period that I have been in this house, at all events—in my humble opinion is an attempt to do that which is outside our jurisdiction. Moreover, the courts are available for the dealing with the question of the custody of the children or child. If one of the parents is deemed to be immoral, the court in every case that I have heard of, has made the other parent the custodian. The same procedure applies to alimony. This woman is not necessarily debarred from the courts of her own province if she desires to secure alimony. I do not think parliament is in possession of all the facts to deal with these matters.

Mr. CLARK: It appears to me that when these petitioners come before parliament seeking divorce they come well advised. I notice they are represented by very eminent counsel, some great constitutional authorities, strange as it may seem, representing certain of the petitioners. It stands to reason that they have given due consideration to the rights of the petitioners and they have asked for all that they believe parliament can grant. If the mover of this amendment wishes to have the powers enlarged we cannot enlarge them by voting on the present proposal. It seems to me that parliament should have a definition of the legal rights of petitioners for divorce; and that definition—as to the right for instance of parliament to grant alimony or to decide with respect to the custody of the children—should come from the legal department and not be inferred from a vote in this house. I think the hon. member who moved the amendment will agree that parliament is not a body competent to give a legal opinion. Parliament relies on the Department of Justice for its legal opinions, and in this instance, in my opinion at least, if there is anything to be explained the explanation should come from that department. The explanation should not be gathered from the result of a vote in this committee.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I am opposed to divorce on principle, but as regards a definition with respect to the granting of alimony and the decision as to the custody of children I do

not see any reason why this parliament, if it has the right to grant divorces, should not have the right also to consider these other questions. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), who probably is better posted on the subject than I am—

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: —made the statement that alimony was a civil right and that a woman getting a divorce could go to the civil courts if she wished to obtain alimony. But I would point out that if we dissolve a marriage here no right can exist in the matter of alimony for the simple reason that, after the dissolution by this parliament, there is no state of marriage in relation to the parties concerned; therefore there can be no civil right as regards alimony so far as the courts are concerned. After we have dissolved a marriage here how can the woman go to a civil court to get alimony?—there is no marriage. The only condition under which alimony can be granted is when the divorce is granted by the civil courts.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I thought it was suggested that the Minister of Justice would speak.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, he remains as silent as he can.

Mr. KELLNER: After the divorce is granted here has the woman the privilege to go to the civil court in order to establish her claim in regard to alimony? The hon. member (Mr. Beaubien) has brought out this point and it seems to me the Minister of Justice should favour us with an expression of opinion.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I should like to have the question stand as a notice. So far as the province of Quebec is concerned, with the conditions in which I am more familiar, I know that alimony can be obtained in the courts. Of course, there is no divorce there. The chairman, I think, has indicated a wish to reserve decision on the motion which has been made, and we have been discussing this matter an hour since he so intimated. Would it not be well to leave it at that pending his decision, after he has received advice from the proper source?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What about the subsequent bills?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does my hon. friend intend to make a similar motion in regard to every bill—not only to grant divorce to those who seek it but also to give them money for which they do not ask?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If this is intra vires and we are in harmony with the rules of procedure, I think it would be only right that inquiry should be made in each case.

Mr. LAPOINTE: To grant them alimony even if they do not ask for it? The hon. gentleman is over generous.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I said that inquiry should be made in each case; I was explicit on that point.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But if they do not ask for it why make an investigation? Why investigate whether they want it or not?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Because in the past we have not been fair to the women in these provinces. The women of Ontario and Quebec have not had the opportunity of bringing their rights before any court where those rights can be properly investigated, and at the present moment we are simply pleading that in some way provision shall be made that women seeking divorces will not be thrown on the street and their children left to shift for themselves. If this bill is to stand until the Chairman reaches a decision, I do not wish to see other bills prevented from going through. But I wish to add some further considerations.

It has been said that it is open to the woman who is granted a divorce to enter action afterwards in the civil courts. I understand however that the trouble is that it is very difficult to get the civil courts to give a decision in such matters. I believe it is the general principle that the same court that grants a divorce ought to arrange the provisions under which that divorce is granted; and certainly there should not be the added expense, imposed upon poor people when they come to this parliament and obtain a divorce, of having to go on later to the civil courts to obtain the custody of children or to secure arrangements for their maintenance. I think it is quite proper that the rights of parliament should be defined, as the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Clark) has suggested. But how is that to be arranged? This matter has been brought up again and again, and always we are met with the answer given by the Minister of Justice—"we will take it into consideration."

Mr. LAPOINTE: I thought my hon. friend was pleased the other day when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) suggested

that the government be given an opportunity until next session to look into the matter. The hon. gentleman declared himself satisfied. But now he starts the whole discussion over again.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Prime Minister the other day stated that during the present session the house had decided against a divorce court for Ontario and that for that reason the question could not again be considered at this time. It was on that ground that some of us accepted his assurances. I have no doubt whatever that the Prime Minister spoke in good faith, believing that to be the situation. But after consulting the authorities I find that there is no reason why the matter may not be introduced at this session. It would be well, therefore, that the house should be clear on the situation. We are willing to let the matter stand if nothing else can be done. But if the question can be decided at this session it should be decided and not postponed, and thus an unsatisfactory procedure maintained in all these cases to be dealt with this year, and with the certainty of the difficulty arising again next year. Let me read from May 13 edition, page 299:

> When bills have ultimately passed or have been rejected, the rules of both houses are positive that they shall not be introduced again: but the practice is not strictly in accordance with them. The principle was thus stated by the Lords, 17th May, 1606—
>
> "That when a bill hath been brought into the house, and rejected, another bill of the same argument and matter may not be renewed and begun again in the same house in the same session where the former bill was begun. . ."

That is the senate, in this instance.

> "...but if a bill begun in one of the houses, and there allowed and passed, be disliked and refused in the other, a new bill of the same matter may be drawn and begun again in that house whereunto it was sent; and if, a bill being begun in either of the houses, and committed, it be thought by the committees that the matter may better proceed by a new bill, it is likewise holden agreeable to order in such case, to draw a new bill, and to bring it into the house."

Then follows a great number of instances covering a considerable period of time and coming down very nearly to the present. That simply means that under the procedure of our parliament, the senate having brought in this bill and it having been rejected by the House of Commons before a good many of the members knew just what was involved in its rejection, it is still open to us to reconsider our position. Further, now that members of the cabinet have stated very definitely that the present procedure is a farce; now that to-day we have another member of the cabinet saying that we in this house could not possibly know the conditions affecting the cases under consideration; now that the Prime Minister has declared the present procedure unsatisfactory and has stated his willingness to bring in some remedial legislation, it seems to me high time that we should insist on some action being taken at the earliest opportunity.

Let me tell the Minister of Justice that I was satisfied with the advance we made the other day, as I then considered it impossible for us to do anything further this session, but since my attention has been called to the fact that under the rules of this parliament it is quite possible for the government to introduce suitable legislation at this session, I am not quite so well satisfied.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What legislation?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There is no reason why legislation could not be introduced similar to the bill which was rejected, providing for the establishment of a divorce court in Ontario.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely my hon. friend knows that the bill to which he refers has been rejected by the house, and that is the end of that bill for this session. Even if his interpretation of the rule were correct would he think it fair to impose his views on the majority of the members of this parliament? Majority must rule, even when that majority does not include my hon. friend.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Quite so; the Minister of Justice need not become sarcastic in discussing the matter. I stated that according to the rules of this house it is quite within our competence to introduce that very bill again, and I think the temper of the house is such that another vote on the question might be very different from the vote we took some time ago.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend is flattering himself; he has not succeeded in convincing the house to that extent.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then I was going to suggest that there might be other methods available. For instance, it has been suggested that it might be possible to refer the responsibility for granting divorces to the exchequer court. I know some members of the senate have been considering the advisability of empowering the exchequer court, which is a court of parliament, to undertake the investigation of or perhaps actually to recommend or grant divorces. If I understand the situation correctly, we have it within our power to charge a court to do what we want done. I think it is quite within the powers of this parliament to take that action.

Personally I do not think that would be nearly so satisfactory as the creation of a divorce court for Ontario, but I would say that by so doing we would meet many of the objections which have been raised to the establishment of such a court. In the first place it is clearly within our powers to take such action, and in the second place we would not have to wait until Ontario has expressed an opinion with regard to the matter, as some members have suggested should be done. That is one possible line of action that the government might take even during this session. With these suggestions, I do not think we have yet exhausted the possibilities of action to relieve the situation; therefore I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice and the government to the possibility of proceeding along these lines before this parliament prorogues.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): I am so much in sympathy with the general principle which my hon. friend for Winnipeg North Centre has been advocating for some time with regard to the proper forum in which petitions for divorce should be considered that it is with considerable regret that I am compelled to differ from him now. However, in connection with the matter now under consideration I desire to direct the attention of the house to this fact: Almost from time immemorial questions affecting certain domestic relations, questions of alimony, of the custody of children and so on, have engaged the attention of the leading courts in the British Empire, and it has been well recognized that only by those who have engaged in a lifetime of study and investigation of the law and of special cases has it been possible to reach decisions which are worthy of that law which we desire to see upheld. Under these circumstances the suggestion made by my hon. friend is tantamount to saying that parliament would hand over to a body of men, no matter how able, no matter how willing, men without training with no knowledge of legal precedents, with no ability to recognize the effects of the steps which might be taken with regard to the numerous cases which would come before them for consideration, with no appreciation of such a vitally important thing as the value of evidence, the duty and privilege of deciding questions which have come within the competence of courts and which they have been able to decide, as I say, only after lifetimes of endeavour and with due consideration of the best legal precedents obtainable. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any member of this house whose duty takes him constantly into the courts would undertake to say that any parliamentary committee, I care not from what body it may be chosen, would be as well qualified to deal with matters of that kind or, in fact, to render proper decisions upon them; I know I could not conscientiously take that position. So, without regard at the moment for the general principle which has been under discussion, I am compelled to say that for my part at least I must oppose a measure of this kind, which could only have the effect of submitting to men who, whatever their other qualifications may be, are absolutely unfitted to deal with them, matters involving decisions on questions of the very gravest consequence.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: To which proposal does my hon. friend refer?

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): I was not in the house when the amendment was submitted, but as I understand it, the effect and purport of the proposed motion was to give parliament the power to consider such matters as the granting of alimony and the custody of children.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): Then I should be very glad to be corrected.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I could not quite understand the point raised by my hon. friend. I do not want to repeat what I said, but briefly it was that according to May, from which I quoted, parliament has the power to reintroduce this whole question this session, and that it seemed to me that at this session the government might bring forward some sort of legislation which would help us out of our present situation. Parliament might create a divorce court, which I thought would be best, or it might, temporarily at least, refer the whole matter to the exchequer court.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I think the hon. member for West Hamilton was referring to the amendment to this motion, which, as I understood it, certainly dealt with the question of alimony and the custody of children.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If I rightly understand the amendment of the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) it was just as the hon. member opposite has said.

Mr. VALLANCE: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me when the amendment was moved by the hon. member for Rosetown you doubted whether or not he was in order in moving

it. I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has stated that he did not want to tie up subsequent bills but intended to make a test case of this one bill. Suppose that when we refer this bill back to the committee we decide that we can give alimony in this case, what about the subsequent bills in connection with which petitioners be denied that right when they find that they have no rights in the courts of their own provinces? We doubt whether after a divorce has been granted they can go back to the provincial courts and obtain alimony, and we seem to be in doubt as to whether or not the hon. member for Rosetown was in order in moving his amendment. I think the house is tied up on the whole thing.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment as presented by the hon. member for Rosetown reads:

> That section 1 of the bill be amended by adding the following words thereto:
> "and the said Florence Velma Strachan, have the custody of their child William Swinton Strachan, and that the said Alexander Swinton Strachan shall pay annually to Florence Velma Strachan for her support and maintenance the sum of five hundred dollars, so long as she remains unmarried, and the sum of two hundred dollars annually for the support and education of their child William Swinton Strachan.

When this amendment was moved I suggested to the committee that it was a matter of too grave a responsibility to be decided in a hurry, and I asked for some time to consider it. Since that time there has been considerable debate and I have had the benefit of listening to the opinions of many hon. gentlemen on both sides and also the opportunity of referring to some authorities. Section 92 of the British North America Act reads as follows:

> 92. In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say,—
> 13. Property and civil rights in the province.

To my mind the matter of alimony is one of civil rights, and for that reason I rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. ADSHEAD: May I point out that you are not ruling merely on the question whether or not the amendment is in order, but you are ruling also that parliament has no right to grant alimony. That is the very thing we want to get decided.

The CHAIRMAN: That is my ruling.

Mr. EVANS: Like the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) I am opposed to the principle of divorce, but it seems to be necessary, and as long as it is necessary I would like to see this parliament conduct the procedure in a reasonable way. I have sat for eight years in this house and this is the first time I have seen any serious thought given to this great question of divorce. The debate has been worth while if we can attract the attention of the country and parliament to the necessity of having these bills dealt with in a serious way. Since this amendment may not be in order, and I am still in doubt, why not postpone consideration of this bill and all subsequent bills of the same character? It has been pointed out that the government can bring down legislation during this session to put this matter of divorce upon a reasonable basis and have it carried out by means of a reasonable procedure. The government can do that at once, can deal with the whole thing now, and we could deal later with this bill and subsequent divorce bills.

Mr. KELLNER: What is before the house?

The CHAIRMAN: We are considering Bill No. 123. All the sections of the bill were carried, and the question is: Shall I report the bill?

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

DOROTHY MADELINE HANSON CAMPBELL

The house in committee on Bill No. 149, for the relief of Dorothy Madeline Hanson Campbell—Mr. Clark—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children involved in this case?

Mr. CLARK: Yes, one, who is with the petitioner.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Have you any knowledge as to how the child is being provided for?

Mr. CLARK: I am satisfied that it will be looked after. The father of the petitioner is well able to look after the child and is at present doing so.

Section agreed to on division.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

LERA ETHEL VALLANCE

The house in committee on Bill No. 87, for the relief of Lera Ethel Vallance—Mr. Casselman—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children involved?

Mr. CASSELMAN: There were two children but they have since been placed in the possession of foster parents under the Ontario Adoption Act. As they have been placed under the provisions of that act, the foster parents are responsible for their maintenance.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

MABEL LORENE DECLUTE

The house in committee on Bill No. 100, for the relief of Mabel Lorene DeClute—Mr. Casselman—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children involved in this case?

Mr. CASSELMAN: No.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

EMILY MUNNINGS

The house in committee on Bill No. 102, for the relief of Emily Munnings—Mr. Hubbs—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children?

Mr. HUBBS: This gentleman went to England in 1916 after having lived with Mrs. Munnings for only three weeks. He went to England during the war, came back in 1918, went overseas again in 1920, and was there married. There are no children by the first marriage, and Mrs. Munnings did not live with him more than three weeks.

Section agreed to on division.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

MINA THOMPSON

The house in committee on Bill No. 146, for the relief of Mina Thompson—Mr. Thompson—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children ?

Mr. THOMPSON: There are three children, the oldest being twenty, the second nineteen, and the third seventeen. I understand they are supporting the mother now.

Section agreed to on division.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

LOUISA MARTHA WESTON

The house in committee on Bill No. 155, for the relief of Louisa Martha Weston—Mr. Casselman—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children in this case?

Mr. CASSELMAN: I have not been able to find out in this case whether there are children or not, I sent for a copy of the bill, but I could not get one from the distribution office.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then I think we might ask that the bill stand until we find out whether there are any children involved.

Bill stands.

FRANCES GWENDOLYN SNOW LOTT

The house in committee on Bill No. 91, for the relief of Frances Gwendolyn Snow Lott—Mr. Garland (Carleton)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): No children.

Section agreed to on division.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 98, for the relief of Marion Ruth Laidman—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

EDYTH MAY SHIELDS

Mr. N. M. YOUNG (Toronto Northeast) moved the second reading of Bill No. 94, for the relief of Edyth May Shields.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children?

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto): One male child who has now attained his majority.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time, on division.

MARY MELVINA GUERIN

Mr. N. M. YOUNG (Toronto Northeast) moved the second reading of Bill No. 95, for the relief of Mary Melvina Guerin.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children involved?

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto): Four children of varying ages who until 1926 had resided with the paternal grandmother, but are now with the petitioner.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The question is whether in granting these divorces we are free to do so without some provision being made for the care of the children. I should like to have that assurance before the divorce is granted.

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto): While the mother is not by any means a rich person, she does not seek any relief in that regard from this court. If such relief is to be given, it can be obtained much more cheaply through the court at Toronto to which she has access.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time, on division.

FLORENCE MAY FORBES

Mr. C. W. BELL (West Hamilton) moved the second reading of Bill No. 122, for the relief of Florence May Forbes.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children involved?

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): There were three children. The husband of the petitioner, unhappily, became a defaulter and fled the country some time ago. In order that the children of the marriage might be cared for, two of them were taken in charge by the wife's mother in England and are being brought up by her. The wife has charge of the other child here in Canada.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time, on division.

SOPHIA LOVE

Mr. N. M. YOUNG (Toronto Northeast) moved the second reading of Bill No. 127, for the relief of Sophia Love.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Are there any children?

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto): There are two children, but the husband is in England and without the jurisdiction of either this court or the courts of the province of Ontario. The petitioner seeks no relief from this court in that regard.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: You have no idea as to how the children are being provided for?

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto): The children are with the petitioner. The husband deserted his wife and is living in England, where he went through another form of marriage.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time on division.

HARRY FREEMAN SWITZER

Mr. N. M. YOUNG (Toronto Northeast) moved the second reating of Bill No. 138, for the relief of Harry Freeman Switzer.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time on division.

MINERVA ELLIOTT

The house resumed, from April 19, consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast) for the second reading of bill No. 88 for the relief of Minerva Elliott.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): What about the children in this case?

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto): There is no living issue.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time on division.

SUSANNAH MUSSON SAVERY

Mr. C. W. BELL (West Hamilton) moved the second reading of Bill No. 156, for the relief of Susannah Musson Savery.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): What about the children?

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): In this case there is one child fourteen years of age. She is with her mother and is desirous of remaining in her custody.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time on division.

GREAT LAKES AND ATLANTIC CANAL AND POWER COMPANY LIMITED

Mr. A. N. SMITH (Stormont) moved the second reading of Bill No. 169 respecting the Great Lakes and Atlantic Canal and Power Company, Limited.

Mr. BENNETT: We should like to have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont): Authority is sought to construct, improve, maintain and operate a combined canal and ship channel or deep waterway from a point below the city of Sorel to a point near Cornwall of not less than thirty-five feet for the passage of ocean-going vessels. The route of the proposed canal is to be from Sorel to Montreal, from Montreal to Laprairie basin, and from Laprairie basin to Cornwall. It is proposed as an alternative to improve and make navigable for ocean navigation the Richelieu river from Sorel to Chambly basin and to construct a suitable canal from Chambly basin to a point on the southeast shore of Laprairie basin. In view of the wide powers asked for in this bill, I think the best way will be to give it second reading and refer it to the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, where all the necessary information incidental to the project may be made available.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): I am not desirous, Mr. Speaker, of opposing an application for the consideration of any reasonable project, but I submit that this bill is of grave importance. The powers asked for are of a very extensive character, and will affect directly the great St. Lawrence project which is now occupying the attention of the government of Canada and the governments of the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Only recently the federal government approved of certain plans under the Navigable Waters Act with respect to the Beauharnois scheme, which involves the construction by a private corporation of a canal as well as a power plant. This will vitally affect those great projects. If we give this bill second reading it will of course be said that we have agreed to the principle of the bill. I notice the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) shakes his head, but I am stating what is actually the fact so far as parliament is concerned. Undoubtedly, when a bill of this character is brought forward we are supposed to consider on the second reading its broad general principle, in this case whether parliament is to agree to a private corporation constructing a series of canals in the St. Lawrence. I do not want my hon. friend, the sponsor of the bill, to think that I am merely captious in my criticism, but, speaking for myself, I am not prepared to agree now to the principle of any private corporation undertaking the improvement of the St. Lawrence waterway. I think almost from confederation the question of the canalization of the St. Lawrence to the great lakes has been in the hands of the parliament of Canada. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by the people of Canada on this great work. I think we ought not to give this bill second reading. Probably the government should have taken the whole question into consideration and have been prepared, when the bill came forward, to state their attitude in regard to it. It should not be the duty of any private member, especially on the opposition side, to now offer objections to the bill, because after all it is a question for parliament and particularly for the government to consider. If the government are prepared to endorse the bill publicly, then it becomes a question of policy whether we shall get behind or oppose the government in the matter. Speaking for myself, I am opposed to the principle of a private corporation being granted the powers set forth in this bill.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, I should have spoken immediately after the sponsor of the bill (Mr. Smith) moved the second reading had not my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) been on his feet. With most of his remarks I am in cordial agreement. I for one am not convinced that there should be such a canal as is proposed in this bill, and certainly the government is not adopting the principle of permitting private corporations to enter into the business of canalization and charging tolls, when it has been the policy of successive governments for a great many years past to operate, for the marine traffic of this country, canals without any toll charges. The question which arises in connection with the bill is one which has been frequently referred to this house. When private parties petition for private legislation and pay the fees demanded by this house it is presumed that they will get an opportunity themselves to present the object in which they are interested and for which they desire parliamentary approval. There is only one place where petitioners can thus appear, and that is before one of the select standing committees of this house. That is the only reason why I should be prepared personally to vote for the second reading of this bill—in order that those concerned may have an opportunity of presenting to a committee of this house such arguments as are in their possession, such information as they have, which would warrant parliament in

departing from what has been a principle of many years' standing in connection with undertakings of this character. I am absolutely opposed to the bill finally passing this house, but I am prepared certainly to allow the petitioners to come before a committee of the house and tell us all about it.

I do not pretend to know all that can be known about the St. Lawrence. I have studied the bill to some extent and find that in the main it does not relate at all to the St. Lawrence canal. It is a canal intended apparently to go overland to paralled the St. Lawrence for practically the whole of its distance. That may or may not be a merit, but for my part I am prepared to allow the petitioners to appear before the railways and canals committee and to endeavour there to demonstrate that what they propose is more in the interests of the people of Canada than is the policy now followed. I do not believe they can demonstrate it; I do not believe so for a moment, and I am myself opposed to the bill. But we should at least give them an opportunity to present their case.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Does the second reading of a private bill necessarily commit this house to the principle of the bill?

Mr. DUNNING: That of course is very debatable in connection with a private bill. But if my hon. friend puts his question in this form: Does the second reading of a private bill, which necessarily involves its reference to a committee of the house for its examination, commit this house to the final passage of the bill?—I can answer him definitely in the negative. It merely involves, in my judgment,—and I speak only as one member of the house—that the house in passing the second reading of the bill permits the petitioners to appear in the only way they can appear, before a select committee, there to endeavour to make out their case. I have indicated that personally I am opposed to the bill as such; but I see no way of treating petitioners fairly, after they have paid their fees, than at least to give them a hearing. That may not suit hon. gentlemen; I know it does not. But personally I have consistently followed that course—and, as I say, I speak only for myself in the matter. Certainly I do not deem myself voting for the passage of the bill in voting for the second reading; not at all; in fact, it would require a great deal of new information to persuade me that it is worth voting for at all. But I deem it wise that petitioners, whoever they may be, should have the right to appear before a committee of parliament.

[Mr. Dunning.]

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I would not trespass on the time of the house were it not for the observations of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning). It is laid down in May clearly that when the house gives second reading to a private bill it approves the principle of the bill. It approves the principle, although the details of the measure may be considered in the committee to which it may be referred.

What is the principle of this bill? The principle of this bill is that a private company may construct a canal and charge tolls, undertake hydro-electric enterprises, construct bridges, and enter upon various matters of that kind. It takes some thirteen pages to outline the provisions of the bill. The Minister of Railways, whose department is directly affected, has said that the petitioner's have given their notice and paid the advertising fees and the fees due to the clerks of the House of Commons and the Senate, and therefore the bill, in his opinion, should go to the committee. I submit with all deference that the principle is that the house itself must determine whether or not it will change a principle which heretofore has been approved, and this house only should vote upon that principle, and not a committee of the house. The house should be convinced, and not a committee. In other words, if the hon. gentleman who introduces the bill is unable to prove to the house in his opening that the matter is one of such great public interest as would warrant this house in departing from the principle which heretofore has guided it in legislation of this character, the bill should not pass. He has not given any explanation to warrant any such thing being done, and as the matter now stands when we give second reading to the bill we have approved the principle of a private canal being constructed, paralleling the St. Lawrence river, with a depth of thirty-five feet and width of four hundred feet, and involving the possibility of tolls being charged, together with various other matters of that kind. I for one will recall to the house what is laid down by May with respect to private bills of this character. When you approve the principle of legislation it must then be assumed that some sort of bill will emerge from the committee to which that legislation is referred. The place to kill the bill, if you wish to kill it, is here and not in the committee; because having sent the bill to the committee you have indicated that you are in favour of the principle of a privately-owned canal, and you instruct the committee to prepare a measure accordingly, and if

necessary so amending the provisions as submitted that there will emerge from that committee a bill carrying out the principle you have approved. For that I am not prepared to vote. It serves no useful purpose to take up the time of the house in a long debate, but certainly, if such a bill were to originate on this side of the house, I have no doubt what the Minister of Railways would say about it.

Mr. DUNNING: Exactly the same as I have said in this case. My hon. friend will permit me to say that I have taken precisely the same ground with respect to bills in the same position emanating from across the way.

Mr. BENNETT: I recall the case of the Georgian bay canal bill. After lengthy discussion, and after attention had been drawn to what May has to say on the question, the bill finally went to the committee where, when it was considered, not a single member but one was found to vote for it. What happened was this: It occupied weeks of debate in this house and was given second reading, a very persistent lobby having been maintained to secure its second reading. The last minister who spoke upon it was the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler). When the bill reached the committee, however, one member stood up in favour of it. The house was then in the anomalous position of having voted by a majority for the principle of the building of the Georgian bay canal, although, when the bill reached the committee, there was just one hon. member who was loyal to his principles and who stood up for the principle of the bill being given effect to by legislation. That, it seems to me, is hardly the practice to be pursued.

If we have no desire to pass this legislation—and apparently we have not—I think the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Smith) will be well advised to take the nays and yeas as indicating whether or not it is the intention of parliament to depart from the principle which has heretofore governed, namely, that canals of this character should be publicly owned and that no tolls should be chargeable in relation thereto. With all my friendly regard for the hon. member for Stormont, I beg to assure him that legislation is not based upon considerations of friendship when it affects the public weal, and I for one propose accordingly to vote against the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion will say, yea.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yea.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those opposed will say, nay.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Nay.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the nays have it. The motion is lost.

Motion negatived.

MESSAGE FROM HIS MAJESTY THE KING

TRANSMITTED BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to inform the house that I have received the following message from His Excellency the Governor General:

Office of the Governor General's Secretary
Canada.
Ottawa, 29th April, 1929.

Sir,

I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor General to inform you that he has received the following message from Lord Stamfordham, private secretary to His Majesty the King:—

"I am profoundly grateful for the address presented by the Senate and Commons of Canada. The Queen and I have been deeply touched by the expression of thankfulness and loyal affection contained in this address, and by all other messages of loving sympathy and devotion which have been received from my people of Canada during my long illness. I trust that under Divine Providence I may soon be restored to full health and strength. George R.I."

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
James F. Crowdy,
Assistant Secretary
to the Governor General.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons,
Ottawa.

FISHERIES NOVA SCOTIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. W. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton North-Victoria): I would like to ask the Department of Marine and Fisheries one or two questions based upon a report appearing in the Halifax Herald under date of April 26, describing the serious condition of the fishing community of Ingonish, in the country of Victoria. The questions are based upon this report, which is as follows:

A wave of indignation mingled with discouragement has struck this community during the past few days, due to the poor prospect of receiving a fair price for fish during the coming summer. The Leonard Fishery are offering 2½ cents for haddock, gutted; this it is felt is

hardly better than last year, when the fishermen received the starvation price of 2 cents apiece round.

Continuing, the article asserts:

Now it looks as if the fishermen must undergo exploitation for another year and the high hopes entertained respecting the benefits that were to follow the remedial recommendations of the royal commission seem as dead as the fallen leaves of last autumn.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not in his seat, but perhaps he will answer my question to-morrow. I desire to ask the government, first: Has the government accepted the majority or the minority report of the fisheries commission?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would respectfully ask the hon. gentleman to give notice of this question.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): This might serve as notice, since the minister is not present.

Mr. JOHNSTONE: My second question is: What is the policy of the government with respect to the abolition of the steam trawler, and third, what relief does the government intend giving the fishermen of this community?

Mr. SPEAKER: This will serve as notice.

NATIONAL DEFENCE EXPENDITURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. E. SPENCER (Battle River): I wish to refer to question No. 2, which I placed on the order paper on April 15, and which requests certain information with regard to the expenditure for national defence for the year ending March 31, 1914. This question has been on the order paper for some considerable time and I would like the information before the estimates of the Department of National Defence come up for consideration.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): If my hon. friend will look at the question he will see that in one sense it is not quite so easy to answer as he might lead the house to believe. He asks for the estimated expenditure on national defence for the year ending March 31, 1914. There was no department of National Defence at that time and the only way in which that information can be obtained is by taking the various departments which had any services relating to national defence and adding the amounts together. That requires clerical work, and if I may say so my hon. friend might do it himself about as well as it could be done by the clerks in any of the departments. Apparently this question just covers what was in the estimates.

Mr. SPENCER: I want authentic information; that is why I did not do the work myself.

Mr. RALSTON: The estimates for that year would give the figures.

Mr. SPENCER: The minister says these expenditures were made by several departments, and I want to make sure of my figures.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—TABLING OF FILES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I mentioned to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) a matter which I think is of sufficient importance to be mentioned in the house now. We have been discussing the estimates of the Postmaster General, and by the arrangement arrived at the other day I think we have done something to expedite the conduct of public business, by having the minister bring the original files to his office to be inspected by members of the opposition without the delay which would be necessary if these files were copied. The multiplicity of cases which have been brought to my attention since we first discussed the estimates of this department render it impossible for us to hope to deal with them all in the ordinary way, and I therefore venture to suggest that the files relating to the cases which I shall presently mention might be brought by the minister to his office for inspection. One case deals with post office affairs at Levis, Quebec, and the other with the appointment to the post office at Mitchell, Ontario. I will not discuss them even in outline, because one is never certain that the information given is warranted by the facts as subsequently indicated by the files. I am bound to say that the Prime Minister thought this request not unreasonable, and since then the Postmaster General has indicated that he is arranging to have these files brought to his office in order that they may be inspected without delay. We are endeavouring to eliminate the discussion of cases involving dismissals, which tends to produce, as I think President Wilson said, more heat than light. Under these circumstances perhaps we can assist the government in transacting public business by pursuing the course I have indicated.

HARBOUR COMMISSION REPORTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): There is one other matter to

which I would like to direct the attention of the government. I cannot find in the office downstairs which has the custody of documents tabled in this house any reports for the year 1928 of the harbour commissions of Toronto, Montreal, Three Rivers, Chicoutimi, Quebec, St. John, Halifax or Vancouver. Perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin) will see that these reports are brought down before we discuss certain resolutions now appearing on the order paper. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) is also interested in these matters in view of the report made by the audit board last year upon the affairs of the harbour commission of Quebec. I mention this so that when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries reads Hansard to-morrow he will see what we desire.

REGULATION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC

PAPERS RELATING TO CONVENTION BETWEEN UNITED KINGDOM AND UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): There is another matter I would like to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister, although I know he must have many things to give him concern at this time; I refer to the correspondence antedating the convention of 1924 between Great Britain and the United States, as requested by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan). We desire that this correspondence be brought down as soon as possible in order that we may have the fullest information before discussing certain of the estimates of the right hon. Prime Minister with respect to the Department of External Affairs.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The leader of the opposition was kind enough to mention his intention of asking this question to-day, and I have obtained from the department a copy of the convention between His Britannic Majesty and the president of the United States of America respecting the regulation of the liquor traffic, which was signed at Washington on January 23, 1924.

I might say that when this document and others were asked for by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George I instructed my officials to ascertain from the British government by cable whether the correspondence might be tabled. That message has been sent, but up to the present there has hardly been time for a reply. For the present I will table the convention and will hope to be able to bring down the correspondence later on.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George understood that the Prime Minister was cabling Great Britain so that there would be no undue delay. I apprehend that if the Prime Minister does not receive a reply within a reasonable time he will send a reminder or a refresher, as the Minister of Railways and Canals might say, so that this matter will not be overlooked.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I inquired as to when the message was sent, and I was told that a cable had been despatched immediately. I will follow up the matter at once.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not quite sure but I think the treaty and other documents were distributed to the members of the house some years ago, but inasmuch as this is a live question now, I wonder if this treaty could either be printed in the votes and proceedings or made available to the members by some other means.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My impression is that the treaty was distributed to the members of parliament but there would be no objection to having the documents reprinted.

Mr. SPEAKER: It might be included in the votes and proceedings for to-morrow.

Mr. BENNETT: That would be very serviceable.

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): The first item is vote No. 131, harbours and rivers.

Mr. BENNETT: As some of the members desire to speak with reference to certain items in vote 132, could this vote be taken up first?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It makes no difference to me.

Charlottetown—reconstruction of railway wharf, $48,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Would the minister give us some information as to the work which is being carried on here?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is a revote from last year.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Does the amount cover the rebuilding of the property which was destroyed by fire last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, that is my understanding.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): It is very difficult for the people of Prince Edward Island to understand why the rebuilding of this shed has been delayed so long.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Will the hon. member speak just a little louder and will my other hon. friends endeavour to keep a little order, because I cannot hear a word of what is being said?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): There was a great deal of dissatisfaction throughout the province in connection with the delay in rebuilding this shed last year. The shed was destroyed some time during June and the rebuilding was not undertaken in time to make it available for the fall season. The people interested think that this delay was unnecessarily long and that the department should have taken some quicker action in order to make the building available for the fall traffic. I am not criticizing the vote in any way except to say that in a matter of such great public interest more energetic measures should have been taken to have the rebuilding done at once.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have not the correspondence before me but my recollection is that the fire took place some time after the house rose. There was no money in the estimates to provide for the rebuilding and a governor general's warrant had to be obtained at the earliest possible moment. As I recollect, that was done and it is a great surprise to me to hear the hon. member say that the work was not proceeded with. I believe I have something among my papers which shows that the representatives down there have expressed their great appreciation of the expedition with which the department acted in regard to this matter.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): We notice here in the House of Commons and in other places that all the representatives for some of the counties in Prince Edward Island do is to express appreciation to the government for what it happens to do. I have no further objection to the vote.

Item agreed to.

Souris harbour—breakwater repairs, $60,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Would the minister give us some information as to what work was done last year? There was $30,000 voted for this work a year ago and apparently only about $7,000 was expended. The vote has been doubled to $60,000 and I think some explanation would be in order.

[Mr. Macdonald (Kings).]

Mr. ELLIOTT: The amount of $60,000 is required to complete the work now under contract with Mr. H. J. Phillips of Charlottetown, P.E.I. This contract consists of placing some 1,500 cubic yards of stone, from two to three cubic yards in size, in front of the outer block, and placing a further quantity of 2,500 cubic yards, from one to two cubic yards in size along the seaward face of middle section of the breakwater for a length of 460 feet. The total amount of stone to be placed is approximately 4,000 cubic yards. The amount expended last year to the 31st March was $8,347.57.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Was this contract made with Mr. Phillips last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Involving the whole $60,000 expenditure?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): This looks like a very large amount of money to which, of course, I cannot object, and I am not objecting, as it is being spent in my constituency, but the condition of the railway wharf at the same point and right alongside this breakwater, is very serious at the present time. To my mind, better service would be given to the community and to the town of Souris if a portion of this vote were made applicable to some repairs to the railway wharf. It is rather important because it is a transfer point for a large quantity of freight for the Magdalen islands. The shed on the railway wharf is in bad condition; the roof is leaking, and the merchandise that is being transshipped by the railway should be stored there until the boat calls for it. It cannot be stored there at the present time because it would be in danger of destruction on account of the leaky roof. In addition to that, farmers and business men have to store merchandise waiting for the steamer for the Magdalen islands and under present conditions the wharf cannot be used to any extent because goods cannot be protected from the weather on account of the condition of the roof. It would be better if an additional appropriation could be made for repairs to the railway wharf shed, but if the government cannot see its way clear to provide any more money, as only a small amount was expended last year and as it might not be necessary to spend the whole of the vote this year on the breakwater, I would suggest that a part of the appropriation be used to repair the shed. If that were done, there would be more real value given to the

community and better service given to the town, especially in view of the fact that this shed is the only place where stuff can be stored for shipment to the Magdalen islands or to any other port.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Our instructions from the engineers are quite in accord with my hon. friend's statement made to the house a year ago, namely, that the matter which is urgent is the building of the breakwater. The other structures are in danger of being completely destroyed unless the breakwater is constructed. It is the protection for the rest, and the information that I have at hand is that it should be proceeded with first of all.

Item agreed to.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock we were considering vote No. 132. The item we are now considering reads:

Victoria—wharf repairs, $1,100.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, whether the item of $60,000 for breakwater repairs for Souris harbour was passed or not, but in any case I am sure that the minister will answer my question. Is it the intention of the department this year to see that proper accommodation shall be provided for the transfer of goods from the railway to the steamer, especially the government subsidized steamer for the Magdalen islands? The accommodation at the transfer shed is unsatisfactory now owing to a leaky roof and other defects. Will anything be done this year to remedy that condition?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is nothing in the estimates providing especially for that, but there is the general vote for work of that kind, and it is a little larger than usual this year.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I hope the minister will keep the condition of that shed in mind, because it is a very important one. I hope that something will be done in this direction out of the general vote so that the accommodation will be made of some real use to the people. It is of importance in several ways, and particularly because the Dominion government subsidizes a steamship service there to the amount of $50,000 a year, anad surely when a steamship service is subsidized to that extent the transfer shed from the railways to the steamer should be such as to afford protection to the goods.

Item agreed to.

Westville—wharf, $10,600.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I wonder where Westville is.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does my hon. friend not know the location? For his information I may say that it is Queens county on the south side of the West river.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): It is rather difficult to understand why so much money is voted for these places. There is a vote of $8,200 for wharf reconstruction and extension at West river bridge, and this vote of $10,600 for the wharf at Westville. Can the minister tell us just what business is being done at these places to justify such an expenditure?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The district engineer reports:

Westville is a point on the south side of the West river about five miles from Charlottetown, where a small structure known as "McEwan's" wharf was built by the local government many years ago. It supplies shipping accommodation for the various communities in this vicinity, namely, New Dominion, Long Creek, Canoe Cove, South Shore, Nine Mile Creek and Fairview, same containing probably from 600 to 800 persons interested in the export of surplus farm produce and import of coal, lumber and general merchandise by water, as they are entirely cut off from any railway service. The wharf is also a point of call twice weekly for the subsidized steamer "Harland", but owing to recent development in the seed potato industry it has been found inadequate and vessels arriving in the busy shipping season have often to lie at the pierhead one outside the other. There are no statistics available as to the value of the business transacted over this wharf, but from personal observation covering the past twenty years or more I am of the opinion this would not exceed $50,000 per season. The wharf is still controlled by the local government, and as only small repairs have been made on it from time to time it is now in very bad condition and will shortly require to be entirely reconstructed. Under these circumstances shippers and others interested in obtaining improved facilities at the place desire that the present wharf be abandoned and an entirely new one built a short distance to the eastward, and I have no hesitation in advising the department that I consider that it would be better in every way to comply with such request. The proposed new site has an excellent approach both from water and land, with sufficient space for any warehouse accommodation that might eventually be required, while approach to present wharf is up a very steep hill, difficult to team heavy loads over, and the land surrounding it is neither available or suitable for the traffic that it is anticipated will follow improved shipping facilities at Westville.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Is that report from the district engineer?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, the district engineer, Mr. Hyndman.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I have a great real of confidence in any report made by the district engineer, as I know he is a really practical man. How far is this wharf from the West river bridge wharf, for which there is a vote of over $8,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT: My information is that it is three or four miles below that bridge.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): When those of us who know the situation existing there compare the treatment the West river is receiving with that accorded to other points in the province, especially in Kings county, we cannot help wondering why it is that so much attention is given to certain points, two, three or four miles apart in one county, and no attention whatever to large sections in another county.

Mr. McPHEE: It is well represented.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I was going to suggest, when my hon. friend interrupted, that the representation apparently has a great deal to do with it, and I say that with all due deference to my hon. friends from Queens county. My hon. friend (Mr. McPhee) lived alongside the West river a few years ago before he moved west, and he knows as well as I do that the expenditure of fifteen or twenty thousand dollars on sections of the river there three or four miles apart is justified by the exigencies of the representatives of Queens county.

Item agreed to.

Bailey's Brook—extension to pier, $3,000.

Mr. CANTLEY: Mr. Chairman, what is this item for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required to construct a cribwork extension 240 feet long, 10 feet wide and 10 feet high to the eastern pier. An extension to the pier is required in order to straighten and constrict the channel, thus preventing the accumulation of debris which obstructs the traffic. About sixty fishing boats use this harbour during the fishing season, and the improvement suggested will be of great benefit to them in the handling of their fish. The annual value of the fisheries is $24,500. Three lobster factories are located in the district, which has a population of approximately five hundred.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. CANTLEY: How much was spent last year, and who was the superintendent under whom the work was done?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Last year we spent $2,490 I have not the name of the superintendent. I shall be very glad to get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. CANTLEY: Can the minister tell me under whose recommendation the superintendent was appointed, and if he continued throughout the season to carry on the work?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I could not answer that question offhand.

Mr. CANTLEY: I think the minister had better let the item stand over until he has the information ready.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It would facilitate matters if my hon. friend saw fit to let the item pass, but I am not going to urge it. I will undertake to supply all the information he requires.

Mr. CANTLEY: Will you allow me to discuss the matter later?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Certainly, I shall be very glad to.

Mr. CANTLEY: With that understanding, all right.

Item agreed to.

Barrington passage—ice piers, $35,000.

Mr. ERNST: Would the minister explain on whose recommendation this is being done, and for what purpose?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Seventeen thousand dollars of this is a revote from last year. The amount is asked to be provided towards the construction of a second concrete pier at Barrington passage. The amount expended on the pier last year was only $104.

Mr. ERNST: They are ice piers. What purpose do they serve?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is claimed that under existing conditions the people of Cape Sable island are practically isolated during the winter months. The ferry which runs between Barrington passage and Cape Sable island cannot give regular service on account of the heavy ice fields which run up and down the passage making navigation unsafe. If the proposed piers were constructed across the passage they would keep the ice fields broken up in such small quantities that the ferry boats would have no difficulty in making daily trips.

Mr. ERNST: Does this represent the final expenditure, or will further piers be necessary?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It depends to a certain extent upon the results obtained. If the first two piers constructed have the effect of doing what the engineer thinks they will do, it is possible that something further along that line will be done.

Mr. ERNST: How much more?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There are only two piers at the present time.

Mr. ERNST: What is the final scheme if this experiment proves satisfactory?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The $35,000 includes everything contemplated at the present time.

Mr. ERNST: The present expenditure is experimental, I understand?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Largely.

Mr. ERNST: If the experiment proves successful what is to be done further? Is there no definite scheme?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, this is experimental and there will be nothing definitely decided upon until the engineers have an opportunity of seeing how it works out.

Mr. ERNST: On whose recommendation, may I ask, is it being done?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The engineer's.

Mr. ERNST: Is the minister quite sure? I was informed that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) promised this work.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, it is the engineer. Part of his recommendation is as follows:

Under existing conditions, it is readily seen that the people of Cape Sable Island are practically isolated during the winter months, and the reason for this isolation is that the heavy ice fields which run up and down the passage do not allow the safe navigation of the passage, and it seems reasonable to believe that if ice piers were constructed across the passage at its narrowest part they would break the ice fields which flow back and forward through the passage during the winter. As the tide runs in and out of the passage four times a day, ice piers would no doubt keep the ice fields broken up in such small quantities that the ferry boats would have no difficulty in making their daily trips.

Mr. ERNST: Is it being done on the recommendation of the Minister of National Defence? It is in his constituency.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know he has spoken on behalf of this.

Mr. ERNST: Before the engineers made their report?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think it was after the engineers reported.

Item agreed to.

Brooklyn—dredging, The Mersey Paper Company, Limited, to contribute one third of cost, $70,000.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister might explain this item. There is another one of a similar character.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is one of a number of similar projects which the government have been assisting. This amount of $70,000 is asked to be provided towards the following dredging at North Brooklyn, the Mersey Paper Company Limited to contribute one-third of cost: The work proposed at Brooklyn consists of the dredging of a dock and basin for the pier of the Mersey Paper Mill Company. The average dimensions of this work are approximately; length, 1,150 feet; width, 550 feet; depth, 23.1 feet below L.W.O.S.T. It is estimated that 176,400 cubic yards scow measurement of sand, clay and gravel will have to be removed.

The object of the work is to provide suitable berths and basin to accommodate large steamers which will be engaged in carrying the products of The Mersey Paper Mill.

Mr. GARDINER: Will this wharf remain under the control of the government?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Is $70,000 the total cost, or will it be $105,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The total cost will be $110,000. Our information is that The Mersey Company are expending a large sum of money there, variously estimated between six and nine million dollars, in establishing a paper mill at North Brooklyn; and I believe their power development will involve a further expenditure.

Mr. ERNST: The power development is being done by the provincial government entirely, but the company have built their plant and pier there at their own expense.

Mr. GARDINER: The government has nothing to do with the pier?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. GARDINER: Who will have access to the pier?

Mr. ELLIOTT: All those doing business with this large concern; it is not a public pier.

Mr. GARDINER: How far is the government going to go with this policy. It is ridiculous to do dredging in connection with private piers.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is the same policy as is followed in connection with dredging up to grain elevators. It is the policy of the government wherever there is a large expenditure of this kind creating considerable business development to endeavour to assist either in dredging or sometimes in actual dock construction. In this case we are assisting merely in the dredging.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the government endeavour to secure from the company the right of access to the pier on the part of the public?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The government have done so in cases where they have contributed towards the wharf. But where they are doing only dredging I do not recall any case in which that right has been sought.

Mr. ADSHEAD: It seems to me that the public should have the right to use the wharf. This was the case in connection with Anticosti island.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes; but in that particular case additional construction was made to render the place a port of refuge.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Would it not be a good policy, wherever the government undertake to do dredging in connection with such operations as this, to provide that the public shall have the right to use the wharf?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think that any question in particular arises in connection with the matter. Practically everyone who will have any business at the wharf is doing business with The Mersey Company, and I know of no objection on their part to such persons using the wharf. What applies in some cases does not apply here. There is a very large development in this case and I understand that a substantial investment is being made by the company. In making arrangements in a matter of this kind you try as nearly as possible to do the fair thing in view of what the company has done. I think we are getting all that we are entitled to.

Mr. ADSHEAD: It might happen, however, that a town would grow up on this site and someone might want to build a store or to do business of any other nature, and it would be very inconvenient if they could not land material at the wharf without first obtaining the consent of the company. When the government does dredging of this sort it should receive, it seems to me, something in the nature of a quid pro quo. Personally I see no reason why the public should not be allowed to use the wharf.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

Mr. ERNST: In this particular district, which happens to be in my constituency, this wharf is not required for public purposes. There is an excellent public wharf owned by the government.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There are two other wharves.

Mr. ERNST: Yes, there is a breakwater and there is a wharf in the district. There is no question about the public needing this wharf, for there is ample accommodation. Furthermore, dredging is always done to improve someone's waterfront or to render someone's wharf more accessible.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Is there a company town growing up there?

Mr. ERNST: No, not do any extent.

Item agreed to.

Digby—repairs and renewals to pier, $6,000.

Mr. SHORT: Has the minister had any application with reference to dredging in Digby basin? He is aware, I presume, that Digby is the only entrance which the Canadian Pacific Railway have to Nova Scotia; that is to say, by steamer from St. John across to Digby. They have just given a contract for a very much larger steamer than is operating at the present time, an up to date vessel which will cost a considerable sum of money. This new vessel will draw very much more water than does the present boat, and it is absolutely necessary that dredging shall have been done by the time the boat arrives. Her construction will require about a year and it will take some time to do the dredging. I am wondering whether the minister has had any application from the town of Digby or from the Canadian Pacific Railway with reference to the necessity for dredging there.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In the details I have here there is nothing touching the matter to which my hon. friend refers. Of course, we are only supplied with the details of the items actually in the estimates. It is just possible that such a request has been made but neither my deputy nor myself has it in mind at the moment.

Mr. SHORT: I want to direct attention to the fact that this work will be absolutely necessary. The steamer now being built by the Canadian Pacific Railway for that service is 350 feet long, whereas the one now in use is less than 200 feet in length, so some extra dredging will be necessary. I do not ask this for the benefit of Digby at all but for the benefit of Canada generally, because this

is the only Canadian Pacific Railway connection into Nova Scotia. I want to direct attention to the fact that some provision should be made in the dredging operations for the coming summer to take care of the necessary dredging at Digby basin because, with the present channel, at low tide this new steamer would be hardly able to turn round. As the minister knows, we have a great rise and fall of tides there; the average is 24 feet, and sometimes we have tides of 28 or 29 feet, so it is essential that this dredging should be done this summer.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I understand this is a Canadian Pacific Railway steamer to which my hon. friend refers, and evidently at the time they were making this request they overlooked the work he has in mind. However, I will be glad to have the matter looked into.

Mr. SHORT: They gave the contract for the new ship only two or three weeks ago.

Item agreed to.

Fourchu—harbour improvements—The British Metals Corporation (Canada) to contribute one-third of cost, $75,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Is this also for dredging?

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I would like an explanation of the work intended to be done at this point.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required for dredging at this point; The British Metals Corporation (Canada) is to contribute one-third of the cost. It is proposed to dredge the entrance channel generally 100 feet wide and 2,650 feet long, to a grade of 16 feet, with a turning basin at Cann's Point 600 feet long and 100 feet to 300 feet wide to the same depth. Through the rock area at the outer end of the channel, which is 700 feet long, it is proposed to limit the bottom width of the dredging to 75 feet. The completion of this channel and basin will provide for vessels of 17 to 20 feet draft and will give ample accommodation for local coastal vessels.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What were the reports from the engineers? What class of dredging is it to be?

Mr. ELLIOTT: District Engineer Locke requested this appropriation, and according to his statement The British Metals Corporation (Canada), in their letter of April 10, 1928 to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, requested consideration by the department of the provision of shipping facilities for them in order that they might proceed with the shipping of concentrates produced from ore from their mines at Stirling, Richmond county, Nova Scotia. The company followed this up by their letters of August 17 and October 11, 1928, and their telegrams of October 26 and 31, 1928. There was also a telegram on January 21, 1929, from Mr. M. A. Patterson of Sydney, Nova Scotia, and Hon. J. L. Ralston also wrote in respect of this matter in May of last year.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I asked about the dredging. What have the engineers reported as to the class of material to be removed, and what kind of harbour do they thing they can make?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I gave my hon. friend the size of the harbour, its length, depth and width. It is estimated that the rock excavation will amount to 16,000 cubic yards, place measurement, estimated to cost $8 per yard, and it is estimated that the dredging will amount to 186,000 cubic yards, at 50 cents per yard.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is this $75,000 the total cost or two-thirds of the cost?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The total cost to complete the work will be about $200,000, and this is one-half of our contribution.

Mr. BENNETT: Then the government will pay $150,000 altogether?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): How does the government propose to do the dredging at the entrance to the channel?

Mr. ELLIOTT: What does my hon. friend mean; does he mean by contract or day labour?

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): How is it proposed to remove the stone in the entrance? I have gone over this location very carefully; I was with the engineer when this harbour was inspected in 1926, and we found that the entrance was solid stone. How does the government intend to remove this stone?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think the ordinary practice will be followed, so far as I know; they will drill and blast and then take out the stone with a dipper dredge.

Mr. BENNETT: They will drill and blast and then claim extras.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No doubt they will claim everything they can.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Is this work to be done by contract or by day labour?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think it will be done by contract.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): In Nova Scotia we have found in the past that most of these contractors come back for extras. This will be a very expensive work if it is done by tender and contract, and I think it is up to the government to safeguard themselves in some way. A short time ago we had the case of St. Peter's canal; I notice that in the estimates this year we are providing an amount for 1925 extras.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Might I ask if this is a new harbour we are creating or if shipping has used this harbour previously?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Fishing boats and small coastal boats have used the harbour for some time but up to the present it has not been an improved harbour.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): For the benefit of the hon. member for Mackenzie I may say that Fourchu is an old harbour. We have 12 feet of water there, but extensive developments are made necessary through the increased shipping which will result from the mines at Stirling. Fourchu as a harbour was frequented as early as 1700.

Before this item carries I would like to thank the Minister of Public Works for the magnificent way in which he has treated the county of Richmond. I notice that there are a few other points which he has treated in a very substantial manner but the only way we can get action from the minister is to go after him as hard as we possibly can. I am very glad to see that he has remembered my old constituency in the way he has.

I understand that requests have been made on many occasions from the district of Main a Dieu, asking that a shed be placed on the public wharf there. I understand that the fisherman's union have sent a request that this should be built. The wharf was built in 1925 and the fishermen of the district have asked for a shed. The cost of building this shed would not be very much and it would be of great convenience to the fishermen.

I would like also to direct the minister's attention to the need of a public wharf at Louisburg. This is the oldest town in the province of Nova Scotia and is one of the larger towns in the province. It is without a public wharf and I claim that it is a disgrace for the government to allow this community to go this length of time without having such a public convenience. I would ask the minister to forget some of his friends in that district. The reason a public wharf has not been built is that his friends have secured options on all the available property in that district, and the minister is not in a position to decide which one he is going to purchase the property from.

Mr. POULIOT: Are they good friends or bad friends?

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I do not think they are good friends, when they do a thing of that kind. I would ask the minister to take this matter under immediate consideration.

Another matter requiring immediate attention is the repairing of the breakwater at Gabarouse. I understand that some of the logs required for the purpose have been taken to the district of Fourchu and the breakwater at Gabarouse, which is badly in need of repairs, must be allowed to go by the board.

Item agreed to.

Glace Bay—wharf reconstruction, $16,000.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): I am very glad indeed to see this vote in the estimates. Could the minister tell the house if that wharf has been taken over by the government?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The negotiations are nearly completed but the agreement has not actually been signed.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): It will be taken over?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is the intention.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): The intention is that this vote will be spent this year and not revoted next year.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is getting into the realm of prophecy to a large extent. The completion of the agreement has taken a longer time than we contemplated and that is the reason for the revote this year.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): The terms have all been agreed on?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, but it is impossible to say how long it will be before the agreement is completed. The work will not be started until that agreement is contemplated but I expect that it will be done this year.

Item agreed to.

Grass Cove—breakwater wharf, $2,000.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): Will this vote complete that work?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, this is to complete it. This amount is required to complete the work now under contract. About $31,000 has been spent on it already.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): What county is that in?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is in the constituency of Cape Breton North-Victoria.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $80,000.

Mr. SHORT: I should like to ask the minister on what he proposes to expend this $80,000 and in what sections of Nova Scotia.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I can only tell the hon. member where the general vote was expended and how it was expended last year. This is to meet the ordinary maintenance charges made up of several small items, many of which cannot be foreseen at the present time.

Mr. SHORT: I brought this matter to the attention of the minister last year when this vote was up and directed his attention to some dredging which was very urgently required at Battery point—known as Victoria beach—and I endeavoured to get the minister to make a definite promise that he would consider this matter during the present session. I was not very successful last year but I hope he will not turn a deaf ear to my pleas to-night. This is a very large fishing station right at the entrance to Digby basin, just inside the bay of Fundy. The government owns two breakwaters there but they are filled up with sand and dredging is very urgently needed.

I would also like to refer to the dredging which is required at Digby basin. The government should have its engineers look into this matter before the present season opens so that the dredging may be completed this year. I do not make this request from a local standpoint at all as it would be to the benefit of Canada generally. As I have said before, this is the only connection the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has in Nova Scotia. Their line of steamers run from St. John to Digby and before they can operate their new steamer it will be absolutely necessary that extensive dredging work be done there.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We cannot do dredging work out of this vote; this is only for repairs to works already constructed.

Mr. ERNST: I notice the amount is increased over last year by some $15,000. There must be some purpose in increasing it in that manner. Is any part of it allocated?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Of course the more works we have, the more repairs we require. As a general rule we are reaching the point where we are extending the quantity of dredging being done in different places. The increase is not at all out of proportion to the increase in work of this kind that has been done in recent years.

Mr. ERNST: Does it bear some direct relation to the capital expenditure in the province?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It bears a direct relation to the amount of repairs it looks as if we would require this year to works that are already constructed. The engineers recommend that an additional amount be voted this year.

Mr. QUINN: Do I understand the minister to say that no dredging will be included in this $80,000 appropriation?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. QUINN: The fishermen of Bald Rock in Halifax county requested an engine for hauling up their fishing boats. Will that likely be included in this vote?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does my hon. friend propose the purchase of an engine?

Mr. QUINN: Yes, at Bald Rock. It is a public work. A skidway was provided two years ago, and the request came in from the fishermen for an engine. I think I mentioned it to the minister.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That might be done out of this appropriation.

Mr. QUINN: It would be?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I say it could be.

Mr. QUINN: Will the minister say, it would be?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Possibly.

Mr. QUINN: No dredging is included in this vote?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. QUINN: Will there be some way of providing an item for extra dredging? The constituency of Halifax is not very liberally treated under the item "Harbours and rivers," and I might point out that a small amount of dredging is needed at the harbour of

Chezzetcook. There is only one wharf on the east side of the harbour which is being filled up with sand so that the vessels cannot get in. I bring the matter to the attention of the minister again and I ask that he would give it some consideration.

Mr. ERNST: Would the minister give me a little more information in respect to the item "Harbours and rivers generally"? Is it the practice of the department that the engineers simply say: We want $80,000 this year; or do they give a number of specific instances and say: We require $1,500 here, $1,500 there and other sums elsewhere in addition to a certain amount for emergencies?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I can give my hon. friend a list showing what was appropriated last year and which was spent practically before the end of February.

Mr. ERNST: But is there any list of prospective expenditures this year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: A large number of items are noted.

Mr. ERNST: Will the minister give me the list of those?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Let me say to my hon. friend that the requests of the engineers are not by any means imperative or final. We have to take them into consideration, and we are hardly ever able to grant all or nearly all their recommendations. But already items noted for expenditure for 1929-30 include the following:

Place	Amount
Abbott's harbour	$700
Annapolis	700
Avonport	750
Baker's point	100
Beaver harbour	120
Big Bras D'Or	200
Black Rock	200
Boularderie Centre	500
Canso	800
Cap Rouge	700
Caribou island	350
Carr's Brook	800
Chapel Cove	800
Chetticamp	400
Chezzetcook (E)	160
Devil's Island	No amount stated
Dover	800
Eastern passage	750
French Village	200
Grand Desert (beach protection))	340
Grand Desert (breakwater extension and repairs)	930
Grand Mira	500
Halfway Cove	800
Haulover	750
Johnston's Harbour	700
Judique (Baxter's)	300
Kelly's Cove	300
Kempt Head	200
Larry's River	$600
Litchfield	600
Lockeport	650
Long Point	500
Lower Plymouth	700
Lower Prospect	940
Lower Sand Point	600
Mabou Harbour	600
Marble Mount	400
Margaretville	550
Marine pests (continuing experiments)	500
Middle East Pubnico	750
Necum Teuch (repairs to wharf and shed)	150
Necum Teuch (extension to beach protection)	800
Ogilvies	No amount stated
Ostrea Lake	150
Parker's Cove	500
Parrsboro (repairs to pier)	800
Parrsboro (office and waitingroom)	450
Peggy's Cove	200
Petit de Grat	500
Petpeswick	200
Pleasant Bay	700
Port Dufferin east	500
Port George	650
Port Greville	800
Port Hood	500
Port Latour	400
Port Maitland	700
Portuguese Cove	750
River Bourgeois (Boyds)	800
River John	No amount stated
Rockdale	500
Round Bay	800
St. Joseph du Moine	No amount stated
Sandy Cove	700
Sandford	650
Seaforth	400
Seal Island	800
Seaside (Harbourview)	500
Sheet Harbour passage	500
Ship Harbour west (wharf repairs)	100
Ship Harbour west, (block and shed)	850
Skinner's Cove	No amount stated
Smiley's point	800
South Lake	No amount stated
South Ingonish ferry	800
Three Fathom harbour (breakwater repairs)	800
Three Fathom harbour (repairs to beach protection)	700
Trenton	600
Victoria bridge	200
Walton	No amount stated
Washabuck (centre)	200
West Berlin	500
White Point	300
Wreck Cove	600

Mr. ERNST: The total of those is what?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is not totalled because as yet we have not the estimates for many of them.

Mr ERNST: This amount of $80,000 is intended to include all those as well as emergencies which may arise owing to storms?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Repairs. We do not do any large repairs out of these. They are small, usually in the vicinity of or under $100. If

there is a very urgent case we might perhaps go just a little bit further, but this is to meet urgent cases.

Mr. ERNST: Has it not been the practice in the past—this is my recollection—to vote a lump sum for dredging generally in the maritime provinces?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. ERNST: I have just been advised by one of my colleagues that that item is in the estimates.

Mr. BENNETT: There is a principle involved in this which applies to many cases of a similar character. When a bulk sum estimate amounting to over 10 per cent of the total estimates for any one province is granted by this house, it will be observed that it places in the hands of the minister a very substantial sum of money to be expended without regard to parliament. It will be observed that some of the items that we have voted do not exceed $1,000. Therefore any expenditure beyond $1,000 that is made out of this $80,000 vote is not being quite fair to parliament. The largest item which the minister read, if my memory serves me, was $750.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There was one of $940.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not catch that, and the next largest, I think, was for $750. I do submit that it is a violation of the general principle on which supply is based if a bulk sum estimate is passed by the house without having some idea as to what is to be expended as a maximum in any one particular instance. That is the only reason I mention it. In days gone by, when those who now sit to the right were sitting to the left of the Speaker, those who are curiously inclined may have observed from the utterances of distinguished Liberals who came from the province of Ontario how strong their criticism was with respect to bulk estimates involving the possibility of the minister making expenditures under pressure from political supporters in any particular section, and that certainly would be the case here, judging from the reports that were read, and the number of cases that were singled out for favourable treatment in the estimates and those that were left untouched in the estimates and must be dealt with out of the larger vote if they are to be dealt with at all

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What does the government intend to do with the $500 it is going to expend at Petit de Grat? Is that for wharf repairs?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is marked for breakwater repairs.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What is it proposed to do with the $500 to be expended at River Bourgeois?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is for wharf repairs.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): To which wharf?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Boyd's.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I may say that Petit de Grat has been asking for a public wharf for some time. The people in that community make their living exclusively by fishing. There is a small item in the estimates for dredging, but there was a much larger sum in the estimates in 1925 for that purpose, namely, $30,000, and it was not expended. This is a revote of some of that money. On the other hand, hardly a fishing boat goes out of River Bourgeois, and yet it has two wharves, one built in 1926, and the other taken over from A. J. Boyd ten or fifteen years ago. I say, Mr. Chairman, that we should not spend money in this way for political purposes, as was done last year at Soldier's Cove. The town of Louisburg also wants a public wharf; Petit de Grat wants a public wharf, and I would ask the minister to place a sum in the supplementary estimates for this purpose so that this needed work may be done. That will be far better than taking the advice of defeated candidates who want their fathers' wharves repaired. The entrance to the Grand river should also be opened We have had this matter up in the house on various occasions, and probably next year if there is an election on, the minister will have an item in the estimates for that purpose.

Item agreed to.

Little Bras d'Or—wharf, $2,300.

Mr. JOHNSTONE: Is that a government wharf?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is a cribwork wharf which it is proposed to construct, 20 by 35 feet. It is asked for by the district engineer, who states that the wharf is required to provide accommodation for Little Bras d'Or village and for the people living along the Bras d'Or channel and trading with the village by water.

Item agreed to.

Liverpool—dredging, $30,000.

Mr. ERNST: Is this appropriation to remove the bar which has formed across the river, and to which I drew attention last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think the hon. member drew attention to it last year, but I think that is the purposes of the vote.

Mr. ERNST: I am sure that I did bring it to the minister's attention last year, and I read a resolution from the town council.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is asked to be provided towards dredging a channel from near the highway bridge at Liverpool, out to a point outside the bar at the entrance to the harbour. Total length of channel is 3,890 feet. The inner 1,050 feet of the channel has a width of 200 feet and the remainder of the channel a width of 150 feet.

The district engineer reports:

The bar at Liverpool is formed by the meeting of the tidal flow from Liverpool bay and the currents from the Mersey river. Where the forces of both are neutralized an eddy is formed and all material flowing down the river or flowing in from the sand banks outside the harbour naturally begins to settle in said eddy. Under ordinary average conditions this filling in is comparatively small, but an unusually heavy storm, accompanied by extraordinarily high seas, has been known to cause a filling in of from 3 to 3½ feet. The people of Liverpool have at different times asked for a deeper channel than the one herein proposed, but the district engineer has suggested a depth to the proposed new channel of 16 plus 1 foot at L.W. O.S.T. This depth conforms almost precisely with the average depth of the immense body of sand lying outside the bar. By similarizing the depths of the channel and the outside deposit of sand, the likelihood of renewed filling in is reduced, also the 16 plus 1 foot depth, if fairly well maintained, should accommodate practically all the shipping which will enter Liverpool harbour in the future.

Mr. ERNST: That is the work which the town council resolution referred to last year? It is the removal of the bar to give sixteen feet at low water?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Malignant Cove—wharf extension—to complete, $1,200.

Mr. CANTLEY: What money was spent last year, and what is proposed to be done this year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Last year we spent $4,337.61 to March 31. This amount of $1,200 is required to complete the construction of the cribwork extension of fifty feet to the eastern pier. The work is asked for to provide shipping accommodation for the gravel industry.

Mr. CANTLEY: Will this complete the work?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Ernst.]

Pictou—repairs to railway wharfs, $10,000.

Mr. CANTLEY: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the repairs to the Pictou wharf last year, there seems to be some misunderstanding. On March 14th, 1928, the Minister of Railways and Canals in reply to a question asked by me, said that the repairs to these wharfs were to be carried out by his department. A little later, on April 12, the minister so informed Mr. James A. Fraser of New Glasgow. I think he confirmed the same information in a letter to the Board of Trade of Pictou some few days later. Now may I ask by what department were the repairs actually carried out, the railway or the public works department.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The repairs that were made last year by this department amounted to $13,918.44 to March 31. I am not in a position to say what was done by the railway department in that district, but I shall be very glad, if my hon. friend wishes it, to tell him exactly what was done by my department.

Mr. CANTLEY: Would my hon. friend be good enough to explain why the Minister of Railways said the work would be done by the Railway department? He so informed me on March 14th, and this was confirmed by a letter from the Minister of Public Works of April 12, also by a letter addressed to Mr. James A. Fraser, New Glasgow, on April 18th, and again by a letter to some parties in Pictou. Then on April 19th the minister informed Mr. James A. Fraser that the work would be done by the Department of Public Works. What is the explanation of this change of attitude, one statement at one time, and an absolutely different statement at another time?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think the explanation is that at the time the statement was made by the Minister of Railways and Canals the works had not been taken over by this department. They were not taken over until July, I understand, and that is why the apparent difference has arisen.

Mr. CANTLEY: Am I to understand that the wharves were actually taken over by the Department of Public Works in July last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. CANTLEY: And before work was begun on them?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. CANTLEY: All the work done was done by the Department of Public Works; is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT: All the work after they were taken over was done by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. CANTLEY: There was no work done before they were taken over by your department?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. CANTLEY: Was the work done by tender and contract or by day labour?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This work was done by day labour.

Mr. BENNETT: How much?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The amount was $13,-918.44.

Mr. CANTLEY: I understand that $25,000 was voted last year for this work.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. CANTLEY: How much was spent by the Public Works department?

Mr. ELLIOTT: $13,918—nearly $14,000.

Mr. CANTLEY: How much material did you buy? Did you buy any from the railways?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have not a list of the material.

Mr. CANTLEY: Under whose superintendence was the work done?

Mr. ELLIOTT: By Isaac R. Arbuckle as foreman.

Mr. CANTLEY: Who recommended him?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I assume that the district engineer made the appointment. I have nothing to show who recommended him.

Mr. CANTLEY: Is it not a fact that he was appointed on the recommendation of Mr. McColl?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is possible, but I have nothing to indicate on whose recommendation he was appointed.

Mr. CANTLEY: Mr. McColl appears to be the man in that district who controls all the appointments and the whole expenditure of the Public Works department.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Oh, no.

Mr. CANTLEY: I judge so from the fact that he recommended the man as superintendent to carry on the work at another point further east. Later that man was dismissed on the report of one of the engineers that the character of the work done by him was the worst he had ever seen. Then I find that another man was appointed on the recommendation of Mr. McColl, that other work was carried on at the recommendation and for the benefit of Mr. McColl, and that Mr. McColl practically dictates to the department as to what should be done.

An hon. MEMBER: Is Mr. McColl a defeated candidate?

Mr. CANTLEY: No.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have nothing on record to show there has been any dictation by Mr. McColl, but I have no doubt that his recommendation would receive very careful consideration.

Mr. HANSON: Who is he?

Mr. SHORT: Is he a district engineer?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. SHORT: Why, then, should you take recommendations and advice from a layman with reference to your expenditures on public works?

Mr. ELLIOTT: In matters of this kind recommendations coming from someone in the district who is well known to the department, and whose recommendations in the past have worked out well, always carry weight.

Mr. SHORT: But the district engineers are certainly familiar with every part of the district and they would know best who should prove the most suitable man.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have no doubt the district engineer is the man who really settles the question as to the foreman.

Mr. SHORT: Who is Mr. McColl? You must know who he is.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If my memory serves me, he was the Liberal candidate in the last election.

Mr. SHORT: No, he was not; you are wrong there.

Mr. BROWN: Tell us who he is, then.

Mr. SHORT: We want the minister to tell us. He knows who he is.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I really do not know that I know the gentleman.

Mr. CANTLEY: Will the minister tell us what influence Mr. McColl has? Why are his instructions taken, as apparently they are, with respect to all these matters?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have no doubt that if his recommendations were taken it was because the officials of the department knew who he

was and in the past had found his recommendations satisfactory. There must have been some reason for it. I have no recollection of any personal acquaintance with him. That is all I can say. I have nothing in my papers to indicate.

Mr. FORKE: The leader of the Progressives would know.

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) suggests he is one of his old colleagues.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That may be.

Mr. FORKE: I met him in Halifax and I know he is a very fine fellow.

Mr. CANTLEY: For the edification of the minister I might refer him to a letter dated September 8, 1928, which is addressed by the district engineer at Halifax to Mr. MacLean. Mr. MacLean was appointed on the recommendation of Mr. McColl and the letter states that after conversation with Mr. McColl it had been decided that all the outstanding accounts had not been forwarded, and that having been done the gentleman would not perform any further work. The letter goes on to say that the completion of pay rolls and accounts would be expected not later than September 14, 1928. No further work was done for some considerable time. Later Mr. McColl recommended the appointment of another man and he went on with the work. I want to know why Mr. McColl directs the operations of the department in Pictou county as he evidently does. He was not the defeated candidate; he never was a candidate for the federal house. Why does the minister take orders from him and obey his instructions?—because that is virtually what has been done in two or three cases.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not know that I know who he is.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: You said he was the Liberal candidate.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I was under the impression that he was. And that perhaps is the best evidence my hon. friend can have that the gentleman's recommendations were not accepted on that ground. So far as appointments made by the engineer are concerned, I have no doubt he consults in each locality someone on whom he thinks he can rely. We endeavour to get the best foremen we can, and I must say that in all the work done there has been very little complaint in the district about our not having been able to secure the services of a competent foreman. Personally I have no knowledge of the matter.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. CANTLEY: I want to tell the minister that the record is full of instances that show McColl as having directed and practically controlled the work of the department in the county.

Mr. BANCROFT: Is that the Duncan report? What is the hon. member referring to?

Mr. JACOBS: It seems to me that if Mr. McColl is not permitted to function while the government is in power he certainly will not be able to do anything when my hon. friends come into office. He is making hay while the sun shines. I do not think any blame can be laid at the door of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. HANSON: That is a valuable contribution to the debate.

Mr. CANTLEY: Mr. McColl recommended Mr. MacLean. His work was not satisfactory, judging from the report of the district engineer, who reported to his chief that the work was the worst of the kind he had ever seen. Then there was further trouble with his accounts and he was asked to explain having put in an account for a certain amount of work. The engineer says that he was on hand on the day for which an item was put in for labour and that the man was not in attendance at the wharf at all and could not have done any work. The explanation then was that he was at home sharpening saws and doing other work of that kind. That is the type of man Mr. McColl recommended; but notwithstanding that, he is allowed to recommend another man to do the same class of work. There is no evidence that work of any consequence was done; the work remains undone. Is not that the fact?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There was $14,000 worth of work done.

Mr. CANTLEY: Out of how much?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Out of $25,000.

Mr. CANTLEY: In other words, about one-half the work contemplated was done. The fact is that a state of affairs exists there which is not creditable to the department and they had better make a change.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know my hon. friend wants to be fair in the matter.

Mr. CANTLEY: Yes, I want to be fair.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Well, only a moment ago I drew his attention to the fact that this wharf did not come under the jurisdiction of the department until July 12.

Mr. CANTLEY: Pardon me; I am referring to the Arisaig breakwater, not the wharves at Pictou. All my discussion during the last few minutes has been with reference to appointments made on the recommendation of Mr. McColl, and I was instancing work carried on in connection with not the Pictou wharves but the Arisaig breakwater.

Item agreed to.

Port Maitland—breakwater extension, $50,000.

Mr. SHORT: Last year $50,000 was voted for this work which is being carried on in the constituency of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), and there is $50,000 again this year. How much of that work was done last year and what expenditure was made out of that sum?

Mr. CANTLEY: We have not yet finished with the Pictou Wharf.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will recall it.

Mr. CANTLEY: That makes a difference; we are not through with the Pictou wharf yet. What is the intention of the department with regard to completing that work? About half of the work contemplated has been carried out.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We are asking for a revote of $10,000 which is to be provided towards repairs to wharves, as follows: repairs to east wharf, $2,750; repairs to shed wharf, $6,850; repairs to west shed wharf, $400, making a total of $10,000.

Mr. CANTLEY: That is for this year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. CANTLEY: Will that work be done by contract or day labour?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I should think day labour would be the only way to carry on that work satisfactorily, and I will give my hon. friend the reason. When it comes to repairing an old wharf, the condition of which cannot be ascertained until the flooring is taken up or something of that sort done, for years the practice of the department has been to do such work by day labour. It has been found that when such work is advertised everything is presumed against the old wharf and there are always extras, things which must be done and which could not be foreseen, making it necessary for the contractor, who is not sure just what may be the condition of the old wharf, to put in an estimate usually much larger than the amount for which the work could be done by day labour.

Mr. CANTLEY: The minister has appealed to my sense of fairness, and I will admit frankly that probably he is correct in this case. However, I want to point out that the work done last year consisted almost entirely of re-covering the top of the wharf; and practically nothing was done with regard to the piling or the underwork. Both wharves are in bad condition with regard to the substructure and piling, and a very great deal more work must be done than it will be possible to do with the amount of money voted this year. I am thoroughly familiar with that situation and have known of it for years; the wharves have been neglected for a long time, and they are only standing to-day by the grace of God. That is the situation, and I trust that the minister will see to it that the work is begun immediately and carried on without delay until this amount of money is expended. I submit to him, however, that the amount voted is not nearly sufficient to complete the work as it should be done. I give the minister credit for having good intentions and for dealing with the work to this extent; I think perhaps he has adopted the most economical and indeed possibly the only way in which this work could be done, but I hope that in his supplementary estimates he will supplement this vote sufficiently to carry out all necessary work in connection with these wharves.

Item agreed to.

Port Maitland—breakwater extension, $50,000.

Mr. SHORT: Will the minister tell us how much money was expended on this work last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Last year $15,132 was spent to March 31. This amount of $50,000 is required to provide for the completion of the work now under contract with Messrs. MacMillan and MacDonald, the amount of the contract being $62,711.95. Of this present vote $35,000 is a revote.

Mr. ERNST: Which Mr. MacMillan is this?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Mr. A. S. MacMillan.

Mr. ERNST: Of Halifax?

An hon. MEMBER: Of Hudson Bay.

Mr. JACOBS: Surely the province can support only one Mr. A. S. MacMillan.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Apparently this firm includes Mr. A. S. MacMillan and Mr. C. R. MacDonald of Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Mr. SHORT: This amount is required to complete the contract? They did not complete their work last year, which I understand is an extension to the original breakwater there. I believe they have been working on this same breakwater for a number of years. Can the minister tell us how much money has been expended in this work?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The recent expenditure was to provide for the construction of an extension to the breakwater 520 feet long, 20 to 25 feet wide on top, 32½ feet high at the outer end and building a break 400 feet long on the existing work. The amount of the contract was $62,711.95; inspection, contingencies and so on $2,288.05, or an approximate total cost of $65,000. The balance required is $50,000.

Mr. SHORT: Will this $50,000 complete the work?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. HANSON: Would the minister be good enough to tell us just how many contracts exist between Mr. A. S. MacMillan and the Dominion government? If he has not the information before him at the moment perhaps he might give it to the committee when his estimates are up again; it would be very interesting information. Just while we are on this item I would like to know if public tenders were called for, who the tenderers were and what were the different amounts of the tenders.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Tenders were called for.

Mr. HANSON: In what manner?

Mr. ELLIOTT: They were advertised. Perhaps I had better give my hon. friend all my information respecting this item. On June 6, 1928, the first call for tenders was received and Messrs. MacMillan and MacDonald were the lowest with a tender of approximately $58,033.53, which was accepted by order in council dated June 23, 1928. On receipt of a wire from the contractors stating that they had made a mistake in their unit prices, which should have been $62,969, it was decided to call for new tenders, which were received on July 25, 1928. The first tender was from M. A. Condon and Son and amounted to $69,808.96; the second was from MacMillan and MacDonald, amounting to $74,767.57, and the third was from J. W. and S. F. Comeau, amounting to $76,384.57. As the lowest of the tenders received on the second call, the amount of $69,808.96 was considerably higher than the price quoted by Messrs. MacMillan and MacDonald in their first tender, which amounted to $62,969. The matter was taken up with the firm and they agreed to work at unit prices, entailing an expenditure of about $62,711.95.

Mr. ERNST: Has this work been completed?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This item is to complete it.

Mr. ERNST: Will this amount complete all the work?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. SHORT: Will the minister tell me the amount of the tender of J. W. Comeau?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That tender amounted to $76,384.

Mr. SHORT: I might say that Mr. Comeau is practically doing the work on this breakwater, so evidently Mr. Comeau and Mr. MacMillan, one being the lowest and the other the highest tenderer, have gotten together and split the contract in some way.

Mr. HANSON: The minister has given us some very interesting information, to the effect that on the second public call for tenders Messrs. Condon were the lowest tenderers, but nevertheless the contract was not awarded to them. Instead of that, a friend of the government was approached and asked if he would not do the work at his old unit price, and a contract was entered into practically without competition. I want to know if Messrs. Condon were asked, after the second tenders were called for, if they would do the work at the price previously tendered for by Messrs. MacMillan & MacDonald; was any offer made to them or did the department arbitrarily make a private contract—because that is what it amounts to—with Messrs. MacMillan & MacDonald.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps I did not make myself clear to my hon. friend. The first tender which came from Messrs. MacMillan & MacDonald was for a total expenditure of approximately $58,033. My recollection is that that tender was based on certain unit prices, but a wire was received stating that a mistake had been made in the unit prices which were—

Mr. HANSON: We understand all that, but the minister has not apprehended my question. It appears that as the result of representations made by Messrs. MacMillan &

MacDonald the first tenders were abandoned and new tenders were called for. MacMillan & MacDonald were not the lowest tenderers; as a matter of fact they were about $5,000 higher than Messrs. Condon.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Who were $7,000 higher than MacMillan & MacDonald.

Mr. HANSON: Seven thousand dollars higher than the previous tender of MacMillan & MacDonald, who admitted that they had made a mistake in their unit prices and did not want to do the work for that amount of money. The department, in violation of the tender system and all that it implies, did not award the contract to Messrs. Condon, who were the lowest tenderers and who had every right to believe they would get the contract. Instead of doing that they go to their friend Mr. MacMillan, a second time and give him an opportunity to put in a third price which would be below the lowest tenderer. I want to know if that is the way to do public business. I am willing to bet without knowing anything about it that there will be claim for extras from MacMillan & MacDonald which will exceed their second tender price and we will be faced with another vote next year. Some explanation is due from the minister as to why Messrs. Condon did not get the contract in accordance with their tender and why the department, if they considered that Messrs. Condon's price was too high, did not give them an opportunity to bid on the lower price at which it was given to MacMillan & MacDonald. In all fairness to Mr. Condon he should have had the right to do that and I would like to know why he was not given that right.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would like to ask the hon. member on what ground Mr. Condon had that right.

Mr. HANSON: Because he was the lowest of three tenderers on the second call for tenders, and if anbody had a right he certainly had one. He was occupying a preferred position with respect to the public tenders and I want to know why he was not asked if he would do it at the lower price, having regard to the figures the department had evidently compiled. I gathered from the minister that the department felt that all the tenders were too high. Is that not right?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. HANSON: That is what I gathered from what the minister said; the department felt that the price was too high, having regard to MacMillan's first offer. They got after MacMillan, who had failed on the second public competition, and they asked him to do it at a price somewhat lower than the price quoted by Condon. I want to know if Condon was given the opportunity to do it at that price.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think if the hon. member will permit me to repeat what took place he will be the first man in the house to say that we did the right thing. First of all, we called—

Mr. HANSON: You did the right thing by MacMillan.

Mr. ELLIOTT: And by the people of this country. First of all the hon. member said that Condon should have been given an opportunity on the second call to make a second quotation, and gives as his reason the fact that on the second call for tenders Condon was the lowest tenderer. If that is a good reason, applying to the second call for tenders, that the man who was lowest on that second call for tenders should have the first chance, then that is a good reason with regard to the first call.

Mr. HANSON: No.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps the hon. member will permit me to make my explanation.

Mr. HANSON: Did Mr. MacMillan not represent to the department that he had made a mistake in his unit price and it was too low?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, and even allowing for the mistake which he made his figure was $62,969 and it was the lowest tender. Does the hon. member get that point?

Mr. HANSON: No, I do not understand that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will try to make it clear.

Mr. ERNST: Why was he not awarded the contract?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps I will be permitted to make my explanation. We called for tenders and MacMillan & MacDonald were the lowest tenderers at a price of $58,033, but they wired us that they had made a mistake and my recollection is that they sent in the figures on which the estimate had been made, showing that instead of totalling $58,033 it should total $62,969. However, they were still the lowest tenderers.

Mr. HANSON: On the first call for tenders?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, but just on the possibility that they had not made the mistake which they convinced us that they had made, the government felt that the safe course to take was to give everybody another opportunity of tendering.

Mr. PRICE: That is pure bunk.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If it is, then I submit to the superior judgment of my hon. friend in regard to matters of that kind; that is all I can say. We called for new tenders. The lowest tenderer was Condon & Son, with a price of $69,808; the next tenderer was quoting a price of $74,767.

Mr. SHORT: Who was that?

Mr. ELLIOTT: MacMillan & MacDonald. The highest tenderer was Comeau, with a price of $76,384. I submit that the proper course to take was that which my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) is advocating, to give the preference to the lowest tenderer, not the second lowest tenderer. We should say to MacMillan & MacDonald, "Now, you tendered before for $62,969. True you were the lowest tenderer, but your second tender is $74,767." Under our contracts we are not bound to accept the lowest or any tender. We then find that if we had accepted what we were satisfied was the bona fide lowest tender on the first call for tenders, we would have had a contract for practically $7,000 less than the lowest tender on the second call. We say to MacMillan: We cannot accept your tender. Although you were the lowest tenderer the first time, we cannot even give the contract to you at the lowest of the second set of tenders, but if you will take the contract at the lowest tender that we have, which was your first tender of $62,969, we will make that an agreement. That was my recollection of the arrangement, and I think it will appeal to my hon. friend as having been a fair one.

Mr. HANSON: The fallacy of the minister's argument is this: that on the first call for tenders there was no tender from MacMillan and MacDonald that was acceptable. They practically withdrew their tender. I agree that the minister did the right thing in calling for new tenders. That was the only thing he could have done. He calls for a second set of tenders, and he finds that Messrs. MacMillan and MacDonald are not the lowest tenderers, but it is quite apparent the government wants them to have the contract. I do not know on whose recommendation this was. The Minister of National Defence has a right to recommend his friends if he wants to do so, and I would not find any fault with that at all. Mr. MacMillan did not get the contract in public competition, but as I said a moment ago, it is apparent that the minister and the government wanted Mr. MacMillan to have the contract, so they approached him and made a private arrangewith him. They never gave a single one of the other tenderers an opportunity to come in and say: I will do it for the same figure. If Messrs. Condon and Son had been willing to meet the reduced price of $62,969, in all fairness the contract should have been given to them. The minister is able to make out a case only becauses he can show that he got the work done for less than the lowest of the second lot of tenders. An injustice has been done to Messrs. Condon and Son just in order to give a contract to the minister's friends.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. HANSON: Before we leave the item for harbours and rivers of Nova Scotia, I am going to ask the minister to bring down a statement of all the contracts that thave been awarded to Mr. MacMillan by the government since 1926, and all the contracts that have been executed or are in the course of execution. We would like to see the magnitude of his work for the department.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): And the reasons why he was favoured.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will answer the last question first. The reason he is favoured as any other man is favoured by the government, is because he was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. SHORT: He was not the lowest tenderer.

Mr. ELLIOTT: He surely was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. SHORT: He was not.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Who put in a tender as low as $62,969?

Mr. SHORT: When the minister called for new tenders, MacMillan was not the lowest tenderer. When the minister makes a statement like that, I am quite in order in contradicting him.

Mr. ELLIOTT: He put in a tender for $62,969. Who else put in a tender as low as that?

Mr. SHORT: On the second call for tenders, Mr. Condon's tender was $69,808, and Mr. MacMillan's was $74,767. But the minister never asked Condon if he would revise his figure and he never asked Comeau if he would

revise his. How long does the minister consider that a business concern doing business in that manner would last and have reputable firms deal with it?

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): It seems to be the custom of the Department of Public Works to declare tenders that come in to be unsatisfactory, then to have a visit from some firm which is the highest tenderer, with the result that this gentleman, a friend of the government, a man who is doing almost all this work in Nova Scotia and is creating dissatisfaction amongst his friends because he gets all this work, is given these contracts. Moreover, I have no doubt at all that if the work is unprofitable, there will be certain extras which may make it profitable. That applies, it seems to me, to almost every set of tenders for which the goverment calls. That is what happened in connection with the Bedford basin. The tender was declared unsatisfactory; Mr. MacMillan paid a visit to Ottawa with the result that he got the work, and I believe it cost more than the highest original tender.

Mr. ERNST: The Minister of Public Works is a member of the legal profession. Will he not agree with me that the situation is this: He publishes an advertisement calling for tenders. Those tenders constitute offers to the department, at which offers particular persons will do the work required. They are nothing more than offers, and, being offers, they can be withdrawn at any time before acceptance. Probably the minister will agree with me that far.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will say to my hon. friend just to clear that up: while the second set of tenders was being called—

Mr. ERNST: I was not dealing with those. I was putting forward an abstract proposition.

Mr. ELLIOTT: But as long as the deposit is held, I think my hon. friend will agree with me that the tenderer cannot very well withdraw his tender.

Mr. ERNST: I just want to go on with my proposition. A tender can ordinarily be withdrawn. The minister calls for offers again. Surely the minister does not mean to insinuate or to suggest to the committee that, when calling for tenders a second time, the department retain the deposits of the tenderers in the first instance?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is exactly what we do.

Mr. ERNST: That is an irregular procedure, I would think.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is a special safeguard.

Mr. ERNST: In any event, Mr. MacMillan chose to revoke his first offer. He revoked it by putting in an offer which was substantially higher. He could not have two offers before the department at the same time. If he did not have his first offer before the department, then only the second one remained. In the second call for tenders the department had three offers to do the work: Condon, $69,808; MacMillan, $74,767, and Comeau, $76,384. The lowest offer was that of Condon for $69,908. Under the prevailing practice the minister was bound to accept the lowest tender.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr ERNST: Well, if he did not accept it, he was equally bound, as a matter of courtesy and decency, to give the man who put in the lowest tender—and it was the lowest tender before the department, because MacMillan revoked his first tender—an equal chance with MacMillan to take the work on other terms. In the next place, the minister points out that MacMillan's contract price was $62,969. That is, he takes the work on the basis of his original contract price. I am going to suggest to the minister that there have been and will be extras in connection with this contract. That is obvious from the fact that if the contract price was $62,969, the minister would not now, before the contract has been completed, be calling for an appropriation of $65,000. Last year he had voted for this work the sum of $50,000 of which apparently $15,000 was expended. Of this year's vote of $50,000, $35,000 is a revote. If $15,000 was expended last year and the minister is asking for $50,000 further before the contract has been completed, it means that he is appropriating for this work $65,000, or between $2,000 and $3,000 more than the contract price, in anticipation of extras I suggest to the minister that next year he will be back with a further sum for extras.

Mr. DUFF: That is to pay the inspector.

Mr. ERNST: I do not think the inspector got paid under that vote. Surely the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough does not wish to suggest that the government would create a sinecure for some political friend.

Mr. DUFF: They always do. My hon. friend is ignorant. Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise.

Mr. ERNST: I am suggesting to the minister that there is $2,000 already appropriated for extras. I would ask the minister to tell the committee what the tenders were in the first instance. He has told us that MacMillian's was the lowest tender and amounted

to $58,000 odd, but that MacMillian stated that he had made a mistake in his schedule, and he increased his tender to $62,969. I think the minister owes it to the committee to say who were the other tendering parties in the first instance and to give the amount of their tenders. In the second place, I think he owes it to the committee to say whether there was any change in the specifications when the tenders were called for the second time, because the tenders were all higher, and it would seem there must have been a change in the specifications to make such a change in Mr. MacMillan's tender. If there was a change in the specifications, why was the contract awarded on the basis of the first specifications?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I want to answer my hon. friend by calling his attention to what perhaps he overlooked when I was giving the details before. The amount of the contract is $62,711; inspection, contingencies, and so forth, $2,288.

Mr. ERNST: How much of that is contingencies and how much inspection?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Inspection, contingencies and so forth, $2,288.05.

Mr. ERNST: How much of that is inspection?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It all comes under the one heading. There is no division between them. The approximate total cost of the work was $65,000. The total expenditure last year was $15,132.83. This $50,000 was asked for when it was thought that the probable expenditure before the 31st of March would be over $15,000. I think my hon. friend will see that there has been no increase in the amount asked. As to any change in the specifications, I can assure him that there has been none. The second tenders were called on exactly the same specifications as the first tenders, and as an additional safeguard, when Mr. MacMillian asked to be relieved on account of the mistake and had satisfied the officials of the department that he had made a mistake and that his tender was $62,969, the second call for tenders was only made after the 10 per cent cheque of Mr. MacMillan on his first tender was retained.

Mr. HANSON: Why was that done?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It was done so that we would have security that we would not have to pay beyond that amount in any event.

Mr. SHORT: You rejected the tenders.

[Mr. Ernst.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, we did not; and it was because we did not reject them that the deposit was kept. In that way we still have Mr. MacMillan, the lowest tenderer in the first call, bound; we had his 10 per cent, and it was with that clearly in mind that the second call for tenders was made. That was only done with a view to checking up whether or not the increase from $58,033 to $62,969 had been an actual bona fide mistake on the part of the tenderer, and whether or not that was the best price at which we could let the work. When the new tenders came in we still had MacMillan's old tender of $62,969 and his deposit, and we still had as the lowest of the new tenderers, Condon and Son, who I believe the hon. gentleman is perfectly correct in saying, were a perfectly good firm. None of the firms that tendered was blacklisted; they were all good firms. The tender of Condon and Sons was for $69,808.

Now I want to refer to the argument of the hon. member for York-Sunbury that the lowest tenderer should have the preference. We still had the lowest tender on the first call; that is the $62,969, and where my hon. friend from Queens-Lunenburg makes a mistake is that he takes it for granted that we had not taken the precaution of keeping the first tenderer bound by retaining his deposit. I have proven conclusively to the satisfaction of my hon. friends that we have done exactly what the hon. member for York-Sunbury says the lowest tenderer was entitled to. We took the precaution of calling for the second lot of tenders. None of them was as low as the lowest of the first tenders. None of them was as low as the tender for which we still held the deposit. If it was our duty, as my hon. friend says it was, to go to the man from whom we had the lowest tender, who was still bound to us, and say to him, "Your lowest tender is $74,767. You ask us not to hold you to your lower tender because you had made a mistake. If you are going to get the contract it will have to be at the lowest of the first tenders, namely, $62,969," and the preference was given to the lowest tenderer—

Mr. HANSON: You did not say a word to Condon?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Not a word more than we did to the other higher tenderers. We followed the course which my hon. friend says was the proper course. We went to the lowest tenderer. Why would we go to Condon, whose tender was $7,000 higher than the lowest tender? I want to say just another word, unless there is something any hon.

gentleman wishes to ask in regard to this matter. With regard to the first tenders, I am not able to give my hon. friend the particulars from the information I have here, but I shall be very glad to furnish that to him. As to giving a list of all the contracts that MacMillan has with the Department of Public Works, I shall be very glad to furnish that, but I think my hon. friend asked for a list of all the contracts that MacMillan had from the government. That would necessitate my going to the various other departments.

Mr. HANSON: Of course the minister is not responsible for any other department.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be very glad to furnish that so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned.

Mr. ERNST: I think before this item passes we should have the tenders on the first call.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is a perfectly fair proposition, and I want to say to the committee that the more this matter is investigated the better it will suit me.

Mr. HANSON: Then the item will stand.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. ERNST: Would the minister bring down the complete file, not only the first tenders, but the complete file relating to this particular expenditure?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Certainly.

Mr. ERNST: That is, the expenditures of last year relating to the letting of the contracts.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Everything.

Mr. ERNST: As the item is to stand I do not want to prolong the discussion. But simply as a legal proposition, surely when the minister calls for second tenders that is tantamount to the rejection of the first tenders. In other words, the offer is rejected whether you retain the deposit or not. Look at the position you would find yourself in supposing in the second case Condon had tendered for $60,000; would you have let the contract to Condon?

Mr. ELLIOTT: He would certainly have got it.

Mr. ERNST: Without going back to Mr. MacMillan?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Certainly, because he would be the lowest tenderer.

Mr. ERNST: Then when you call for tenders the second time it is tantamount to a rejection of the tenders in the first instance. You cannot ask a man to make a second offer and hold his first offer open; you cannot ask other people to submit tenders in competition with him. If it is a rejection, and I submit there is no doubt that it is, then the only offers you had before you were the three you obtained when you called for tenders the second time, on which Mr. Condon was absolutely entitled to the contract which Mr. MacMillan got. One reason which prompts me to say something relative to it is the fact that this is not the only instance in which Mr. MacMillan has not been the lowest tenderer and yet has got the contract. True, the other instance was in the Department of National Defence, but when you have that recurring it creates suspicion. In the National Defence contract the MacMillan tender was $116,000; that of the Standard Construction Company was $109,000 in round figures. In that case Mr. MacMillan was allowed to put in private figures and was awarded the contract for $107,500. When those things recur in case after case, we on this side of the house can be forgiven if we think that all is not well.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think anybody needs to ask forgiveness for criticizing any of the public accounts. I quite agree that if the department is being conducted as it should be those in charge will welcome investigation into the expenditures made. It is no compliment to furnish all the papers in connection not only with this item but every other item that passes through the department. It may be a little difficult at all times to safeguard as well as they should be safeguarded, the rights of the people whose money we are paying out but, so far as I am concerned, anything in the way of scrutiny I think is perfectly proper; and it is not merely the function, it is the duty of my hon. friend to demand it. So we are all agreed as to that. Now, as to the proposition of law, that by calling for the second tenders we had repudiated the first tenders, I think my hon. friend will reconsider the matter when he realizes—and this is a matter to which I gave some thought—at the time it was going through, and I am practically certain I am right and the deputy is of the same view—that we retained the first tenders. We did that to make sure that we would not lose the benefit of them in case they should be lower than the second ones that we would get. We called for tenders a second time

in order to check up an error which it was claimed had been made. That is the object of stating in the advertisement that the lowest or any tender would not necessarily be accepted.

Mr. HANSON: Is not that put in for the purpose of being able to reject tenders from those who are on the black list, contractors who had fallen down on previous contracts?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is one of the reasons.

Mr. HANSON: Does the minister think it a proper principle in connection with contracts for public works that there should be this continual private bargaining? That is the objectionable feature about this contract, that it was done—I do not say improperly—under cover without the other tenderers knowing anything about it. Reputable contractors will not tender for these big public works unless they think they are going to get a fair deal, and the minister will find that such men will be not available unless they are sure there is no private bargaining behind closed doors. That is the objectionable feature about this contract.

Mr. SHORT: Was there any change in the specifications from the first time that Mr. MacMillan first tendered for this work and time of his second tender?

Mr. ELLIOTT: My information is that there was none.

Mr. SHORT: I should think you would be rather suspicious of those figures. In the first case his tender was $62,969, and in the next $74,767, a difference of $12,000. I would be rather suspicious of a contractor who put in tenders like that. This is the man to whom the contract was awarded, and on his first offer.

Mr. BENNETT: I put this to the minister. The calling for tenders the second time was, so far as the department is concerned, merely asking people to tender subject to an unknown tender which would be accepted if they exceeded its figures. In other words, the government said to decent people who desired to tender for the work: We will receive your tenders, you believing that you are tendering for the work, but you are really tendering against a tender which we hold in reserve. The very argument for retaining the deposit was that they were going to give that contractor the contract if they could, and all the tenders were against his tender. Is not that the situation? All the sophistry in the world does not get away from the fact that in the files of the department was that tender and when you put in the second advertisement for further tenders, of necessity those who responded were tendering against that secret pigeon-holed document. I say that is wrong. The intention was to give the family contractor of Nova Scotia the business, and nobody else, and that is what happened. I agree with what the member for Digby (Mr. Short) says, that when you see a thing like that it should make any engineer, any minister, or any deputy suspicious that the tenderer knows a good deal more about it than the tender indicates.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend's argument, perhaps, would have more point if it were not for the fact that such was not the case. When the tenders were opened, what occurred? Does my hon. friend mean to suggest that in point of fact the people who tendered did not know what the lowest tender was at the time the first set of tenders were opened?

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. ELLIOTT: They all do. Don't think that these contractors do not know what their competitors are doing.

Mr. BENNETT: I never suspected any leak like that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is done openly.

Mr. BENNETT: How could it be done?

Mr. ELLIOTT: When the tenders are opened they are public.

Mr. BENNETT: Does my hon. friend mean to say that the first prices were announced before the second tenders were called?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Certainly.

Mr. BENNETT: By whom?

Mr. ELLIOTT: By the committee of the department who opened the tenders.

Mr. BENNETT: I have seen a good deal of that and I am going to furnish some information about it presently.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps my hon. friend has. If he can suggest any way that is more open and gives every contractor from one end of the country to the other a fairer chance than that does, I should like to have his suggestions.

Mr. BENNETT: If the minister wanted to be fair about it his notice would be: "Subject to a reserve tender of so many thousand dollars, sealed tenders will be received up to such-and-such a date at twelve o'clock noon

for the construction of the work." He should have said, "These tenders are subject to a reserve bid of $62,000", or whatever it was, and then the tendering public would have known. Otherwise the public was tendering against a secret pigeonhole document about which no one knew except the minister and his friends. And they kept the man's cheque so that they could say, when the time came, "You have it now beyond peradventure; your cheque was never parted with". What other construction can be placed on the matter? If my hon. friend had to deal with it as a matter of law what would he say? He would say, "You are subject to a reserve bid". But not having so stipulated, the lowest of the second tenderers should have got the work.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend has the facts as to what took place—the different calls for tenders; what does he say should have been done? What tender should have been accepted?

Mr. BENNETT: The cancellation of the first call for tenders was within the right of the government. But when it did not exercise that right it could not approbate and reprobate at the same time. It could not keep the tender of one tenderer up its sleeve and ask the world to tender, not knowing that fact. It should then, having called for new tenders, have made known to the tendering public that these new tenders were called for subject to a reserve bid of so many dollars by a known tenderer. If it failed to do that, then the department was not fair to the others who tendered. In other words, there either was or was not need of the first set of tenders. If they were rejected in toto then there was a new calling for tenders, and that new calling for tenders should not have been subject to the first call, because many things might have happened in the meantime; the price of material might have changed. But once new tenders were called for, then everything that took place under the first set of tenders was eliminated and should have been forgotten. If it was not, it was not fair to the other tenderers who, as I have said, tendered against a reserve bid. And that reserve bid was the bid that subsequently got the work. That is the story.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If my hon. friend makes that argument seriously—and I know he does, and it sounds well—he has used a most unfortunate expression in speaking of a reserve bid. I would ask my hon. friend a question as to his practice as a solicitor in selling farms, for instance, subject to conditions. When he has a reserve bid fixed, is it his policy, has it ever been his policy, to let the tendering public know what that reserve bid is?

Mr. HANSON: Very often.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Never.

Mr. HANSON: Excuse me.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Well, I will not say never, because I have never had the privilege of practising down in the province in which my hon. friend lives. But I know that they do not do it in the section where I have conducted sales—

Mr. HANSON: The public is notified frankly, "This property is subject to a reserve bid of so much"; and that is notice that if they do not reach that figure they do not get the property. That is often done. If there is no reserve bid you state in your advertisement, "Property sold without reserve". Did my hon. friend never hear that expression? Surely.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. HANSON: There are two kinds of sales.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, but I appeal to hon. gentlemen who have attended sales where there was a reserve bid. After a certain amount of bidding has taken place the auctioneer says, "This property is being subject to a reserve bid"; and he opens the envelope containing the reserve bid, which has been kept secret up until the time he looks at it. And even then he does not disclose what the reserve bid is. He says that the reserve bid not having been reached he must decline to knock the property down to any purchaser. I am speaking only of the practice that has been followed where I have practised law for a good many years. That is the practice, and I know of no exception thereto. Now, with regard to this question which I asked the leader of the opposition, his argument brings us to this point: The first man's tender and all the first tenders should, he says, have been obliterated; the proper thing to have done, if we were to call for new tenders, would have been to have forgotten all about the first tenders. But what would have been the position? We should then have had to grant this contract to Condon & Sons, whose tender amounted to $69,808. That is what my hon. friend says should have been done, and that would have meant our paying $7,000 more for the work than we did.

Mr. BENNETT: Are the extras settled yet?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The contract is not yet completed.

Mr. BENNETT: Every contract of which we have any record, so far as this gentleman is concerned, has always involved a claim for extras, and that would carry the figure beyond the first contract.

Mr. HANSON: One thought occurs to me. Why was not Mr. MacMillan held to his first offer? That is a very pertinent inquiry. Is the Department of Public Works in the habit, if a contractor says that he has submitted too low an offer, of doing what it has done in this case? If they wanted to protect the public treasury why did they not accept the offer of $58,000? It seems to me that would have been more praiseworthy. Why did they give him a chance to withdraw? They had a legal offer to which they could have held him; they had 10 per cent. They did not have to call for new tenders.

Mr. JACOBS: It was an error.

Mr. HANSON: I am addressing my remarks to the minister, not to the silent reserve at his side.

Mr. BENNETT: Not to the new minister.

Mr. HANSON: The point, I submit, is one to which the minister might direct his attention. I am curious to hear his defence.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am delighted to tell my hon. friend what strikes me with regard to his point. As I understand the hon. gentleman, he wants to know why we did not hold to his original offer the man who said, "I made a mistake when I tendered at $58,033; I really intended my tender to be $62,969". Now although I have not the engineer's estimate before me, my recollection is that not only was that $62,969 the lowest of the first tenders received, but that the $58,000 tender was considerably below the estimate. The object of calling—

Mr. HANSON: What was that estimate?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be glad to get the information, but apparently it is not here.

Mr. HANSON: At this point will the minister tell us whether Mr. MacMillan discovered his mistake before or after the tenders closed?

Mr. BENNETT: That is an important point.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think it was after the tenders closed.

Mr. BENNETT: He suddenly discovered his tender was too low.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: The figures presented satisfied the department that it was an error. Subsequent tenders were called for in order to check that up and give the contractors an opportunity to show whether or not any one of them was willing to do it for that amount or less. Now I want to put this to the fairness of my hon. friend: The very fact that we received three tenders, the lowest of which was over $11,000 higher than the $58,000 tender and $7,000 higher than the tender which this man said he really intended to submit,—this very fact, I say, is the best evidence we could have that there had been a bona fide mistake and that the real tender he intended to submit was $62,969.

Mr. HANSON: That will all depend upon what the other figures of the first calling of tenders reveal.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That may have some bearing.

Mr. McNUTT: Did the wire received from the MacMillan firm specify wherein the error lay—whether it was in the unit price or in the extension figures?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think he claimed it was in the unit price.

Mr. SHORT: Do I understand that the minister has not the first tenders, or the figures of the first tenders, with him?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, I have not the list of replies to the first call for tenders; I cannot tell as a matter of fact whether there were others.

Mr. SHORT: The MacMillan tender was the lowest received on the first call, but the minister has not the others?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. SHORT: Probably the next tender was $62,900, and that may be the reason why it was given to MacMillan.

Mr. ELLIOTT: As I say, I am not sure there was another tender.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Would the minister give us the date on which the first call for tenders was closed and also the date on which Mr. MacMillan told the department he had made a mistake in his original tender?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think I have the information my hon. friend requires. On June 6, 1928, the first call for tenders was received.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: That was the opening date; what was the closing date?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It was shortly before June 23, because on that date Mr. MacMillan was notified that his tender of $58,000 was to be accepted.

Mr. ERNST: Then after the tenders were opened and became public property Mr. MacMillan increased his tender by $4,000?

Mr. MACDOUGALL: You had accepted his tender of $58,000 before you gave him a chance to make his tender of $62,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We first refused—

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Just a moment; you said you notified him that his tender of $58,000 had been accepted, but he was subsequently given a chance to tender for $62,969. Will the minister explain at whose instigation this was done.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think that is correct.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Then it is correct that Mr. MacMillan's tender, being the lowest, was accepted at $58,300, and later you notified him that the department had accepted his tender. Then he sent a telegram stating that he had made a mistake in his tender, and you gave him a chance to tender again for $62,969. If this is the way the public business of the Dominion of Canada is to be carried on I think it is a sorry reflection upon the government of this country.

Mr. JACOBS: Now that the hon. gentleman is a member of the house probably he will help improve the government.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I am not talking to you at all; you are not the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. CHAPLIN: You are not even nearly the minister.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): I would like to ask the minister a question; he has probably answered it already, but I did not hear him. Were the deposits of the other tenderers in the first instance returned to them?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am not in a position to say how many tenderers there were in the first instance; there is nothing in the details before me to that effect, but I shall be glad to furnish the information.

Mr. ERNST: The minister is to bring down the complete file?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. SHORT: And in the meantime the item will stand?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item stands.

St. Francis Harbour—breakwater extension, dredging and groyne, $33,000.

Mr. HANSON: In what county is this harbour?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is in Antigonish-Guysborough.

Mr. SHORT: Is this work to be done by contract or by day labour?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is under contract.

Mr. SHORT: Who has this contract?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Thomas P. Charleson.

Mr. HANSON: Let us have the details of this item; we might find it as interesting as the last one.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be very glad to hear any suggestions my hon. friend may offer. This amount is required to provide for completing the following works at St. Francis harbour—

Mr. HANSON: Where is that?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is in the constituency of Antigonish-Guysborough. This is to provide for a breakwater extension. A contract was let for this work on September 5, 1928, to Mr. T. P. Charleson of Ottawa; the amount of the contract was $23,445. The work will consist of a timber cribwork extension to the present breakwater, 16 feet wide on top and 300 feet long measured on the harbour face, together with an ell at the outer end, 50 feet long measured on the harbour face. This amount is also required for dredging. An order in council was passed on August 30, 1928, accepting the tender of the Beacon Dredging Company, Limited, of Halifax, for the removal of 13,750 cubic yards, scow measurement, from a crib site 45 feet by 100 feet to 10 feet at low water, and from a basin 450 feet by 50 feet to 110 feet wide to a depth of 16 feet at low water. This also includes a proposed groyne, which is designed to prevent the gravel from spreading along the breakwater and finding its way around the end. This groyne will be 100 feet long, 8 feet wide and an average of 8 feet high, built of solid crib work. The probable total cost of the work is $38,000; the expenditure made last year was $5,497; a revote of $30,000 is required together with a new vote of $3,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Who had the contract for the groyne? Was it awarded the Beacon Dredging Company?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The groyne is estimated to cost $768.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): Who is the president of the Beacon Dredging Company?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I cannot say.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): Do you know any of the members of the firm?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): Who signs their letters? There must have been some correspondence.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I cannot say offhand; we will have it in the department.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): Perhaps the mininster could tell us to-morrow?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. HANSON: I presume there was a public call for tenders, so perhaps the minister could tell us how many tenders were received, together with the amounts.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Three tenders were received for this work in response to a public advertisement of July 20, 1928. The first tender was from Thomas P. Charleson, and amounted to $23,445; the second was from W. E. Landry, amounting to $29,303 and the third was from Charles McNeil and Alex. G. Fraser, amounting to $33,640.20. The chief engineer's estimate of the cost was $25,000.

Mr. HANSON: Has the contract been sublet, and if so who is the subcontractor?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not see anything in the details I have as to its being sublet.

Mr. HANSON: The department should know.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think it has been sublet.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): In what county is this place?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is in the same county I mentioned just a moment ago, Antigonish-Guysborough.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): There was some work done there last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, $5,197.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): Is that the locality where a lot of dredging was done and when they went to take the dredge out they found that they had to turn around and dredge themselves out?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am not able to answer my hon. friend's question.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): You had better get posted before you come back here.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does the hon. member state that there was some place where that occurred?

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): I understand so.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Could I have the name of the place?

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): Perhaps I can give it to you to-morrow.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): That occurred at more than one place. You will remember that a year or two ago we were discussing L'Archeveque harbour. A dredge was brought in there and could not get out. Some overcasting was left there and I put a question on the order paper with respect to the matter. The minister answered that he had no knowledge of any overcasting having been left there. But the overcasting was left there in the little boat channel.

Mr. ERNST: I understood the minister to say that the contract price was $23,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. ERNST: Why is the total vote $38,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is $33,000.

Mr. ERNST: There was $5,000 spent last year, making a total of $38,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is made up as follows: Breakwater extension, amount of contract, $23,445; dredging, amount of accepted tender, $10,312; groyne, estimated cost, $768; inspection and contingencies, $3,474.50; making a probable total cost of the work, $38,000, less probable expenditures for 1928-29, $5,000, leaving the balance required $33,000.

Mr. QUINN: What is the population of St. Francis Harbour, and what is the extent of the business done there? Why should such amount be expended on such a small place?

Mr. ELLIOTT: My information is that St. Francis Harbour is a fishing settlement on the north shore of Chedabucto bay, ten miles east of Guysborough and twenty miles from Mulgrave, the nearest rail connection. The population of the settlements from which the fishermen come to this place for the fish is about 200.

Mr. ERNST: How many boats come there?

Mr. DUFF: A gentleman named Walter McNeil, a very good Conservative, has about 250,000 cords of wood which will come down the river to be shipped from St. Francis Harbour.

Mr. HANSON: He would not be shipping it over the breakwater.

Mr. DUFF: That is all you know about it.

Mr. HANSON: I would not think so.

Mr. DUFF: Why do you say so?

Mr. CANTLEY: Who is the Conservative at Pictou?

Mr. DUFF: Walter McNeil.

Mr. CANTLEY: I never knew of a McNeil in Pictou county who did not vote Grit.

Mr. DUFF: Walter McNeil was a Conservative candidate in 1921.

Mr. CANTLEY: He did not stay that way very long.

Mr. DUFF: Thank God for that.

Mr. ERNST: I asked a question as to how many fishing boats used the harbour.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The nearest I can come to answering the hon. member's question is the value of fish marketed. That amounts to from $7,500 to $10,000 annually.

Mr. ERNST: Do I understand that this is being done for Mr. McNeil?

Mr. DUFF: I asked for it, so I should know why it is being done.

Mr. ERNST: Then it is being done for Mr. Walter McNeil?

Mr. DUFF: I would say partly.

Mr. ERNST: What proportion?

Mr. DUFF: Thirty-three and one-third per cent.

Mr. HANSON: To pay for his apostasy.

Mr. ERNST: I would like to know if Mr. McNeil is cutting this pulpwood from his own lands for himself, or is he cutting it for American companies?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The amount of wood estimated to be cut is 90,000 cords and the extent of the shipping operations is estimated to be 15,000 cords per year. There are also tracts of land adjacent to the Boylston Lumber Company's area which would produce 80,000 cords additional.

Mr. ERNST: Then it is being done for the 95,000 cords of wood?

Mr. DUFF: Two hundred and fifty thousand cords altogether.

Mr. ERNST: An exaggeration of 150,000 cords is not much for the hon. member.

Mr. DUFF: You are very smart, aren't you?

Mr. ERNST: I think the committee should be informed as to whether or not this wood is cut by an American company or is being shipped by a British subject.

Mr. DUFF: It might be owned by Russians.

Mr. HANSON: Is this another Matane case where the government is making a grant of the public money to assist in shipping raw material out of this country and depleting our natural resources? The government robbed the Canadian National railways of the carriage of pulpwood from that place by building a large pier to enable the American company to carry the pulpwood out of the province of Quebec to be manufactured in the United States.

Mr. DUFF: This is going to Liverpool.

Mr. HANSON: I do not dispute my hon. friend's word but I do not think he knows where it is going.

Mr. DUFF: Oh, yes, I do.

Mr. HANSON: If this pulpwood is being cut on the Hollingsworth and Whitney property then I can tell the minister it will be going to the state of Maine.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The Boylston Lumber Company, Limited, a holding company, own over 8,000 acres of land on the Goose Harbour river, on which is standing about 90,000 cords of pulpwood. This company would immediately commence operations on a large scale if

arrangements for shipping the wood could be made. At the present time it is practically impossible to ship any wood out of this section of the country, except by small schooners, and by taking the chance of loading wood in the bay without any protection. Under present competitive conditions it is impossible to carry on pulpwood operations, unless large quantities can be handled and shipment made by steamers.

Mr. ERNST: The committee should have some information as to who the Boylston Lumber Company is, and where the wood is going. In a former case, where the government were doing something for a purely British company, they contributed one-third of the cost. If this is a United States company and if the wood is to go out of Canada, I think the company should contribute the whole cost.

Mr. HANSON: I think the item had better stand until we get the information.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will provide the information.

Mr. CANTLEY: Can the minister find out if there is any wood there at all? I doubt if there is any.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have the report from the engineer as to the quantity of wood that is there. I think the item should pass.

Mr. HANSON: Let it stand. The engineer's report could not be first-hand. He did not cruise the property. He is giving what somebody told him.

Mr. ERNST: Is there on file any correspondence from the Boylston Lumber Company?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am not able to say. All the reference that I have under my hand is to the report of the engineer.

Mr. ERNST: Is there on the file nothing from anyone but the engineer? Surely the engineer does not pretend to give the amount of timber on a particular piece of property?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is "a petition from the residents of St. Francis habour transmitted and endorsed by Mr. William Duff, in a letter dated March 9, 1927," and there is the engineer's recommendation.

Mr. ERNST: We have the frank admission by the minister that the real reason for this being done is because the Boylston Lumber Company require it. If it were not for the fact that the pulpwood could not be shipped out without this being done, it would not be done. The committee should be informed who the Boylston Lumber Company is, and where the wood is going.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Walter McNeil is a very enterprising citizen of this country who has large investments in Nova Scotia, and I am pretty sure he is the manager of the Boylston Lumber Company.

Mr. ERNST: I should like to know who the stockholders of the company are and where the wood is going.

Mr. DUFF: How can we know where the wood is going?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I can perhaps clear up my hon. friend's suspicion that this is being done entirely for the company, because after speaking about the necessity for providing facilities for getting the wood out, the engineer goes on to say:

> There is another reason for which these harbour improvements should be made, particularly the extension to the breakwater, and that is that St. Francis harbour is the centre of an important fishing district and if coastal steamers could call at that place, business connected with the fisheries would be very materially assisted and should develop. There seems to be no other means of providing a calling place for said coastal steamers except by the extension of this breakwater, therefore, to accommodate the fishing business and to encourage this important pulpwood operation. I would recommend favourable consideration of the extension to the breakwater, the construction of a protecting groyne on the outer side of the gravel beach and the dredging of a loading berth and approach thereto.

Item agreed to.

Short Beach breakwater extension, $7,500.

Mr. SHORT: Where is this Short Beach? Some of my hon. friends behind me want to know if this was named after me, but I repudiate any knowledge of it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is in a very good section of the country. It is in Shelburne-Yarmouth.

Item agreed to.

Sober Island wharf repairs, $1,500.

Mr. MacNUTT: Where is Sober Island in Nova Scotia?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am in a position to tell where that island is. It is in the county of Halifax.

Mr. MacLAREN: I suppose the island is quite a small one?

Mr. McINTOSH: It has great possibilities.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The population of the island is about 300, engaged wholly in the fishing industry.

Item agreed to.

South Bay, Ingonish—purchase, reconstruction and extension of Corson's wharf, $6,000.

Mr. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton): Has the government already purchased this wharf? I would like an explanation.

Mr. ELLIOTT: An order in council was passed on April 9, 1929, authorizing the acquisition from the estate of Mr. H. C. Corson of a wharf property, for the sum of $1,100, also the purchase from Mrs Bridget Peters for the sum of $50 of an additional fifteen-foot strip of land, adjoining the Corson right-of-way, required in connection with the proposed wharf at South Bay, Ingonish.

Mr. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton): On whose recommendation would that be?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is a petition from the residents of North and South Ingonish, stating that a wharf at or near Corson's wharf would serve Ingonish Harbour, South Bay, Ingonish and Ingonish Centre in stormy weather, and provide a safe place for the steamer to land.

Mr. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton): Is it the intention to make it a government wharf for government steamers to call at? The petition must have been recommended by somebody. Who recommended it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have not the names of the petitioners and I have not the petition. I assume that it would go to the district engineer. In his report he refers to the fact that this petition was presented.

Mr. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton): Is that to be a government wharf for government steamers to call at?

Progress reported.

At 11 o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, April 30, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Fifth report of the select standing committee on standing orders.—Mr. Morin (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville).

PETITIONS

Mr. A. C. CASSELMAN (Grenville-Dundas) moved:

That the petition of Lewis Coit Dargavel, presented on the 29th of April, praying for an act to dissolve the marriage between the petitioner and Grace Ethel Dargavel, together with the report of the clerk of petitions thereon, be referred to the select standing committee on standing orders, for the purpose of considering the suspension of standing order 92 in relation thereto.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the house.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—MR. WOODSWORTH

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre)): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. Yesterday I stated that the member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) was not present at the last meeting of the private bills committee. I find I was mistaken: he was present. I am sorry that I was misinformed, and hence misled the house.

INTERIM SUPPLY

ONE-SIXTH VOTE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I understand from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) that he has had a word with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) with regard to permitting interim supply to be granted. With that understanding I should like to ask the unanimous consent of the house to go into committee of supply to introduce a resolution to that effect.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): That is quite acceptable, Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself and those associated with me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $40,909,873.57, being one-sixth of the amount of each of the several items to be voted as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1930, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for the fiscal year ending the 31st March, 1930.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1930, the sum of $40,909,873.57 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in. Mr. Mackenzie King thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 171 for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1930.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. BENNETT: I suppose it is unnecessary to state that this supply is granted on the same terms as we granted interim supply a few weeks ago—without prejudice to our right to comment on the various items of the main supply bill, and that it shall not be taken that we accede to the soundness of any appropriation without the right to criticize it. I make that statement merely as a matter of form.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is correct.

Section agreed to.

Sections two and three agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Post Office

Salaries and allowances, $17,295,464.40.

Mail service, including mail service by air, $16,305,000.

Miscellaneous, including Lucien Pacaud, secretary of the High Commissioner's office, as the representative of the Canadian government on the Pacific Cable Board, at $1,500; and $5,000 for the payment of compassionate allowances to employees injured while in the performance of their duties, or to dependents of employees killed while on duty, such payments to be made only on the specific authority of the governor in council, $1,176,175.

Yukon territory, $150,000–Total, $34,926,639.40.

Mr. BENNETT: A few days ago I ventured to direct the attention of the house to the fact that I had heard grave and disquieting rumours as to the administration of post office affairs in the New Brunswick district, I regarded the matter as of sufficient importance to suggest that the files dealing with the administration of affairs in that district in recent years be made available, and the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) having made such files available, it now becomes my duty to present to the house the facts as disclosed therein. I do so for the moment without any comment as to what the inferences to be drawn from them may be, and I leave it to the house and the country to determine whether or not a department which is administered as that department is should have the confidence of this country or of this house. The matters with which I have to deal concern the administration of the department in the district office. The office in New Brunswick is under the control of a single superintendent, Mr. Woods, and there are two inspectors, Mr. Emerson, the senior, and Mr. Griffith, the junior. As was indicated the other day at times relations between the inspectors have not been harmonious, for reasons which I shall indicate as I proceed to unfold the case to the house, but one of the difficulties came about in connection with shortages in one or two of the offices under the control of the district superintendent.

There is a small post office at Dupey's Corner, the postmaster of which receives about $144 a year; on investigation it was indicated that a shortage of $907.06 existed at this post office. The investigation of this

office was entrusted to the junior inspector, Mr. Griffith, and in consequence of the investigation which he made under instructions from Mr. Atwater, one of the chief inspectors at Ottawa, he made a report which indicated, as I have said, a deficit of $907.06. In order that there may be no misapprehension in respect to these various matters I am afraid I must ask the indulgence of the house as I place upon Hansard the record as indicated by the file.

Office of District Superintendent of
Postal Service.
St. John, N.B. August 2, 1926.

H. E. Atwater, Esq.,
Chief Inspector,
Inspection Branch,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,

On account of complaints from the financial branch that the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, N.B., was delaying his remittances to the bank and also had not taken into account two error notices, the above-named office was visited and inspected by Inspector Griffith of this district on July 29th. At the completion of the inspection it was ascertained there was a deficiency of $907.06.

The postmaster was not present when the office was inspected but arrived home in the afternoon and Mr. Griffith collected from him the amount of $61.45 which brings the actual shortage down to $845.61. Duplicate and triplicate receipts and bank draft for $61.45 are herewith attached.

The first irregularity reported against this office was from the financial branch with reference to an alleged remittance of $170.00 per registered letter No. 377 entered in the postmaster's cash account on January 31st, 1926. After much correspondence the postmaster explained that he was of the opinion that this remittance had been destroyed by his four-year old child who accidently put same in the fire. The postmaster explained he was unable to pay this amount at once but made arrangements to send in $20.00 per month. To date he has made three payments of $20.00 each in May, June and July respectively. This leaves a balance of $110.00 in connection with this irregularity.

A further letter from the financial branch stated that an error notice, number not given, was forwarded to the postmaster in December, last, with reference to a remittance of $60.00 claimed at item 16 in the postmaster's cash account of the 30th November, forwarded under No. 353.

Another report was in connection with error notice No. 5899 for $10.00 to correct an error in the postmaster's return for the 31st of January 1926.

Another report was received regarding a deposit of $180.00 entered in the postmaster's cash account of June 8th alleged to have been forwarded to the Bank of Montreal on that date under registered number 463.

In the postmaster's account of July 22nd he claimed $608.57 worth of postal notes on hand. When the office was inspected on July 29th he had $173.51 worth of notes on hand.

The postmaster was instructed to make up his cash account to July 29th, inclusive, and forward same to the department, entering the amounts above stated on the debit side. Copy of financial statement is attached herewith.

Also attached you will find a translated copy of the postmaster's statement given to Mr. Griffith. It will be noted that he admits using post office funds for his own business, his method being to hold remittances and forward same after he had sold money orders, stamps and postal notes; also by claiming a larger amount of postal notes on hand than he had when the accounts were forwarded.

It will also be noted that the postmaster volunteers to make good this amount by monthly payments of $40.00. He was informed by the inspector that it was not likely the department would entertain this proposition and that he would be expected to forward the amount of the shortage without delay in order to avoid more serious consequences. The seriousness of his actions was drawn to his attention by the inspection officer and also in a letter from the district superintendent under date of July 31st.

The money order business of this office was closed out on July 29th and the money order books, postal notes, and equipment were removed. The office was l ft in the care of Mr. Hebert with a stamp credit of $25.00.

If agreeable to the department it is the intention to have an inspector again visit this office in the course of a few days to make a strong endeavour to collect the amount of the shortage.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) H. W. Woods,
District Superintendent.

That was the report made to the office at Ottawa with respect to the conditions existing in that post office. That report was acknowledged by the chief accountant on August 23, 1926, by letter which is also under my hand. It is directed to the district superintendent, and is as follows:

With reference to your letter of the 2nd instant, addressed to the chief inspector regarding the shortage in the accounts of the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, I beg to say that the department is willing to consider the question of allowing the postmaster time to make the amount of his deficit good but before taking this up and endeavouring to fix an amount that should be paid each month I should like to be advised as to the postmaster's ability to fulfil any engagement in which he may enter. It is presumed that he has some business other than that of running the post office. Will you please let me know what is the nature of this business and whether its present standing is sufficient to guarantee the postmaster eventually making good all the shortage. What sureties, if any, can the postmaster give for the execution of any agreement in this connection?

That letter was signed by the chief accountant, and in due course a reply was sent from

the district superintendent at St. John under date of November 9, 1926, as follows:

In reply to your letter of the 6th inst. regarding the balance due by the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, and the assurance given that he would make good the sum of $200 by the 1st November, and at least $40 a month thereafter, would inform you that nothing further has been heard from this postmaster.

It is the intention of Inspector Griffith to visit this office within the next few days when a report will be made to the department.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) H. W. Woods,
District Superintendent.

At that time, as I have indicated, after crediting the amounts paid and deducting the salary and commission for October, amounting to $21, the balance due was $850.93. Then on September 9, 1926, a further letter was sent by the district superintendent, Mr. Woods, to the chief accountant of the financial branch, Mr. Austin Bill:

In reply to your letter of the 3rd instant, JAO/JMH, asking for a reply to your letter of the 23rd ult. regarding the shortage in accounts of the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, N.B.—I beg to say that Inspector W. F. Griffith is expected to see the postmaster of Dupey's Corner some day this week and will give full information on his return to the office.

On December 1, 1926, Mr. Griffith wrote to Mr. Austin Bill and the letter, although marked personal, is now upon the file. I think, in the language of the editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press the other day, it will be admitted that no document is personal which deals with public business, as is the case here. This letter proceeds:,

With further reference to our conversation re shortage in accounts of the postmaster of Dupey's Corner, N.B. I beg to inform you I visited this office last week and while it was not possible to see Mr. Magee to ascertain whether or not he would endorse the notes for the postmaster I can personally assure you that there will be no doubt about the monthly payments as promised by the postmaster, and I would respectfully suggest that you concur in the arrangements set forth in official communication from the district superintendent's office of this date.

That letter is signed by Mr. Griffith and refers to a conversation he had in Ottawa with Mr. Austin Bill, chief accountant of the financial branch. On the same day a letter was sent, signed by the district superintendent and bearing under the signature the initial "G." It reads as follows:

With further reference to my memo of the 9th ult, and previous correspondence regarding balance due by the postmaster of Dupey's Corner, N.B., I beg to inform you Inspector Griffith visited Dupey's Corner last week and received from the postmaster the sum of $150 on account of the shortage.

[Mr. Bennett.]

The postmaster promised to pay at least $50 more by the 15th of December, and will complete the balance in twelve monthly payments.

The inspector is positively sure that the postmaster will be able to make the payments as promised, and it is respectfully recommended that the department concur in the recommendation.

Attached please find duplicate and triplicate receipts and bank draft for $150, as per above.

That letter was written by Mr. Woods, the district superintendent. It will be observed that in the letter written on the same day by Inspector Griffith he refers to Mr. McGee. Mr. McGee was not, so far as the correspondence indicates, in any way connected with the postal service and just why it was suggested that he should sign a note or give a guarantee for the default or deficiency in the Dupey's Corner office does not appear. I merely mention that in passing; otherwise, it might be thought that he was in some way connected with the office.

On December 3, 1926, two days later, the chief accountant at Ottawa directed a communication to Mr. Griffith, the inspector at St. John, reading as follows:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 1st inst. regarding the collection of the amount due the department by the postmaster at Dupey's Corner.

The matter has been taken up with the Deputy Postmaster General who has directed me to say that the offer of the postmaster to pay $50 a month can be accepted if the department has your personal guarantee that the payments will be duly and promptly made, or if a written endorsement of the postmaster's promise can be obtained in the form of a promissory note from Mr. McGee.

I would point out that it is necessary to have such assurance of payment as the postmaster has, both in the preparation of his accounts and in carrying out the promise already made not given the department reason to have great confidence in him.

I would point out that the suggestion of a personal guarantee to be given by Mr. Griffith comes from the chief accountant after Mr. Griffith had visited Ottawa and had discussed with him the deficiency at Dupey's Corner.

On December 11, 1926, Mr. Griffith wrote to Mr. Bill, the chief accountant at Ottawa, in these terms:

Replying to your AB-JMH of the 3rd instant with further reference to the collection of the amount due the department by the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, I beg to inform you that I personally guarantee that the payments will be duly and properly made; that is, at the rate of $50 a month, not later than the 15th day of each month.

That note is marked "personal." It is quite true that it is now upon the files but just why a personal note should be written by a post office inspector at St. John, N.B., to

the financial department of the post office at Ottawa, guaranteeing a deficiency or default in the accounts at Dupey's Corner post office in Westmorland county, does not appear.

The chief accountant acknowledged receipt of that letter, and in order that there may be no misunderstanding I am going to quote it. This letter is dated January 29, 1927, and reads as follows:

With reference to your letter of the 11th December, W.F.G./E., relating to the collection of the amount due to the Post Office department by the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, in which you advised that you would personally guarantee that the payments would be duly and properly made at the rate of $50 a month and not later than the 15th day of each month, as no payment has been received this month I shall be pleased if you will advise me concerning this matter.

A reply to that letter was sent by Mr. Griffith on February 7, 1927, reading as follows:

I beg to acknowledge receipt fo your personal letter number JAO-JMH of the 29th ult., with reference to the collection of the amount due the Post Office department by the postmaster at Dupey's Corner. My absence from the office was the cause of same not being replied to sooner.

I may say that the postmaster has been sick in bed this last month or more, and was unable to make his payment in January. I am arranging to go down there some time next week and can assure you that a double payment will be forthcoming before the end of the present month.

I expect to be in Ottawa the early part of next week and will drop in and discuss this matter more fully with you.

Then we have a letter directed by the Deputy Postmaster General to his superior officer, namely, the Postmaster General, the present incumbent of that office. That communication is dated February 25, 1927, and reads as follows:

With reference to the attached letter from the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, N.B., to the Postmaster General, he is informed that on the inspection of the post office on the 29th July last there was established a shortage of $907.06, which was later reduced by adjustments to $874.93.

I might observe that the letter written by the postmaster at Dupey's Corner to the Postmaster General is not attached to this file but it is referred to in this letter of the Deputy Postmaster General to his chief. The letter continues:

The first payment received from him was $150 collected by Inspector Griffith and forwarded to the department on the 1st December. At that time the postmaster promised to make up the balance by a payment of $50 on the 15th December and monthly payments thereafter of the same amount. Inspector Griffith having recommended that this offer be accepted, he was advised that some further assurance of payment should be given. Mr. Griffith replied that he would personally guarantee that the payments would be duly and properly made not later than the 15th day of each month.

As no further payments had been received up to the 29th January Mr. Griffith was asked on that date to advise the department concerning the matter. He wrote on the 7th February that he expected to be in Ottawa the following week and would discuss the matter fully then. In an interview with the chief accountant Mr. Griffith said that he would see the postmaster personally on his return to New Brunswick and arrange for a double payment before the end of February.

In anticipation of this payment no further action has been taken by the department in the case.

That was a communication from the Deputy Postmaster General to his chief, who is now the incumbent of the office of Postmaster General. On March 23, 1927, the chief accountant at Ottawa wrote a further communication to the district superintendent, reading as follows:

When Postal Inspector Griffith was in Ottawa some weeks ago he stated that on his return to New Brunswick he would arrange for a double payment on account of the shortage in the Dupey's Corner account before the end of February. No word has been received from you in this connection. I shall be pleased to be advised as to the progress made.

Mr. Woods, the district superintendent, replied to that letter on March 2, 1927, as follows:

Receipt is acknowledged of the chief accountant's letter AB-JMH of the 23rd inst., with reference to the statement made by Postal Inspector Griffith when he was in Ottawa some weeks ago that when he returned to New Brunswick he would arrange for a double payment on account of the shortage in the Dupey's Corner account before the end of February.

The district superintendent begs to say that until the receipt of this letter he was not aware that the inspector had made this promise, and that on the return to headquarters of the inspector, who is now on field duty, the matter will be brought to his attention with the hope that the same may be adjusted to the satisfaction of the department.

That was the position on March 25, 1927. On April 14, 1927, a little less than a month later, the chief accountant at Ottawa again wrote to the district superintendent in these terms:

With reference to your letter of the 25th ult., HWW/M., in which you advised that Postal Inspector Griffith was on field duty and the question of the shortage in the Dupey's Corner accounts would be brought to his attention upon his return, as nothing further has been received relating to this matter I shall be pleased if you will advise me concerning the arrangements made as soon as possible.

On April 19, a few days later, the district superintendent replied to the chief accountant as follows:

Replying to your memo of the 14th instant, number JAO-JMH and previous correspondence, I beg to inform you that Inspector Griffith visited Dupey's Corner in connection with the shortage in the accounts of the postmaster of that office, and reports that owing to the illness of the postmaster, he was unable to make the payments as promised. It was arranged, however, that the sum of $150 will be forwarded to the department not later than May 5.

While the payments have not been made as promptly as promised, the inspector guarantees the department that the amount will be paid in full, and that the department will suffer no monetary loss.

To that letter the chief accountant wrote as follows on the 12th May:

With reference to your letter of the 19th ult., and previous correspondence, in which you inform me that owing to the illness of the postmaster at Dupey's Corner the promised payments have not been made but that arrangements had been made that the sum of $150 would be forwarded to the department not later than the 5th May, as no payment has been received I shall be pleased if you will advise me by return mail as to what action has been taken.

To that communication seven days later, namely, on the 19th May, 1927, District Superintendent Woods wrote as follows:

Replying to your letter of the 12th instant, JAO/JMH, referring to previous correspondence in regard to the indebtedness of the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, N.B.

I beg to say that no payment has been received from this postmaster at this office, and on questioning Inspector Griffith, who has been dealing with this matter, he advises me that he has not heard from the postmaster since his report of the postmaster's illness on April 19th, and arrangements are being made to have the inspector again visit him at an early date.

On the 9th June the chief accountant again wrote the district superintendent as follows:

With reference to your letter of the 19th May—HWW/M—in which you advise that arrangements had been made to have an inspector visit Dupey's Corner at an early date with a view to collecting the shortage, as nothing further has been received in this division relating to this case I shall be pleased if you will advise me as to what action was taken.

I might inform you that after the salary has been applied to date the balance due is $668.93.

To that letter District Superintendent Woods sent this reply on the 17th June:

With further reference to the matter of shortage in the accounts of the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, and in reply to your letter of the 9th inst, asking to be advised as to what action has been taken in this matter.

I beg to say that as stated in my letter of the 19th May, arrangements were being made to have Inspector Griffith visit Dupey's Corner at an early date.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Unfortunately, however, the inspector has not found it convenient to do so, and on the 13th inst. I made a personal visit and interviewed the postmaster, and received information from him, if corect would show that he has not been given full credit for all moneys that he has paid the inspector.

The inspector has not been in the office nor reported to me since the 6th instant, and I am awaiting his return to the office in order to get his explanation. As soon as this is received a full report will be made to the department.

I would ask you, therefore, to consider this confidential, and to hold the matter in abeyance until you further hear from me.

That letter was placed on the official file although the district superintendent marked it "confidential" and directed it to the chief accountant. I believe, in placing it upon the public file, the officer pursued the correct course. On the 20th June the chief accountant wrote to District Superintendent Woods in these words:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 17th inst. marked "confidential" regarding the shortage in the acounts of the postmaster at Dupey's Corner. Of course, you will realize that if there is anything serious in the transactions between the postmaser and one of your inspectors the matter cannot be kept from the heads of the departments. On the other hand, I am glad for the sake of the inspector referred to that it is not necessary to place your letter on file as it may cast reflections on him which are not justified by the unsupported word of a postmaster who has been grievously at fault in accounting for post office cash.

I note that you say that the inspector has not been in the office nor reported to you since the 6th inst. I would suggest that this is a matter on which a special report should be made to the department and not embodied in a "confidential" communication to one of the officials.

It was for that reason, I assume, that the letter was subsequently placed on the official file. I now come to a letter written on the same date, the 20th June, 1927, a very important communication. It was originally marked "confidential." It is dated at St. John and signed by District Superintendent Woods. It is addressed to the chief accountant of the Post Office Department at Ottawa, and reads as follows:

Referring further to the matter of shortage in the accounts of the postmaster of Dupey's Corner, and to my confidential letter of June 17 in which it was stated that I made a personal visit and interviewed the postmaster, and received information from him, if correct, would show that he has not been given full credit for all moneys that he had paid the inspector.

By referring to report from this office of August 2, 1926, WFG/S, it will be noted that Mr. W. F. Griffith, inspector of postal service, visited Dupey's Corner office on July 29, and at the close of his inspection he found that the postmaster was $907.06 short. After the in-

spection there was collected from the postmaster $61.45, which was deposited in the Bank of Montreal, Saint John, on August 3.

This reduced the indebtedness to $845.61.

According to our files the postmaster has paid nothing since, with the exception of $150 on December 1, which was placed to the Receiver General's credit in the Bank of Montreal on that date, as per deposit slip No. 2516.

Inspector Griffith, who was specially assigned this case, and who according to his letter of December 11 to the chief accountant, in response to one addressed to the inspector dated December 3, gave his personal guarantee that the payments promised by the postmaster would be duly made. Since then he has frequently been reminded of the indebtedness of the postmaster, and always gave assurance that the postmaster was all right and that he would see that the amount was collected, and on April 19, 1927, he reported that he had visited Dupey's Corner, but owing to the illness of the postmaster he was unable to make the payments as promised.

As I have not been satisfied with the course that the inspector has been pursuing in this case, and considering it strange that he would guarantee the postmaster's account, I decided to visit the office personally. This I did on the 13th inst., and in my conversation with the postmaster I concluded that there was something irregular going on.

The postmaster produced the following receipts, which I have now in my possession, for money paid to the inspector on account of the Post Office Department:—

Date of inspection:

July 29	$50
August 23	40
September 30	50

Besides this he stated, and verified the statement by entries in his registration book, that he sent to Mr. Griffith to his home the following amounts:—

Nov. 8—registered letter No. 526... $200
Dec. 2—registered letter No. 545.... 40

These registers have been traced and found that they were delivered by letter carrier to Mr. Griffith's house and signed for by Mrs. Griffith.

The $50 mentioned as being received on the 29th July I feel confident is part of the $61.45 that was deposited to the Receiver General's credit on August 3. This would mean that if the postmaster's statement was found to be correct there should be placed to his credit $330, instead of $150 as per bank receipt No. 2516, December 1, 1926.

On acount of the inspector's absense from the office I was unable to question him in regard to these discrepancies until this morning.

When asked how many payments the postmaster had made to him he replied that there were three, namely:

$ 60
40
50
Or a total of $150

and while he was unable to give the dates that he received these amounts he stated that from time to time he got the first until he received the third there would be about six weeks elapse.

He was then asked if the postmaster had made a payment at any one time of $200, and after hesitating a moment he replied "Yes", and stated he received it by registered letter. He was asked if he had received from the postmaster any other registered letter, but said "No". He was then told that the postmaster had stated to me that he had also sent by registered letter $40. The inspector then stated that he had no recollection of receiving this. He was asked if the $200 that he received from the postmaster by registered letter was on Post Office account, and he said "Yes". He was then asked why there was no record on the Dupey's Corner file of these amounts, and he stated that as he had become accountable for the amount due by the postmaster that he was holding them until the amount would make a fairly decent payment in order to make a good showing for the postmaster.

While the inspector has not yet admitted that he received the $40 that the postmaster says he sent on December 2, by register 545, I am quite convinced that he did receive this amount, and assuming this acording to my information there should be placed to the credit of the postmaster the following amounts:

August 23	$ 40
Spetember 30	50
November 8	200
December 2	40
Or a total of	$330

instead of $150, or a balance due from Mr. Griffith of $180.

It will be noted that the inspector received on or about November 9, $200, and that he did not place the $150 to the postmaster's credit until December 1, which would go to show that the reason he gave for not turning these amounts over when he received them is not a very substantial one.

Going into this matter a little closer I find that in a letter dictated by Mr. Griffith to the financial superintendent on December 1 he stated that he had visited Dupey's Corner last week, and received from the postmaster the sum of $150. In checking up his journal of proceedings for November I see that he refers to a trip to Dupey's Corner on November 15, leaving there that same day.

The postmaster advised me that he had not made any payment at any time of $150 to Mr. Griffith. It can, therefore, be assumed that he made incorrect statements in his letter of December 1.

Again in his letter to the chief accountant of April 19, he states that he had visited Dupey's Corner, and that owing to the illness of the postmaster he was unable to make the payments as promised. The postmaster said that he did not visit the office during the month of April, and there is no mention of his being at Dupey's Corner in his journal of proceedings for the month of April.

Mr. Griffith has just called upon me, and has delivered to me on account of the shortage of the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, $180, and the same will be deposited in the Bank of Montreal, Saint John, this date.

That is the letter, as I have said, of the district superintendent, under date of June

20, 1927. Following that, a letter was sent by District Superintendent Woods to the acting financial superintendent, reading as follows:

Referring to previous correspondence concerning the indebtedness of the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, I beg to report that the sum of $180 has to-day been deposited in the Bank of Montreal, Saint John, towards such indebtedness, and herewith are duplicate and triplicate receipts and bank draft for same.

Then followed on the 23rd of June, 1927, a letter addressed to Mr. Coolican, the assistant deputy postmaster general, and this becomes important, Mr. Chairman, in view of subsequent communications that I shall read. It is directed by the acting financial superintendent, Mr. Atwater, to Mr. Coolican, the assistant deputy postmaster general, and reads as follows:

Re Dupey's Corner, N.B., we find that original shortage was $844, and that at the present time we are still short about $469. The office only has a revenue of $144 yearly, and why the postmaster was ever allowed to go on as he did, I do not know as I believe the matter was taken up by Mr. Glover a year ago.

Instructions have been sent to the district superintendent to-day to inform the postmaster that he must make an immediate settlement of the balance, the reason being given that he has failed to keep his agreement to pay $40 monthly.

There appear to be certain very disturbing factors in connection with the payments that have already been made, and probably they will be reported on by the district superintendent.

That letter was dated the 23rd day of June, 1927. On the 24th of June, 1927, the next day, the acting financial superintendent, Mr. Atwater, wrote to District Superintendent Woods a letter which although marked personal is upon the file, and lest it be that a precis of it would not be satisfactory I venture to trespass upon the time of the house by reading it:

My attention has been called by the chief accountant to a very serious case in connection with the shortage at Dupey's Corner, N.B.

I find that out of the original shortage of $844, there still remains $469 owing the department, although it is nearly one year since the shortage was first brought under investigation. You will receive an official communication asking you to have this balance collected immediately.

Will you be good enough to see that personal attention is given to the matter, and that steps will be taken immediately to call upon the postmaster at Dupey's Corner to make good the balance of this amount without further delay. It cannot be expected that so large a sum of public money misappropriated by a postmaster can be left indefinitely for the postmaster to make good as he sees fit. The postmaster should have been placed under arrest when the shortage was first discovered if he failed to make it good. We have numerous cases, not nearly so seriou, one of them happened a few days ago, in which postmasters in other districts are promptly placed under arrest if they do not make good the shortage at once.

I do not know why the postmaster was allowed so much freedom, but it is quite evident that the case has been treated with a benevolence towards the postmaster, which is not usual. As the shortage took place a year ago, I am not aware of all of the facts, but in any case it is requested that this matter be adjusted without further delay.

To that communication District Superintendent Woods, on the 29th day of June, 1927, directed a reply, addressed to Mr. Atwater, the acting financial superintendent, reading as follows—and this letter becomes rather important in view of what subsequently transpired:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 24th instant, 1-66 with reference to the serious case in connection with the shortage at Dupey's Corner, N.B.

The official notification to which you refer asking me to have the balance due by the postmaster collected immediately has also been received, and the postmaster under registered cover has been advised that it will be necessary for him to have the amount due, namely, $469.43, in my hands not later than July 5th.

You will remember that the chief accountant after consulting with the Deputy Postmaster General wrote a letter dated December 3rd to Mr. W. F. Griffith stating that the offer of the postmaster to pay $50 per month would be accepted if the department had his, Mr. Griffith's, personal guarantee that the payments would be duly and promptly made.

In response to this letter Mr. Griffith wrote on December 11th personally guaranteeing the account.

Will this demand made on the postmaster annul the guarantee given by Mr. Griffith, or will his guarantee still hold good?

I note that you say the postmaster should have been placed under arrest when the shortage was first discovered if he failed to make it good.

On July 31 the postmaster was written to and it was pointed out to him the seriousness of his position, and a number of sections were quoted from the Post Office Act among which was the following:

"Every officer of or connected with the post office who converts to his own use in any way whatsoever, or by way of investment in any kind of property or merchandise or lends with or without interest, any portion of the public moneys entrusted to him for safe-keeping, transfer, disbursement, or for any other purpose, shall be deemed to have stolen so much of the said moneys as is taken, converted, invested, used or lent, and is guilty of an indictable offence."

He was told that the matter was being referred to the Post Office Department at Ottawa, and was advised that I was of the opinion that the department would not accept the offer that he made to the inspector.

A report dictated by Inspector Griffith was sent to you as chief inspector on August 2 giving information as to the shortage of the postmaster.

While this report did not recommend that criminal proceedings be taken against the postmaster, I may say that I was somewhat surprised when I did not receive authority from the department to do so, and I am at a loss to know why the postmaster was allowed so much freedom, and quite agree with you that he has been treated in a benevolent way.

It may be that the inspector's sympathy for him was made known to the department, but no early record of this is on file at this office, although a letter from the chief accountant dated November 6 refers to a conversation that took place with Mr. Griffith on October 14, which gave the chief accountant assurance that the postmaster would make good the sum of $200 by the 1st November, and at least $40 per month thereafter. Previous to this conversation the inspector had already collected from the postmaster $90 for which he had not given the postmaster credit. $40 of it was paid the inspector on August 23, and $50 of it on September 30.

It is quite evident that the inspector did not mention these payments to the chief accountant.

It is a sorry state of affairs when the action of trusted officials is such that their reliability is questioned, and it is regrettable that Mr. Griffith should so far forget his duties as an inspector as he has in this case.

I have my doubts as to the ability of the postmaster to meet this payment for I saw on my visit indications of poverty and distress, and the farm on which he lives belongs to his father and it is mortgaged up to its full value, namely, $1,400. However, he has been advised of the department's demands and you will be further informed in regard to the matter in a few days.

I am taking it for granted that you do not wish an arrest to be made until authority is received from the department.

On the 5th of July, 1927, District Superintendent Woods addressed a letter to the chief accountant, Mr. Austin Bill, reading as follows:

With reference to previous correspondence regarding the shortage in the accounts of Mr. Edouard R. Hebert, postmaster at Dupey's Corner, N.B., and in response to your letter of the 22nd ultimo, asking that the postmaster be called upon for an immediate settlement of the balance due, namely, $469.43.

The postmaster was written to on June 28 and advised that it would be necessary for him to have the amount of the shortage in my hands not later than July 5, and the following letter has been received from his father, Raymond F. Hebert:

"In answer to your letter to my son Edward, postmaster of Dupuis Corner, re shortage in his account, I must say that I had the occasion to meet the hon. Postmaster General yesterday and referred the matter to him and asked him to extend the time for one month to enable me to raise a part of the money and would make arrangement for the balance.

The hon. minister promised me to either write or phone you to-day.

Hoping you will grant me the extension of time, I am, sir, with thanks,

Yours very truly,

Raymond F. Hebert."

I am acknowledging the receipt of this letter and advising Mr. Hebert that the matter has been referred to the department.

I may say that up to the present I have had no communication either by letter or phone with the hon. Postmaster General regarding the matter.

You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that that letter is dated July 5, 1927, and on the day preceding, according to the statement made by the postmaster, he had interviewed the Postmaster General with respect to this prosecution and requested that he be given an extension of time to make good his shortage of cash.

Mr. VENIOT: I think the hon. gentleman is making a mistake; it was the father.

Mr. BENNETT: I thank my hon. friend. It was the father of the postmaster. On July 9 the acting financial superintendent wrote a letter to the general superintendent of postal service, Mr. T. P. Coolican, reading as follows:

Referring to letter of the 23rd ultimo, in regard to Dupey's Corners, I am enclosing copy of report from the district superintendent at St. John.

I have sent a copy of this report to the Deputy Postmaster General.

The financial branch is following up the case as regards the collection of the shortage.

The district superintendent has been notified to have this amount collected without further delay.

The question of any action as regards Inspector Griffith in connection with this case is, of course, not a matter for the financial branch.

On July 9, the same day, the following memorandum appears to have been prepared by Mr. Atwater, the acting financial superintendent:

Memorandum for Deputy Postmaster General.

Please find attached copy of report from the district superintendent of postal service at St. John, in regard to collection of instalments paid by the postmaster at Dupey's Corners on a shortage in official cash at that office.

The district superintendent has been instructed to take immediate steps to collect the balance due by the postmaster, without further delay. This will be followed up.

In the meantime, the matter is submitted in connection with the regrettable action taken by Inspector Griffith.

Copy of a letter to Mr. Woods, dated the 23rd June, is also attached.

Copy of this report is also being sent to the general superintendent of postal service.

On July 14, five days later, there appears on the file this memorandum:

Mr. Gaboury.

When this difficulty occurred at Dupuis Corners Mr. Griffith personally informed me of arrangement made to get it straightened and I approved of his giving time to postmaster to settle and when all was paid we would dismiss him. I did not think it necessary to

make the arrangement a matter of record. Griffith guaranteed payment. The postmaster's father saw me a short time ago and I told him if the amount was settled within next four months we would not prosecute and I know nothing about amount received by Mr. Griffith. Leave matters stand for a while.

P. J. Veniot.

That, Mr. Chairman, you will observe is dated July 14, 1927. It indicates at least one thing clearly in these words:

When this difficulty occurred at Dupuis Corners Mr. Griffith personally informed me of arrangement made to get it straightened and I approved of his giving time to postmaster to settle and when all was paid we would dismiss him.

Then follow these words:

Griffith guaranteed payment.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, without drawing any inference at this stage with respect to this correspondence, that that memorandum abundantly establishes the reason why they suggested a guarantee should be given by Griffith himself. The real reason why Griffith gave a guarantee in respect to this matter—

Mr. VENIOT: I do not think my hon. friend wishes to be unfair, but if he will look back he will find that this occurred in June or July, 1926, when I was not Postmaster General, and that Mr. Griffith had given his guarantee before 1927. So when it is stated that I saw Mr. Griffith, and so on, it refers only to the first time I became aware of the case.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. Postmaster General is quite right in saying the difficulty in the office at Dupey's Corners occurred at a time prior to his accession to office; but he overlooks the fact that it was in September, 1926, that we first have any reference to a guarantee being given by Griffith. Further, the minister's own signature to the memorandum of July 14, 1927, makes it clear that when his attention was directed to the difficulty at Dupey's Corners he discussed it with Griffith, with the result that I have just read from the memorandum.

Now, we find next that on the strength of that memorandum of July 14, 1927, Mr. L. J. Gaboury initialled this memorandum to Mr. Atwater:

Please close this case. P.M.G. instructions to me. L.J.G.

So whatever may have been his knowledge at the inception of this trouble, it is perfectly clear that by July 14, 1927, the minister had apprised himself of the situation, and that Mr. Gaboury had taken the action to which I have referred under instructions given by the minister. Let me follow it further. On

[Mr. Bennett.]

August 19, 1927, Mr. Atwater made this memorandum for the Acting Deputy Postmaster General:

After instructions were sent to the district superintendent St. John, on the 23rd June, 1927, to take immediate steps to collect the balance of a shortage owing by the postmaster at Dupey's Corners, a report was sent in dated June 29, by the district superintendent, indicating that certain moneys had been turned over to Inspector Griffith by the postmaster, Dupey's Corners, which had not been turned in to the department by the inspector until a considerable time after.

This matter was brought to the attention of the Deputy Postmaster General on the 9th July, but in accordance with instructions given by the Postmaster General at that time, it has been allowed to stand for the present.

Now, mark you, sir, that is the memorandum from Mr. Atwater, the acting financial superintendent, to the Deputy Postmaster General of Canada. It proceeds:

Since that time the case has come up in connection with the theft of mail matter at Shediac post office.

To which I shall presently refer.

The culprit in this case is a young man by the name of Leger, who was apprehended.

There is a dispute between Inspector Griffith and Leger in regard to the amount turned over to Griffith by Leger. It appears that district superintendent Woods questioned Leger in this matter, and a copy of Inspector Griffith's statement to the inspection service is attached.

There is no definite evidence that Inspector Griffith received any amount more than he accounted for from Leger, although he does not dispute the possibility.

In view of the fact that District Superintendent Woods has considered it necessary, having regard to the cases mentioned, to refuse his recommendation of Inspector Griffith's yearly increase, it would seem advisable that this matter should be definitely cleared up and the actual facts ascertained.

Since the department is aware that there is considerable personal animosity between District Superintendent Woods and Inspector Griffith, it would be very unwise to accept the statement of either one without independent investigation.

It is therefore suggested that as soon as the acting chief inspector, Mr. Fortier, returns to duty he should be instructed, subject to the Postmaster General's approval, to go to St. John and investigate these cases to ascertain what are the actual facts.

I shall not now refer to the Shediac case, which I shall deal with as a separate matter. Nor shall I refer for the moment to the recommendations made by Superintendent Woods with respect to Inspector Griffith; I shall deal with that also as a separate count in the indictment against the Postmaster General. Then follows a letter, written by the district superintendent to the chief accountant, Mr. Atwater, dated September 17, 1927:

Referring further to the indebtedness of the postmaster at Dupey's Corners, N.B., I beg to

report that a further amount of $75 has been collected from the postmaster, and the same has been deposited in the Bank of Montreal, St. John, towards his indebtedness, and you will find herewith duplicate and triplicate receipts and bank draft for same.

Then we have on September 17 a report dealing with the situation in its entirety, signed by the district superintendent:

Enclosed herewith you will find copy of a memorandum sent to the chief accountant advising him that $75 has been placed in the Bank of Montreal, St. John, N.B., as a further payment from the postmaster at Dupey's Corners on account of shortage found in the postmaster's accounts as per reports from this office WFG/S, dated August 2, 1926.

Not receiving any reply to my letter addressed to the chief accountant of July 5, in which a copy of a letter from Raymond F. Hebert, father of the postmaster, was quoted, which was to the effect that Mr. Hebert had been in conversation with the hon. Postmaster General with a view of having the time of the settlement of his son's case extended, I made a visit to Dupey's Corners on the evening of the 15th inst., and saw the postmaster, who advised me that he did not have any money, but he thought that his father had come for me. I then called upon Mr. Hebert, Senior, who lives about ten miles distant from Dupey's Corners, and received from him the $75 mentioned above. Mr. Hebert advised me that it would be impossible for him to make any further payment on this account before spring.

In my conversation with him he stated that his son had told him that he was of the opinion there was $80 more that should have been placed to his credit than what has been. He was told that he must be mistaken in this, as the postmaster had not told me anything about it, but was advised that if the postmaster had any evidence that would show he had paid more than what was put to his credit to let me know at once.

Then followed a communication from the chief accountant to the district superintendent, merely acknowledging the receipt of the money and dealing with what was proposed to be done with respect to verifying the alleged facts touching the $80. I shall not take up the time of the house reading that. On October 6th, 1927, a letter was written to the financial superintendent by the district superintendent at St. John in the following words:

In reply to departmental memo of September 23, AB/JMH, relative to the shortage of the Dupey's Corner post office, and suggesting that an inspecting officer interview Mr. Hebert, sr., and have full investigation made of the claim that another $80 had been paid in for which credit had not been given, the financial superintendent is advised that Inspector Peck visited Dupey's Corner on the 4th inst. and interviewed Mr. Hebert, sr., as well as the postmaster, Edouard Hebert.

Upon questioning Mr. Hebert, sr., it was found that the extra amount which he thought had been paid was $50 instead of $80. He obtained this information from his son, as the son had informed him that he had made a payment of that amount at the time the office was inspected and the shortage discovered. He was shown that credit for this amount had been duly given opposite item 30 on the inspection report, and investigation shows that the amounts paid by him correspond in total with the credits given him up to the present time. The correct balance now due from him is $375.93, as per statement attached to the above-mentioned memo.

The inspector pointed out to both Mr. Hebert, sr., and the postmaster, the great leniency that had been shown them by the department, and pressed them very hard for another payment at this time. This they both stated was absolutely out of the question, and from observation made by the inspector, he is convinced that such is the case.

Mr. Hebert, sr., is undoubtedly doing his best to pay off the shortage, although he cannot promise to pay anything before spring, and it is thought that this duty will devolve entirely upon him, as the son has all he can do to make a living. The latter has a family of six in very poor circumstances, and great hardship would be entailed upon them if he were arrested, and nothing would be gained towards a speedier payment, as there is no security to offer for a loan, and the promises made by Mr. Hebert, which are thought to be sincere, offer the only means for the department to recuperate its loss.

I fancy the word was not "recuperate" in the original but that is the way the copy reads. On the 22nd day of November, 1927, a letter was written by the district superintendent of St. John directed to the Postmaster General.

Dear Mr. Minister,—

I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Raymond F. Hebert, Shediac, N.B., in regard to the misappropriation of post office funds by his son, Mr. E. R. Hebert, postmaster of Dupey's Corner, N.B., in which he expresses a willingness to make good the amount of the balance of the misappropriation, but says that he cannot pay the amount all at once. He states that his son has a large family of small children and his wife is delicate, and that it takes all he can earn to support his wife and family. He further states that he will pay $75 this coming winter and at the rate of $150 per year until the amount is paid up.

Mr. Hebert enclosed with his letter a letter that he received from you dated 31st October, which would indicate that you are satisfied to leave the settlement of this case to the district superintendent at Saint John.

As this case has some complications I hesitate to take the responsibility of making a settlement without first receiving direct instructions from you as to the department's wishes in the matter with authority to act.

Yours very truly,

H. W. Woods,
District Superintendent.

The letter referred to as being directed by the minister to Mr. Hebert was not attached to the file; it is not on the file. Now, the reply to that letter is found in a communication directed to the district superintendent,

Mr. Woods, by the acting financial superintendent, Mr. Atwater, under date December 1, 1927:

Referring to your communication addressed to the Postmaster General under date of the 22nd instant, you are authorized to make a settlement with the postmaster at Dupeys Corners for the payment of balance of the amount due the department on account of shortage in post office cash.

If the settlement suggested in your letter is the best that can be obtained in the circumstances, this may be allowed, but in permitting the postmaster to make good the amount in this way, the department must obtain adequate security that the amount will be paid.

Will you be good enough to immediately take up with the postmaster the question of security that is to be furnished by him, or by his father, who is making good the amount, to guarantee payment.

No promise of settlement can be made until the department is satisfied in regard to the security given.

To that letter Mr. Woods, the district superintendent, wrote a communication under date December 14, 1927, addressed to the financial superintendent, and although marked confidential it appears on the file. As it deals with purely public business, I assume it was put on the file for the purpose of being read. It reads:

Pursuant to directions contained in departmental memorandum of December 1st, authorizing a settlement with the late postmaster of the above office in accordance with suggestions made from this office under date of November 22nd, the superintendent is advised as follows:

On the 12th instant Inspector H. B. Peck interviewed Mr. Raymond Hebert, (father of the late postmaster) at Shediac who made the offer referred to in above-mentioned letter. Mr. Hebert stated that his property which he valued at $1,800 had a mortgage against it of $1,400. This the inspector verified by consulting with the attorney who transacts Mr. Hebert's business and he also stated that there was no one at Shediac who would join Mr. Hebert in becoming responsible for the amount in question. All the security Mr. Herbert could offer was his own notes. When informed that this was not sufficient and being asked if he had not some relative to assist him he replied that he had a brother who was a priest at Buctouche and to whom he did not wish to apply for assistance and who knew nothing of the matter.

The inspector suggested that he be given a letter of introduction to Rev. Phil. Hebert, the brother above referred to, notifying him that the matter would be laid before him with the intention of obtaining his signature to joint notes covering the amount due. This Mr. Hebert finally assented to and the inspector first obtaining the signature of Raymond Hebert to the notes covering the amount proceeded to Buctouche and after explaining the whole matter to the Rev. Phil. Hebert, the latter also signed the notes which are herewith enclosed.

[Mr. Bennett.]

The superintendent is assured that the above is the best settlement that could be effected and is undoubtedly considered adequate security for payment of the shortage.

The several parties were given to understand that the settlement as made was contingent upon its acceptance by the department and in no case was it to be binding nor did the department relinquish its right to take such further action as might be deemed advisable in the event of any or all of the notes not being met at maturity.

That closes the incident, except for a letter written by Mr. Atwater, the acting financial superintendent, under date December 19, 1927, in which he says:

Please find enclosed five notes in favour of the Postmaster General, to cover balance of shortage, not yet made good, by the postmaster, Dupey's Corner.

These notes have been signed by the postmaster's father, who is making good the amount, and Mr. Hebert's brother, who is parish priest at Buctouche, and who has consented to jointly sign the notes, as security for the department.

It is requested that steps be taken to have these notes brought forward at proper intervals, for settlement.

Steps should also be taken to withdraw the total amount from guarantee fund, to recoup revenue, and as each note is settled, the amount can be returned to guarantee fund.

That closes the incident so far as the records before us indicate. We now come to what may be described as the Shediac incident in connection with the administration of the office by Mr. Griffith. The record of that incident is not lengthy but it must be dealt with frankly. Before I deal with that however it may be convenient to deal with the case connected with the reports made by the district superintendent, Mr. Woods, to the chief inspector regarding the administration of the office by Inspector Griffith. As the committee is no doubt aware, it is the custom of the department to submit to the district superintendent annually an efficiency report, and on that efficiency report the ratings are made in relation to increases in salaries. In this instance we have before us two documents with the relevant exhibits dealing with the increase in salary to Mr. Inspector Griffith. I think perhaps it is well, without taking up too much time, to direct attention to the application made for the 1927 revision. The 1927 revision was for an increase in salary of $180 to take place April 1, 1927. District Superintendent Woods reported for instance a 90 per cent rating in regard to the quantity of Mr. Griffith's work; as to quality of work and industry, he gave a rating of 80 per cent; he rated at 90 per cent his intelligence, resourcefulness, initiative and ability to carry on work without supervision, his ability to carry out instruc-

tions, and his knowledge of the work of the branch. He placed at 80 his tact in meeting the public and in dealing with other employees, and at 80 his willingness to cooperate; his fairness toward assistants and his conduct in his relations with superiors was placed at 70; his physical fitness was placed at 90, punctuality at 80, ability to plan and supervise work and to instruct and direct others at 90; his judgment and ability to accept and carry responsibility at 80, and his success in charge of staff is placed at 90.

On the reverse of the sheet, however, the district superintendent was asked whether or not he could recommend that the inspector be given his salary increase, in these words:

26. In case the employee is not at his maximum, do you recommend him for increase in salary? No.

If not, state why. In view of the irregularities of Inspector Griffith as per report from this office of June 20th, 1927, regarding shortage in the accounts of the P.M. Dupey's Corner; also report of the 13th July, 1927, dealing with claim of Mr. Edwad T. Leger of Shediac that he had paid the inspector money which was not placed to his credit, the district superintendent cannot recommend Mr. Griffith for increased salary.

That was the recommendation made by the superintendent of the New Brunswick division in 1927. He made the same report in 1928, but then we find a most amazing letter on this file. This letter is signed by P. T. Coolican, Assistant Deputy Postmaster General; it is dated August 27, 1927, and headed "Memorandum for Inspection Service." The letter proceeds:

The Postmaster General instructs that Mr. Griffith's annual increase be proceeded with, notwithstanding the report by District Superintendent Woods.

The Postmaster General advises that he knows all the details of the case—hence, the above instructions.

As I have said, that memorandum was signed by the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, and when the matter came up for further consideration in 1928 Mr. Woods, the district superintendent, then referred to the instances which I have mentioned with the result that he did not recommend the increase. It is not until September of 1928, when Mr. Woods wrote Mr. Fortier, that we have a further memorandum in the following words:

Referring to your communication of the 17th instant, enclosing form 24 G, in connection with the annual increase of salary of Mr. W. F. Griffith, inspector of postal service, St. John district, and particularly to your remarks as regards cases reported on June 20th and July 13th, 1927, on acount of which you say you cannot recommend Mr. Griffith for an increase in salary, I desire to inform you that these cases have been inquired into personally, by the Postmaster General and the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General when the matter was brought to their attention last year, and the explanations given by Inspector Griffith have been considered satisfactory, so under the circumstances, these cases are considered closed, and further mention of them need not be made in any further reports of the conduct or efficiency of Inspector Griffith.

I trust that this committee will realize just what those words mean, Mr. Chairman. At this moment I do not propose to comment upon them; I merely direct the attention of this house and the country to what has been done in this matter; I leave hon. members to be the judges. Personally I am drawing no inferences from these facts; I am leaving them as they appear.

With respect to the Shediac matter, which perhaps might have been taken sooner, but which I can deal with chiefly without encumbering Hansard with the complete record, the fact is that there was a shortage of $334 in the Shediac post office and it was contended by the Legers, who had to pay that amount, that they had not received credit for all the money they had given Mr. Griffith. That is the instance referred to by District Superintendent Woods and by the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General who, under the instructions of the Postmaster General, treated the matter as one not to be mentioned or heard of again. On July 13, 1927, the district superintendent placed the Shediac matter fully before the acting chief inspector in these words:

In compliance with the acting chief inspector's memorandum Insp. 68413 of June 22nd, which enclosed official cheque No. 879 for $29 representing the balance of the sum of $334 collected from J. Leger, sr., Shediac, N.B., to make good the losses of registered mail matter due to the depredations of his son.

A cheque for $29 payable to J. Leger, sr., was forwarded to the postmaster at Shediac, with a request that it be handed to Mr. Leger taking from him receipt for the same.

This cheque was duly received by the postmaster, and when he presented it to Mr. Leger it was not accepted by him because it should have been made payable to Edouard T. Leger instead of J. Leger, sr., and also that it was for an amount less than the difference between the amount that Mr. Leger paid and that for which he was given credit.

By referring to report from this office WFG/E. of June 22nd, 1925, it will be noted on page 2, paragraph 2, that postal inspector Mr. W. F. Griffith stated that he had received from Mr. Edward Leger a total amount of $300, and in a memorandum from the district office dated September 1st, 1925, there was enclosed duplicate and triplicate receipts from the Bank of Montreal for $334, which showed that $34 had reached this office besides the $300 above referred to.

In a statement furnished by Mr. Leger to the postmaster at Shediac on the 9th inst. he claimed to have paid the following amounts to Inspector Griffith:—

	$100 00
	200 00
	34 00
	15 00
A total of..	$349 00

As this showed that there was $15 missing a visit was made to Shediac by the district superintendent on the 12th inst., and a declaration was received from Edouard T. Leger, which reads as follows:—

"I, Edouard T. Leger, of Shediac, in the county of Westmorland, do solemnly declare that due to certain losses from registered mail matter on account of depredations committed by my son, Alban Leger, I paid the Post Office Department indemnity to the amount of three hundred and forty-nine dollars ($349) as follows, that is to say, on or about June 19th, 1925, I paid to W. F. Griffith, inspector of postal service, one hundred dollars ($100); on or about June 22nd, I paid to Mr. J. V. Bourque, postmaster, Shediac, N.B. two hundred dollars ($200); on or about August 20th, 1925, I paid to Mr. W. F. Griffith on the train between Moncton and Shediac thirty-four dollars ($34), and some time in the month of October, 1925, Mr. W. F. Griffith called at my home and told me it would be necessary for me to pay fifteen dollars ($15) more, and this amount was given him in my presence by my wife, Delphine Leger."

Besides this, the following declaration was made by Mde. Delphine Leger:—

"I am the wife of Edouard T. Leger, and that some time in the month of October, 1925, I, on request of my husband, and in his presence paid to Mr. W. F. Griffith fifteen dollars ($15):"

In the conversation held with Mr. Leger he stated that he received no receipts from the inspector for any of the money that he had paid.

On this date Inspector Griffith was questioned as to the amount of money that he received from Mr. Leger, and he stated that as this case dated back to two years ago he couldn't remember exactly what amounts he did receive. He was shown his report of June 22nd, 1925, and also a list that had been made out of the abstractions against the Shediac post office, which totalled $334, and besides this the original receipt for the deposit of that amount made on Sept. 1st. As this covered the only record that is on the file of money received Mr. Griffith said he presumed that the $334 is all that he had received. The only moneys, however, that he was positive in receiving was the $300 that is mentioned in his report of June 22nd, 1925.

He was asked if he had met Mr. Leger on the train or at his own home, and he stated that he had remembered seeing him at Moncton station, but could not remember whether he got money from him there or not, but was quite positive, however, that he did not receive any money from Leger at Leger's home, with the exception of the $100 that was paid on June 19th.

At this juncture the inspector was told that as there appeared to be a discrepancy between his statement and that of Mr. Leger's, it would be necessary for him to give a written statement of his knowledge of the matter. To this he objected and refused to give any statement until he saw Mr. Leger. This did not meet with approval, and he was told that it was absolutely necessary for him to give a written statement, and after some more conversation the stenographer was called and the following is a statement signed by him:—

"I cannot say positively what moneys I collected from Mr. Leger.

I have positive recollection of receiving $300 in three amounts of $100 each; $100 cash and $200 money orders issued at Shediac post office payable to me at Saint John."

I do remember going to Moncton, I think on two different occasions."

"I went once to the C.N.R. shops, Moncton. The second time I went to Moncton I saw him at the station, shook hands with him, and saw him get on board the train for Shediac, but I do not remember whether I got money from him or not at that time."

"The time that I met Mr. Leger at the station is the last time that I saw him."

"The first payment that I received from Leger was paid me in his own home, and this is the only money that he paid me in his own house to my recollection."

"I have never received any money from Mr. Leger's wife, to my recollection."

"(sgd.) Wm. F. Griffith."

It was not until after the inspector gave his written statement that he was told that the district superintendent had seen and gotten declarations from Mr. Leger and his wife, and he showed much annoyance and accused the district superintendent of playing a mean and underhanded trick.

As to this the district superintendent has no comments and he refrains from making any recommendation in this case, but is of the opinion that the total amount that the inspector received from Mr. Leger is $349 instead of $334, leaving a balance due from Mr. Griffith of $15.

That is the communication which Mr. Woods sent the department at Ottawa. On July 18, 1927, and this date is rather important in view of the memorandum signed by the hon. Postmaster General himself, the following letter was written by Mr. Griffith to H. Fortier, the acting chief inspector:

On Wednesday of last week just before I was leaving the office the district superintendent called me and asked me to make a statement immediately about a case that I was dealing with during the summer of 1925, that is, the stealing of letters at Shediac post office by a young man by the name of Leger.

Naturally it is pretty hard for a person to remember everything that happened within two years and not having the file to refresh one's memory. However, I made a statement as near as possible from memory and after doing so the district superintendent produced a lot of papers from his desk and started to read affidavits fom different people. I then took a tumble that he had evidently been down to Shediac, and I asked him what he was driving at or what he meant. He informed me that in the settlement of the case the department had returned some money to Mr. Leger, and he, Leger, took exception to the amount.

It seems there is a difference of $15 between what I have on record and what Leger claims he paid.

All I know about the matter is that when I was there I was paid $100, and within a day or two I received two money orders for $100 each, making $300 in all. This covered the total amount of losses at that time reported.

Some time afterwards other cases cropped up and instructions were received in each case to have the money collected from Mr. Leger. On receipt of those cases from the enquiry section I have a distinct recollection of going to Moncton twice and I know I collected $34 from him but cannot give the exact date.

It seems that some time later there was another case of $15 turned up and I went to Moncton to see Mr. Leger. I remember meeting him just as the train was pulling out for Shediac. It is most probable from what Leger and his wife say that he did not have the money on him at the time and that I did go into Shediac later and received the $15 from him, but I certainly have no recollection of same at present. But there is one thing certain—Leger and his wife are honest people and if they are positive they paid this additional $15 I certainly would not dispute their statement, but I would be surprised if I received any money and I did not give them a receipt for same.

Now I have had no opportunity to see Mr. Leger since, in fact from the actions of the district superintendent I thought perhaps it would be better not to go near him.

With reference to this matter I may say I will make no move until I receive orders from the department.

As before stated, if Mr. and Mrs. Leger have any proof of paying me the above amount I will be only too pleased to either return it to them or forward it to the department, as directed.

The next communication is a letter dated July 20, 1927, from the district superintendent, Mr. Woods, to Mr. Fortier, in which he says:

Referring further to the acting chief inspector's memorandum of June 22nd, insp. 68413, authorizing a refund of $29 to be paid J. Leger, senior, Shediac, N.B., to make good the losses from registered mail matter due to the depredations of his son.

The district superintendent begs to call attention to his report of July 13, in which it was pointed out that the refund is due Edouard T. Leger instead of J. Leger, senior.

Will the acting chief inspector please authorize the paying of this amount to Edouard T. Leger, and also give instructions as to whether the claim of Mr. Leger for a further amount of $15 which he says that he paid to Inspector Mr. W. F. Griffith, shall be entertained or not.

On July 22, two days later, the letter was acknowledged in the following language:

Mr. Leger's claim for a further amount of $15 is receiving attention and the district superintendent will be further advised.

This $29 was paid to Edouard T. Leger, who acknowledged by receipt which is upon the file. On July 30, the following letter was sent by the district superintendent:

With further reference to the matter of refund to Mr. Edouard T. Leger, Shediac, N.B., in connection with losses from registered mail matter due to the depredations of his son.

Enclosed herewith please find receipts from Mr. Leger for $29, authorized to be paid him, as per the acting chief inspector's memorandum 68413 dated July 22nd.

The next letter, dated August 1, certainly throws a rather lurid light upon the administration of the department, and I use that language without being in any sense offensive. It reads:

Memorandum for the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General.

This file has reference to the collection of $334 from Edouard Leger, sr., Shediac, N.B., to make good the losses of registered mail matter, due to the depredations of his son.

In a statement furnished by Mr. Leger to the postmaster at Shediac on July 9, he claims to have paid the following amounts to Inspector Griffith:

$100
$200
$ 34
$ 15

a total of $349.

Inspector Griffith has not accounted for $15 of this amount, and, as a refund has to be made to Mr. Leger, there is a shortage of $15, which must be made good.

Mr. Griffith, in dealing with this matter in a memorandum dated July 18, claims that he has no recollection of having received a payment of $15 from Mr. Leger, and he states that, if Leger and his wife are positive they paid him (Griffith) $15, he will not dispute their statement. He concludes his communication, however, by saying if Mr. and Mrs. Leger have any proof of paying him the amount in question he will be only too pleased to return it to them, or forward it to the department.

It is desired to point out that, in the Dupey's Corner case, various sums were paid to Mr. Griffith, which were not immediately accounted for.

It would seem that Inspector Griffith should be instructed to forward immediately the sum of $15 to the department so that same may be paid over to Mr. Leger, and the matter adjusted.

(Sgd.) Cantwell
H. Fortier,
for Acting Chief Inspector.

Observe these words:

The P.M.G. mentioned this case to me before his departure for the east. Return this memo to me on P.M.G.'s return.

Initialled P.T.C.,
August 9, 1927.

We assume those to be the initials of Mr. P. T. Coolican.

Then the following memorandum, dated September 16, 1927, is placed upon the file:

This case was discussed with the general superintendent a few days ago who intimated that action in so far as the inspection service is concerned might be allowed to stand as this matter was receiving the personal attention of the Postmaster General.

(Sgd.) Cantwell.

Let us now proceed to the next count to which I referred the other day, the insubordination in the administration of the office at St. John, N.B. This is a matter which vitally affects the public service and the seriousness of it arises from what took place prior to this year. I am going to read from the files and not make a precis of the case lest there be trouble hereafter as to the correctness and fullness of these statements.

Early this year it became apparent that it was necessary to look into the mail service in connection with the new Canadian National ships sailing to and from the West Indies. The Postmaster General said the other day that as Mr. Woods had not been feeling very well he thought that he would be a desirable person to look into the administration in connection with the mail service between the West Indies and St. John and Halifax. On January 2, 1929, District Superintendent Woods addressed the following note to Mr. Coolican, the general superintendent of postal service:

No doubt you are already aware a trip has been arranged for me to the West Indies, and I expect to leave Halifax on the ss. Lady Drake on January 11th, returning to St. John on February 24th.

During my absence it is my intention to leave Inspector, Mr. John Emerson, in charge of the office.

Trusting that this may meet with your approval and with very best wishes for the new year, I remain.

Yours very truly,
H. W. Woods,
District Superintendent.

About the same day there is a direction from P. T. Coolican, addressed to Miss Theriault, as follows:

Please show to P.M.G. The usual thing is to have the senior inspector take charge during the absence of the district superintendent. In St. John this would be Emerson but the minister may have some views on the matter.

These views are expressed in a memorandum dated January 9, 1929, signed by P. T. Coolican, as follows:

Memorandum for the Chief Inspector

With reference to the attached application from the district superintendent, St. John, for leave of absence starting on January 11th, the Postmaster General instructs that Inspector Griffith be placed in charge during the district superintendent's absence.

As Mr. Woods leaves on the 11th, it will be necessary to wire him.

I will not go one step farther than I would if I were a crown prosecutor opening a case to a jury. Without making any comments which in any sense are inferences, I would point out to the house and to the country that the man the Postmaster General instructed should be placed in charge was the junior inspector when his deputy points out that it was usual for the senior to be placed in charge. And he also does it with the knowledge that Griffith had embezzled $150 which was an offence under section 98 of the Post Office Act, which section has been read into this record. That is the position and that cannot be controverted. All I have to do at this time is simply to ask this question: Why? Why is a man who is admittedly an embezzler placed over men during the absence of his chief when the ordinary rule is that the senior inspector should be placed in charge, against whom, as I am reminded by an hon. member, there is not a single black mark. Under date of January 9, I find the following instructions given by wire directed to Mr. Griffith at his residence, 115 Lansdowne avenue, St. John, New Brunswick, and signed Fortier, chief inspector:

Instructions putting you in charge during Woods' absence going forward to-day.

Then follows the letter dated 9th January:

Dear Mr. Griffith,

I have to inform you that during the absence of Mr. H. W. Woods, from the 11th instant to the 24th February, next, you are to be in charge of the St. John district office. The district superintendent has been advised accordingly.

On the same date Mr. Coolican, general superintendent of postal service, directed to Mr. Woods, district superintendent, a notice intimating that the same appointment had been made. Thereupon, on the 10th January, 1929, that is the day following, Mr. John Emerson, senior inspector of postal service of New Brunswick, against whom there is not a single black mark, wrote this letter to Mr. Griffith:

I beg to advise you that a letter has been received from the department addressed to H. W. Woods, district superintendent of postal service, advising that during his absence the office is to be left in your charge.

That is, the senior inspector does his duty by thus advising the junior inspector of his appointment over his head. Mr. Griffith writes to Mr. Coolican on the 11th January in these words:

Dear Mr. Coolican,

I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 9th inst. with the information that I was to be placed in charge of the Saint John district office during the absence of Mr. H. W. Woods, district superintendent, and stating that the district superintendent had also been notified.

Herewith for your information please find copy of notification received by me signed by Mr. John Emerson, inspector postal service, although Mr. Woods was in his office yesterday afternoon.

According to instructions I assumed charge of the office this a.m., and enquired of Inspector Emerson and principal clerk of the office service section, Miss Howard, asking for the official letter regarding my being placed in charge. Miss Howard stated she had never seen it, and Inspector Emerson stated that Mr. Woods must have taken it with him. I would respectfully suggest that you forward another letter, so that the copy may be placed in the order books for the information of those concerned.

In other words, it will be observed that the junior inspector, thus placed in charge, was not willing to accept the intimation from his senior that the superintendent had sent the letter because the original was not in his hands. Thereupon Mr. Coolican, the general superintendent, sent a copy of this letter to Mr. Griffith on the 14th January, 1929. It was two days before that when Mr. John Emerson, senior inspector of postal service at New Brunswick, wrote to Mr. Coolican a letter which, although it is marked "personal" but dealing with public business, is on the files that have been produced. That letter reads:

Dear Sir,

Referring to the absence of District Superintendent H. W. Woods for a period of six or seven weeks on a trip to the West Indies, and to your letter of the 9th instant instructing that the Saint John postal district was to be under the supervision of Mr. W. F. Griffith, inspector of postal service, I beg to draw your attention to the following facts:

As you are aware, I am the senior inspector of the Saint John postal district, having been appointed to that position on July 1, 1917. W. F. Griffith was appointed an inspector on the first of October, 1925.

During former absences of Mr. Woods, I have always been in charge of this district, and I would especially draw your attention to the fact that during the strike in June 1924, I was in charge for a period of 10 or 11 weeks; also during Mr. Woods' illness in the spring of 1928, I was in charge from February until May.

In view of the fact that the district superintendent notified you by letter on the 2nd inst., that he was leaving me, the senior inspector, in charge, I would respectfully ask on what grounds I have been passed over and one who is my junior in the service given charge of the district.

I may say that I deeply resent the action of the department and intend to see that my rights are recognized.

Trusting to hear from you at the earliest possible date, I remain,

Yours respectfully.

Then the assistant deputy on the 14th January wrote to Mr. Emerson as follows:

Replying to yours of January 12 I beg to say that you will receive a further reply to your letter as soon as I have taken the matter up with the Deputy Postmaster General.

In the meantime the matter was further considered by Mr. Emerson, and on the 2nd February, 1929, he wrote this formal letter which, though long, I feel I am bound in justice to the postal service, one of the most important branches of the public service in Canada, to read to the committee.

St. John, N.B. February 2, 1929.

L. J. Gaboury,
Deputy Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Referring to the absence of District Superintendent H. W. Woods, during his trip to the West Indies, and the authority contained in a letter to Mr. Woods, dated 9th January from the general superintendent of postal service, advising that during his absence the office was to be in charge of Mr. W. F. Griffith, inspector of postal service.—In connection with this ruling of the department, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that on the 2nd of January the district superintendent, H. W. Woods, notified Mr. Coolican that during his absence it was his intention to leave Inspector John Emerson in charge of the office.

On the 12th ult. I wrote a personal letter to Mr. P. T. Coolican, Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, protesting against the action of the department in passing me over and placing W. F. Griffith, my junior, in the service in charge of the Saint John postal district and I have patiently waited for an official reply to this letter, from the department, but up to the present have not received same.

In connection with this action of the department I wish to refer for your attention a letter which I received from you bearing date of the 18th July, 1924, bearing your personal signature and reading as follows:

"I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, in regard to the circumstance under which you assumed charge of the district since the absence of the district superintendent on account of illness.

I have made a note of your remarks in regard to the telegrams exchanged with the department, and, in reply I beg to reiterate the statements already made as to the procedure to be followed in selecting an officer in charge during the absence of the district superintendent from duty. When a district superintendent is absent for any reason, the senior inspector of postal service is to take charge automatically. If the senior inspector is absent for any reason, instructions as to the officer who is to assume charge of the district are to be obtained from the department, and no official is to assume charge until departmental instructions are received."

You will note from that, that according to your ruling on the date mentioned that when a district superintendent is absent for any reason the senior inspector of postal service is to take charge automatically and I, therefore claim it was my right to assume charge of the Saint John district in the absence of the district superintendent, even without being especially designated by the district superintendent that I was to do so.

As the records of the department will show I have been in the service since the first of July, 1890. I was appointed an inspector on the first of July, 1917.

W. F. Griffith, entered the Saint John postal district as a transfer helper about 1908 and his appointment as an inspector dates from the first October, 1925.

On the morning of the 10th January, previous to Mr. Woods leaving the office he gave me the following list of cases which had been given to Inspector Griffith and which will be found on their respective files not attended to.

Upham R.R. No. 1.

Letter dated December 5, 1928, re report of R. M. Clark, E. W. Hammond as to unsuitability of mail car 3427.

Memoranda of August 13 and 30 re proposed Milledgeville R.R. No. 1.

Letter dated December 5, 1928, re frequent supervision and handling of mails at the Saint John station, not replied to.

Chief superintendent railway mail service, file No. 22490, re increase of rates for conveyance of mails, June 22.

Chief superintendent railway mail service, file No. 26845—15′ apartment postal car.

Chief superintendent railway mail service memorandum June 29, classifying R.P.O's into two grades, viz: "A" and "B".

Complaint of Mr. J. M. Woodman, general superintendent C.P.R. re transferring mails at McAdam, letter to inspector, December 14.

Complaint made by Doctor Violette relative to the mail service, St. Bazil.

Re postmastership of Norton station, request of deputy dated November 22, that inspector interview applicants. Reminder sent January 4, 1929.

Re loss of parcels posted by the T. Eaton Company, at Toronto addressed for delivery in the maritime provinces. File No. 69928.

Re memoramdum of mail service branch, referring to report 79B asking for an extension of Anagance, R.R. No. 1, August 14 and August 24.

Re petition regarding proposed Hampton station R.R. No. 1 dated August 25.

Re designation head-end of full postal car.

Re memorandum mail service branch, Peel R.R. No. 1 of November 27.

The district superintendent also left me a note, showing that W. F. Griffith had not been in the office between the 6th and 22nd day of December inclusive, neither had he made any report in connection with his doings, to the district superintendent during that time.

The district superintendent went to Fredericton on the 23rd of December and did not return until the 2nd January. During this period I was in charge of the office and W. F. Griffith was in the office on the 26th December from 1 p.m. to 4.30 p.m.

December 27—all day.
December 28—from 1 p.m. to 4.30.
December 29—not in the office.
December 31—not in the office.
January 2—not in the office.
January 3—not in the office.
January 4—not in the office.
January 5—not in the office.

It will be seen from the list left by the district superintendent that inspector Griffith has not been in the habit of making prompt reports in regard to any matter that has been handed over to him for attention. As a sample I would draw your attention to the fact that on the 11th May, 1927, an application was made for the establishment of a rural route at Petitcodiac to supersede the present Dobsons Corner and Petitcodiac mail service and notwithstanding the fact that the district superintendent and the department at Ottawa made many efforts to have Inspector Griffith complete a report on the matter, the said report was not sent to the department until August 7, 1928, viz:—a period of fifteen months from the time of the receipt of the request from the department until same had been attended to by the inspector in whose hands the matter had been placed.

It will be noted in the list left with me that it refers to a letter from yourself, dated November 22nd, that Inspector Griffith interview applicants for the office of postmastership of Norton Station. This was handed over to Mr. Griffith and a reminder sent to him on January 4, 1929, but up to the present no report has been made to the department.

I would draw your attention to the fact that upon W. F. Griffith's apointment to that of inspector his duties were assigned by the department to the inspectorship in charge of the railway mail service of the Saint John postal district. These duties included inspection of all baggage car services of the province and also all water services.

This man has been in charge of the railway mail service for a period of three years and one-half and during that time he has made no reports to the department as far as I know, on—

Baggage car on trains 251, 252, 37, 38, C.N.R., between Campbellton and St. Leonard.

C.P.R. trains Nos. 373, 171, 172, 174 between Debec and Houlton, Maine.

C.P.R. trains Nos. 185, 186, between Fort Fairfield and Aroostock Junction.

Trains 47, 48, Fredericton and Centreville.

Trains 191, 192, Fredericton and Woodstock, Gibson branch.

Trains 27, 237, 28, 238, Newcastle and Fredericton, C.N.R.

Fredericton Junction and Fredericton, baggage car service, Nos. 119, 105, 111, 109, 107, 106, 108, 110, 112.

New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company, Fredericton and Grand Lake, Norton and Fredericton.

C.P.R. Pinder and Southampton, Nos. 195, 194.

C.P.R. trains Nos. 162, 164, St. Andrews and Watt Junction.

N.B.S. Saint John and St. Stephen Nos. 115, 116.

Water service, between Grand Manan Island and the mainland.

Between Chatham-Hardwicke.

Between Saint John and Black's Harbour.

This statement can be easily verified by looking up the records in the office of the chief superintendent of railway mail service, Ottawa.

I would, therefore, respectfully ask whether in view of the facts that the department has been fully advised by the district superintendent of postal service as to the lack of official attention to duty of the inspector now in charge of the office, and also that the said district superintendent has refused to recommend his increases at least on two occasions, you, as Deputy Postmaster General and active head of the post office department, consider that the record of this man, W. F. Griffith, justifies the placing of him in charge of the Saint John postal district over the head of a senior inspector, who has on numerous occasions carried on the work of the office to the best of his ability, during the illness and absences of the said district superintendent.

I believe I am within my rights in asking at least, a departmental acknowledgment of this letter, and also information on what grounds I have been passed over and a junior given charge.

I may say that I am sending a copy of this letter to P. T. Coolican, Esq., Assistant Deputy Postmaster General.

Trusting to hear from you at as early a date as possible, I am, sir,

Yours respectfully,

That was signed by John Emerson, the senior inspector at St. John.

Mr. POULIOT: He was not complaining of not being in charge of the office.

Mr. BENNETT: He was reciting the circumstances under which the former order was no longer being made effective and a junior placed in charge.

Mr. POULIOT: He was not complaining of an injustice.

Mr. BENNETT: He certainly was.

Mr. POULIOT: A supposed injustice.

Mr. BENNETT: We next find this memorandum dated February 4, 1929, and I ask that this house carefully consider this memorandum:

J. Emerson,
St. John

Assistant Deputy,
February 4, 1929
Postmaster General

That is the head of it. It goes on:

P.M.G. says O.K. He will not alter his instructions.

(Signed) Gaboury.

I wonder if the full significance of that is understood. There is a man who is admittedly an embezzler—under the statutes, a thief.

Mr. POULIOT: For fifteen dollars.

Mr. BENNETT: No, $180 in the one case and $15 in the other. The section of the statute has already been read. He converted this money to his own use, and the Post Office Act says that this is theft. The Postmaster General admits that he knew of it, and in face of that knowledge and the complaint made by the senior inspector Emerson of the treatment he received, Mr. Gaboury makes this notation:

P.M.G. says O.K. He will not alter his instructions.

I will not make any comments on that now.

Mr. POULIOT: The facts speak for themselves.

Mr. BENNETT: Res ipsa loquitur. In face of the fact that on the 4th of February the minister had put his imprimatur on Mr. Griffith's position, on the 26th day of February, twenty-two days later, Mr. Griffith writes Mr. Coolican as follows:

With further reference to my temporary appointment in charge of the district office from January 11 until February 24 during absence of the district superintendent as per your memo of January 9, I beg to inform you that the district superintendent, Mr. H. W. Woods, arrived in Saint John yesterday morning from his trip to the West Indies about 8.30 a.m. I have been unofficially informed that he was in communication with the principal clerk of the office service section, Miss Howard, but on being asked if she had any information regarding him, she stated she did not know anything about him. On making inquiry at Fredericton this a.m. I learned that the district superintendent is now at home there. Officially I have no information of any kind, and in lieu of other instructions from you I will remain in charge of the district office until the district superintendent returns to duty.

Mr. Griffith on the 1st day of March wrote to Mr. Coolican as follows:

For your information I may say that the district superintendent, Mr. H. W. Woods, returned to duty this morning, and from this date I will be performing the duties of inspector of postal service.

The last letter is from Mr. Woods when he returned to duty. On the 4th day of March, Mr. Woods, the district superinendent, who had been absent for his health, wrote to Mr. Coolican, the general superintendent, in these words:

Sir:

Once again I find it necessary to advise the department of the insubordination of Mr. W. F. Griffith, inspector of postal service, connected with the district office at Saint John.

It will be remembered that authority dated January 9 was issued by the department to place Inspector Griffith in charge of the district office during my absence on a trip to the West Indies. This authority was received on the afternoon of January 10 by Mr. John Emerson, senior inspector, who had taken charge of the office from noon that day.

I observe that it was from noon that day, although Mr. Griffith had complained that Mr. Woods had not communicated to him the instructions that he was to take charge, being in the office that afternoon, and would not accept the intimation from Mr. Emerson who sent him a copy of the notice that he was put in charge, but asked for another copy because he had not received one from Mr. Woods himself. Passing that by, the letter continues:

Mr. Emerson reached me by telephone as soon as possible after the authority was received, advising me of its contents.

Arrangements were made for the carrying out of the order and I left for Halifax that evening.

On my return to Saint John on Monday, February 25, I proceeded to Fredericton with-

out calling at the office. From there I notified Mr. Griffith that I would be on hand to take charge on the morning of March first and asking him to let me have a memo of any changes of importance that had taken place during my absence.

I reached the post office building about 8.30 a.m. Friday. Not having keys with me that would open the door of the private office, I was obliged to wait in the other rooms until Mr. Griffith arrived.

At about 8.50 he reached the office and came into the inspector's room where I was. I asked him to open the door leading from the inspector's room into the private office and he told me he had no key. I said he must have a key to the private office as he had been using it for the past six weeks and he cried out in a loud voice that I was a "liar," and in the short conversation that took place in this room, he not only called me a "liar" but a "dirty cur" and a "quibbler."

Knowing from past experience how prone he is of making protest of what he said and did not say, I invited him to step out into the staff office in order that those who were there might be witnesses to the choice language he was using, and in a most defiant and bold-faced manner he followed me out, and in the presence and hearing of a number of the staff he used language to me that is rarely heard outside of a drunken brawl.

His attention was called to the strong language he was using and in a loud voice he declared he was making it strong so that I could understand it.

There was no provocation for his outburst of temper, but he has once more proved that he is unfit for any position of trust where honesty and restraint are required.

Shortly after he became attached to the district office and for some length of time he occasionally used to bluster and show signs of insubordination, but after I found it necessary to question him one day in June, 1927, in regard to funds paid him by a postmaster which had not been accounted for, he ceased to exhibit these signs openly. His flagrant disregard of the regulations of the department has been quite generally known, with the result that it has had an influence on some of the other members of the staff.

Had this influence not been so strong, it is believed that principal clerk J. V. Shea of the inquiry section, would have hesitated to withdraw charges in the police court of Saint John in connection with the Wm. A. McIllwraith case, as per report of November 14, 1928.

I refrained from suspending Mr. Griffith at the time as I wished to do nothing in a hasty manner, and I felt that the punishment he so richly deserves would come to him sufficiently early, by leaving the case in the hands of the department.

I wish, however, to say that in so far as my personal honour is concerned it makes no difference to me what name this man calls me, and I do not ask for any apology from him, but if my opinion were asked as to what disciplinary action should be taken because of the effect of his disgraceful actions, I would hesitate between two opinions—suspension or dismissal, but one or the other should be administered.

This, as I say, was written by Mr. Woods to Mr. Coolican at Ottawa, and a copy was sent to Mr. Gaboury, the Deputy Postmaster General. A letter of March 9, 1929, now appears on the file. It is marked, "personal and confidential," and is from Mr. Coolican to Mr. Woods. It reads as follows:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your report of March 4, re insubordination of Inspector Griffith.

I will take the matter up with the Deputy Postmaster General and advise you of the decision as soon as possible.

Mr. Gaboury wrote to Mr. Woods on March 5 in these terms—

Mr. HANSON: He telephoned him first.

Mr. BENNETT: I am coming to that. This is the letter:

Confirming telephone conversation at 9.50 this morning, I beg to advise you that the Postmaster General has instructed that when you are absent from office, even temporarily, the office must be left in charge of Mr. Griffith. The Postmaster General issued these instructions during your recent absence, and they must be lived up to.

I did not want to wire you for reasons which you will readily understand, and I wish you would please acknowledge this letter as well as the telephone conversation.

I am glad to hear that you are well again and that your trip was beneficial. I am sending your account through to-day and same will be attended to in due course.

That, as I say, was written by Mr. Gaboury. It will thus be observed that on March 5, on the instructions of the Postmaster General, Mr. Woods, the district superintendent, was notified that the man who had admitted that he had violated the provisions of the Post Office Act and had converted money to his own use by retaining $180 in his own hands for several months was to be placed in charge of the district office at St. John and the postal service of New Brunswick during the temporary absence of Mr. Woods on any account. Then follows this memorandum:

Memorandum, March 5, 1929.

At 9.50 this morning the undersigned telephoned to Mr. H. W. Woods, district superintendent of postal service at St. John, N.B., that under no circumstances when he absented himself from the office, even temporarily, was the office to be left in charge of any person but Mr. Griffith. He was informed that these are the instructions of the Postmaster General and that they must be adhered to.

Mr. Woods stated he thoroughly understood the above, and the undersigned is confirming these instructions by letter, copy of which is herewith attached.

Then follows a letter from Mr. Woods, the district superintendent who, remembering that discipline is so necessary for the proper administration of the public service, wrote Mr. Gaboury:

Dear Mr. Gaboury,—

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 5th inst., confirming telephone conversation at 9.50 (eastern time) of that morning advising me that it was the wish of

the Postmster General when I am absent from the office even temporarily that the office must be left in charge of Mr. Griffith.

The conversation was a little indistinct at first, but eventually I understood it clearly, and until further advised will act accordingly.

It is noted that the Postmaster General issued these instructions during my recent absence, but I may say that they do not appear on any files of the office.

On March 9 we have written by Mr. Emerson, the senior inspector, a further letter to the Deputy Postmaster General. He now realizes that he is to be replaced by Mr. Griffith on all occasions, and he writes as follows:

Referring further to my letter of January 12 to P. T. Coolican, Esq., Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, and registered letter forwarded to you and copy forwarded to the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General on the 2nd ultimo protesting against the action of the department in placing Mr. W. F. Griffith, junior inspector of postal service in charge of the St. John postal district during the absence of the district superintendent on his trip to the West Indies when I was a senior inspector of the St. John postal district, and on all former occasions had acted in charge during sicknesses and absences of the district superintendent, I again draw your attention to the fact that I have never received a reply to either of these letters.

I strongly feel that this is not the proper treatment to accord one who has been in the service as long as I have. I, however, take it for granted that you have received letter in question and have informed the Postmaster General as to the contents of letters abovementioned.

In my communication of the 2nd ultimo I drew your attention in a very plain manner to the fact that Inspector Griffith has not been carrying on the duties of his office in a proper manner, and I have no hesitation in stating that this man has deliberately broken all rules and regulations governing the Post Office department and civil service of Canada.

During the year 1928 the said W. F. Griffith practically made no attempt to be present at his seat in the St. John office, and it is a well-known fact that he made his home his headquarters. In this connection, if his journals of proceedings for the above-mentioned period are examined, it will be seen that he claims to have spent a great deal of the time absent from the office supervising the handling of mails at the St. John railway station.

This practice of his became so common that on the 5th December last the district superintendent forwarded a letter to him asking for an explanation as to the necessity of the frequent supervision of the handling of mails at the St. John station, to which, however, it may be said there has been no reply.

It is well-known to the travelling staff of the St. John postal district that in the latter part of 1926 there was a shortage found at the Dupey's Corners post office in the electoral district of Westmorland, N.B.; also that Inspector W. F. Griffith was allotted this case. The result of his efforts are also well known, and it is my belief that the details available in June, 1927, were forwarded to the department.

I may say that if this case is reopened at any time I am in a position to give some evidence, which probably is not known to the department.

For your information I may say that the disgraceful way which W. F. Griffith treated the district superintendent, Mr. H. W. Woods, by calling him a liar, cur and quibbler, on his arrival at the St. John district office on the morning of March 1, concerning which you have no doubt been informed as Mr. H. E. Atwater was in St. John at the time, has become street talk in the city of St. John, and I may say that several citizens have expressed to me their contempt for one who would so far forget himself as to treat his superior officer as he, the said W. F. Griffith, did, especially when he knew that the district superintendent was not a well man. The general expression of opinion is that an employee who would so far forget himself is not fit to occupy any position of trust and should be dismissed from the public service.

In connection with the placing of this man over me, I would ask you to advise me as to whether it is to be understood that in future on all occasions when the district superintendent is absent that the said W. F. Griffith is to be in charge of the district office. If this is the intention, I hereby notify the department that I reserve the right to take whatever action I deem fit and proper to see that my rights as senior inspector of the St. John postal district are recognized.

I am forwarding a copy of this communication under registered cover to Mr. P. T. Coolican, Assistant Deputy Postmaster General.

In closing I may say that I very much regret the necessity for writing letters to the department, but you can readily understand that in this matter I have no other means of stating my views.

Trusting that you will advise me as to the receipt of this letter, I remain,

Yours respectfully,

On the 12th Mr. Gaboury, the Deputy Postmaster General, replied to Mr. Emerson as follows:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 9th inst., received under registered cover No. 132, in regard to Mr. Griffith being put in charge of the office during the temporary absence of Mr. Woods, the district superintendent.

I did not reply to your letter of the 2nd ultimo, but acting on the instructions of the Postmaster General, notified Mr. Woods that in future during any absence from the office Mr. Griffith was to be put in charge. I am transferring your letter to the Postmaster General for whatever action he may see fit to take. As you are aware, I could not under any circumstances take the lead in this question, as it is a matter which rests entirely with the honourable the Postmaster General. When I notified Mr. Woods by telephone, and confirmed the conversation by an official letter on the same day, I thought this would cover your letter of the 2nd ultimo. I regret not having replied to your letter, and wish to say that so far as the Deputy Postmaster General is concerned there is no other course to follow, and therefore I am handing your letter over to the Postmaster General.

Mr. POULIOT: May I interrupt the hon. gentleman? As a member of the jury, I have listened with care and attention to my hon. friend. May I ask if there is on the file a letter from Mr. Woods complaining of his treatment by Mr. Griffith?

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps I was reading rather rapidly and the hon. gentleman did not follow me. I read Mr. Woods' complaint, which was prior in point of time to the action taken. Then there is a letter from Mr. Coolican in which he encloses a copy of the letter I have read, followed by a further statement dated April 6, from District Superintendent Woods to the Deputy Postmaster General:

Referring to your telephone conversation of March 5 and letter of that date confirming the same, which gave instructions that when I was absent from the office even temporarily I was to leave in charge Mr. Griffith.

I beg to say that on the 5th instant I was absent attending the funeral of a very old friend, and during my absence Inspector Emerson was in charge, due to Inspector Griffith's absence in Montreal.

Trusting that this may meet with approval, I remain,

Then follows this letter, which I feel I must read, even though I have trespassed upon the time of the committee, but I can regard few matters as being of greater importance to the public interest than the communications I have just read. This letter is dated April 8, 1929—this present month—and is addressed to the Postmaster General himself:

Dear Mr. Minister,—

Since becoming a member of the Post Office Department—

Mr. SPENCER: Who is the writer?

Mr. BENNETT: It is written by District Superintendent Woods to the minister himself, and is dated April 8, 1929:

Dear Mr. Minister:

Since becoming a member of the Post Office Department I have avoided addressing communications directly to the ministers, believing that the proper course was to carry on correspondence pertaining to the work of the office with and through the regularly appointed officials.

On account, however, of the apparent misconception of a serious breach of discipline, reported to the general superintendent on March 4th last, which has not been investigated, I am taking the liberty of calling your personal attention to this and other matters of irregularity committed by Inspector W. F. Griffith of this office.

From the time that Mr. Griffith came directly under the supervision of the district office he has shown signs of insubordination, so much so that on occasions he used to me insulting language and while I admit that I should have reported him for this in the early days, I refrained from doing so hoping that he would eventually cease his bluster, bluff and loud talking.

May I in this regard call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the reports made by Mr. Woods with reference to Mr. Griffith. Let hon. members read them; they will now appear on the record. He gives him ratings of 90 per cent, 80 per cent, and 70 per cent, and I venture to think that no one who had not the fairest mind could give such an estimate of another in the light of the treatment he had received at that man's hands. It shows at least that he had no animus so far as the public service rendered by Mr. Griffith was concerned.

In the year 1926 the postmaster of Dupey's Corner, Westmorland county, was short in his accounts, and Mr. Griffith was sent to investigate. This investigation showed that the total shortage amounted to $845.61, and the postmaster made an offer to clear up the deficit by instalments, which the department accepted, but according to our files the only amount received from the postmaster up to June, 1927, was $150, which was placed in the Bank of Montreal, Saint John, to the credit of the Receiver General, on December first, 1926. From this on the postmaster appeared delinquent, and reminders received from the department were referred to Mr. Griffith; and on different occasions a memo was sent to the department giving some reason or other as to why more payments were not received from the postmaster.

Not being satisfied with the course the inspector had been pursuing in the case, I made a trip to Dupey's Corner on the 13th of June, 1927, and on interviewing the postmaster he gave me information that a much larger amount was paid by him than that placed to his credit, and showed me a record in his registration book of having sent to Mr. Griffith at his home address two registered letters, one of November 8th, 1926, and the other of December 2nd, 1926, containing $200 and $40 respectively. Verification that the registered letters were duly received and delivered was received at Shediac and Saint John. Postmaster also produced receipts from Mr. Griffith for the following amounts:

August 23rd, 1926..	$40 00
September 30th, 1926..	50 00

of which no record could be found at this office. These amounts, together with the $240 stated to have been sent by registered mail to the inspector, made an amount of $330 which the postmaster claimed to have paid, but as there was only the sum of $150 standing to his credit, there was a discrepancy of $180.

On interviewing Mr. Griffith in regard to this, he was asked how much money the postmaster paid him, and he replied that all he received was the amount that the file stated, but said that the last time he was in Ottawa they (meaning the financial branch) had talked with him regarding the postmaster's shortage and from the conversation that took place it would appear that there was a slight difference

in the amount due—a difference of one or two dollars. After some more conversation with the inspector he admitted that he had received the two registered letters referred to, that he had not reported the receipt of the money, and that in doing so he had violated the regulations. It was pointed out that, according to the postmaster's statement and our records, he (Griffith) had collected $180 which he had not accounted for, and he was asked where this money was. He stated that he had it at home, but this was a deliberate falsehood, as I have proof that the $180 he gave me that day was borrowed from a gentleman in this city.

In the year 1925 there was a number of abstraction cases reported that had as a common point Shediac, and Mr. Griffith was assigned the duty of investigating same, with the result that the son of the mail contractor between the post office and railway station at Shediac, was charged with the crime and acknowledged same.

The father agreed to make good the amount chargeable to his son's defalcations, and Mr. Griffith collected an amount sufficient to cover all the abstractions that had been reported which could reasonably be charged to this case. After the department had made final settlement there was an amount of $29 to be refunded to the contractor. On this amount being tendered to him he gave information that it was $15 short, and he made a statement under oath that some time in the month of October, 1925, Mr. Griffith called at his home and told him that it would be necessary for him to pay $15 more, and that this amount was handed to Mr. Griffith in the presence of his wife. This statement was verified under oath by the contractor's wife.

As this amount had not been accounted for by Mr. Griffith, he was questioned in regard to it, and while he did not deny that he received the money, he did not admit it, and up to the present this office does not know whether the $15 has been paid back to the contractor or not, but there is no doubt that the sworn statement of the contractor is correct.

The regulations require inspectors to keep the district superintendent advised as to their whereabouts, but for at least the last two years Inspector Griffith has practically ignored this duty, although his and the department's attention has been called to it frequently.

He has on many occasions failed to pay prompt attention to work assigned to him, some of which had been specially requested by the department.

The last glaring exhibition of his insubordination occurred on the first of March last—the day I returned to the office after my trip to the West Indies. On this date he called me a "liar", "dirty cur", and a "damned quibbler", and this in the presence of a number of the staff. This incivility was reported on March 4th and the only notice that has been taken of it as far as I know is an acknowledgment of its receipt from the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, with the exception of a visit the chief inspector made to this office which lasted from noon of March 25th until the afternoon of March 28th.

The chief inspector brought with him an order from the Deputy Postmaster General placing the chief inspector in charge of the office for an indefinite period, and naturally I assumed that the object of his visit was to investigate the charges I made against Inspector Griffith, but to my surprise I was told by Mr. Fortier that he was not here for that purpose, but for the purpose of getting the office to function in a correct manner. He was asked in what particular this was not being done, and he told me that I was not speaking to Mr. Griffith and was giving him orders in writing. It was explained that I had adopted the plan of giving this inspector written orders for the reason that he was rarely in the office, and the only sure way to catch him was by written memorandum, as well as being the only safe way to deal with him.

By issuing written instructions there could be no chance of his stating that the orders were never given, or that what I said to him yesterday was different from what I said to him to-day.

I perhaps have said enough to show you that I certainly have much reason to complain because of the discourteous conduct of Mr. Griffith to me personally, and surely I have made my charges against him of insubordination and dishonesty sufficiently strong to have some action taken by the department, besides that of putting an officer from the department in charge of the district office for an indefinite period.

Permit me to call your attention to Section 98 of the Post Office Act, which distinctly states that any official connected with the post office, who deals with funds as Mr. Griffith did with money that was paid to him by the Postmaster of Dupey's Corner, is guilty of an indictable offence. He can also be charged with obtaining money under false pretences, in regard to the Shediac case. This, together with his disregard of the regulations of the department and the exhibition he made of himself before a number of the staff, is certainly worthy of greater chastisement than the promotion to the charge of the district office during my absence.

While civil servants guilty of indictable offences are sometimes saved from the full penalty of the law, this is the first case I know where an officer has been permitted to hold his position, and I have reason to believe that flagrant insubordination, such as this man has been guilty of, to go unpunished, is not conducive to the betterment of the service; and knowing you as well as I do, I am convinced that with these facts before you, you will arrange to have the order, issued by the deputy on March 5th, making it necessary to place Mr. Griffith in charge during my absence, rescinded; and the order of March 22nd, placing the district office in charge of Mr. Fortier of Ottawa, recalled.

If this is done, and proper punishment administered to Mr. Griffith, I can assure you that there will be no question as to the correct functioning of the district office at Saint John.

I remain,
Your obedient servant,

H. W. Woods, District Superintendent.

A letter was written apparently on April 15, 1929, a week later by Mr. John Emerson to the

Postmaster General. This letter I shall have to read inasmuch as it is directed to the chief of the department:

Honourable P. J. Veniot,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,

Referring to the absence of District Superintendent H. W. Woods during his trip to the West Indies, and authority contained in letter to Mr. Woods dated the 9th of January from P. T. Coolican, Esq., Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, advising that during his absence the office was to be left in charge of Mr. W. F. Griffith, inspector of postal service, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that on the 12th of January I wrote a personal letter to the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, protesting against the action of the department in view of the fact that I am the senior inspector of the Saint John postal district, and as such have always been in charge of the district during the absence of the district superintendent.

Receiving no reply in connection with this protest, I wrote a letter on the 2nd of February to L. J. Gaboury, Esq., Deputy Postmaster General, quoting a letter to me over his personal signature, dated the 18th of July, 1924, in which he ruled that in the absence of the district superintendent from duty for any reason, the senior inspector of postal service is to take charge automatically. I further drew his attention to the fact that I have been in the service since July first, 1890, and was promoted to an inspectorship on July first, 1917, whereas W. F. Griffith entered the service as a transfer helper in 1908 and was appointed an inspector on October first, 1925. From this it will be seen that I was appointed an inspector more than eight years previous to the appointment of Mr. Griffith, and have been in the service eighteen years longer than he.

I wrote very fully, showing that Mr. Griffith has not been performing his duties in a proper manner, and denoting particulars in this regard. I also drew his attention to the fact that the district superintendent had refused to recommend increases of pay for him on at least two occasions, and further asked the Deputy to advise me on what grounds I was passed over and a junior given charge of the district.

Not receiving any reply to this letter, I again wrote the Deputy Postmaster General on the 9th of March, giving more data in connection with this question, and asked for a reply. I may say that I received a reply dated the 12th of March, in which he stated that acting on your instructions he had notified Mr. Woods that in future during any absence from the office Mr. Griffith was to be in charge. He further stated that my letter of the 9th of March was handed over to you, and I have been patiently waiting for a reply in connection with same.

I also take it for granted that my letter of the 2nd February to the Deputy Postmaster General has been placed in your hands.

I may advise you that I was very much surprised at your action in practically demoting me and placing a junior inspector over me in the Saint John postal district. Surely, after reading the information contained in my letters of the 2nd February and 9th of March to the deputy, the fact should be apparent to you that

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. Griffith is not a fit and proper person to be in charge of the postal service even for one day.

As you must be aware, he has been charged in reports to the department from the district office for not making a return of a sum of money in the neighborhood of $200, which he collected on post office account from the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, Westmorland county in the latter part of the year 1926, and when on June 20th, 1927, the district superintendent brought the matter to a head and demanded an accounting of the moneys collected, he was unable to produce same, which is evidence that he converted same to his own use. In this regard I would inform you that on the afternoon of the above-mentioned date Mr. Griffith borrowed $200 and the cancelled cheque can be produced at any time when an investigation is held.

According to the Post Office Act, section 98, this man was guilty of an indictable offence in this matter.

There is also one other charge which I am prepared to prove, and that is, that W. F. Griffith has been practically commercialising his position as an inspector by borrowing money and accepting gifts from some of those over whom he has had supervision, and also those who have been looking for advancement in the service. You will remember that there were two civil service commissioners relieved of their offices by the honourable Premier of Canada for an offence such as this.

For your information I may say that the present trouble in the Saint John postal district is due practically to the actions of this man, and I cannot see how, in view of the different charges that have been made against him, you, as the honourable head of the postal service in Canada, can come to any other conclusion than that he is not a fit and proper person to occupy any position of trust in the Post Office Department. In my humble opinion, the regulations in this case should be administered and this man dismissed from the service.

I would therefore respectfully ask that previous to your leaving Canada you instruct the Deputy Postmaster General to countermand the order issued at your behest to the effect that W. F. Griffith is to rank over me in the postal service.

I may say that in addition to the letters to the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General and Deputy Postmaster General, I stated my case to H. Fortier, chief inspector of the Post Office Department, when he was in St. John a few weeks ago.

Trusting that you will reply to this letter at as early a date as possible, I remain,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) John Emerson,
Inspector of Postal Service.

There is no reply to that communication upon the file, and I am not in a position to say whether or not a reply was sent. Neither am I in a position to state from the file itself whether or not Mr. Griffith is still the ranking officer in the St. John post office, but I can say that I am not relying upon rumour when I make the assertion that Mr. Griffith has openly boasted that he is practically the Postmaster General in the province of New Brunswick.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to this committee, having read the correspondence, which I have endeavoured to present as far as possible without unreasonable or unfair comment, that it indicates a condition in the public service which one would not believe possible if one did not read it with his own eyes or hear it with his own ears. It is almost incredible that a postmaster general should direct officials of his department to take the actions which have been taken in these cases in the light of the knowledge he possessed as to the conditions under which this office was administered. We do say that under the circumstances disclosed by this file, read without comment and without inferences being drawn, a situation has been disclosed which is an open disgrace to this Dominion of Canada. Worse than that, it reflects not only upon the Post Office Department but upon every department of the government. With the knowledge now possessed by the Prime Minister; in view of the position he has taken in connection with the public service on many occasions, of which the address he made over the radio the other evening is an example; with his earnest desire to maintain the integrity of the civil service, here is an opportunity for him to give concrete expression to that desire. The Postmaster General of Canada should no longer be in a position which will enable him to wreck the careers and ruin the futures of men who are his subordinates.

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): Mr. Chairman, in rising to reply to some of the remarks of the leader of the opposition I must first admit that his attitude this afternoon, although I am not complaining about it, has taken me rather by surprise. If I had known that my hon. friend intended to discuss this question in all its details I too could have reviewed the files and put myself in a position to meet his every argument.

At the outset let me point out that my hon. friend, in opening his remarks, said there were only two inspectors in the St. John district. There are four inspectors there. While that mis-statement of fact does not detract at all from the argument he attempted to advance, still it is well to keep the record clear. There are four inspectors in the St. John postal district, three at St. John and one at Moncton.

It is not my intention to discuss all the charges made by my hon. friend during the reading of these files, because an investigation into these questions has been begun and is proceeding along proper departmental lines; a thorough investigation will be made. However, I would like to point out that if District Superintendent Woods had been carrying on the work of the district office as it should be carried on, why should he give Inspector Griffith the rating he did give him, on which I, as Postmaster General, would have to base my opinion of Griffith's work? No better rating, unless he was rated perfect, could have been given to Griffith than was given by District Superintendent Woods in 1927, and that report contained not one word of complaint against Inspector Griffith as to his absence from duty, as to his refusing duty, as to his non-attendance to duty or anything of that kind. Nothing along this line was received until Inspector Emerson, Superintendent Woods and Inspector Griffith got into a row; then the whole story came out. Until that time, so far as the reports show there was nothing against Griffith. I am not now dealing with the Dupey's Corner case, which I will take up in a few moments, nor am I dealing with the Shediac case; leaving those two cases aside no one could have obtained a better rating than District Superintendent Woods gave Griffith. With that rating before me, and Mr. Woods having refused to recommend the yearly increase in salary to Inspector Griffith in spite of that rating, I believe I was quite justified in overruling that decision, acting upon the rating he had given this man. At that time I was not aware—

Mr. STEVENS: Isn't that awful?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, it is very awful to have that happen, and it is very awful that hon. gentlemen never revealed it but kept it strictly to themselves.

Mr. BENNETT: I read the rating which was given the gentleman.

Mr. VENIOT: And it was an excellent rating.

Mr. BENNETT: Except that it said he was a thief.

Mr. VENIOT: I want to say that neither Superintendent Woods, Inspector Emerson nor my friend the leader of the opposition can make the people of St. John believe that W. F. Griffith is a thief.

Mr. HANSON: Put him on trial and see.

Mr. VENIOT: That is what I am doing.

Mr. POULIOT: We listened to you; now listen to us.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. VENIOT: It was understood that this matter would not be discussed in the house while the investigation was under way. That is why I am merely bringing out one or two

important facts, because I do not wish to do anything which might prejudice the investigation which is now proceeding.

Let us first consider the Shediac affair. This took place in 1925 and I was in no way responsible for it nor connected with it as Postmaster General. I knew nothing about the affair until 1927 when this matter was brought up regarding the payment of $15 to Mr. W. F. Griffith. The parties interested had paid to Griffith other items amounting to $334, and he held receipts for same and showed them to Inspector Woods. When the claim was made that there was a shortage of $15, Mr. Griffith made the statement that if these people would say they had paid him $15 he would accept their word because they were honest people, but they could not show any receipt or any voucher for that payment. I would direct the attention of the house to this fact; the $15 paid to Griffith was not money due to the Post Office department, and the discrepancy would be as between Griffith and the person who had paid the $15.

Now we come to the matter of Dupey's Corner post office. That defalcation took place before I was Postmaster General, and the first trouble arose during the time our friends were in power for a short period in July, 1926.

Mr. MANION: May I ask the hon. minister a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friends asked questions pretty often, and I have a right to ask one of the minister. Does the name of any minister of our government appear in this affair at all?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There was no minister.

Mr. MANION: Oh yes, there was.

Mr. VENIOT: I say that it took place in July, 1926, during the time that the so-called —I do not mean that in an offensive way— shadow government was in power; that was before I took charge of the department. Reference to the records will show that any arrangements or negotiations which took place with Griffith as to his becoming personally responsible to the department or to the financial branch of the department for any part of the defalcation took place long before I had anything to do with the department at all.

Mr. HANSON: It took place in December, 1926.

Mr. VENIOT: It started long before that. He had visited this office and had made reports. He had said that this man was a poor man but expected to be able to get someone to go guarantee for him by the endorsing or signing of a joint note, and he mentions the Hon. Fred McGee. Mr. McGee's name is dragged into this case because the postmaster expected that he would have Mr. McGee endorse a note for him so that he could make good.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister realizes that the Hon. Fred McGee's name is not mentioned. I said "Mr." McGee, and also said that I did not know who he was.

Mr. VENIOT: I know who he is, because I made inquiries and found out.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not know.

Mr. VENIOT: It is the Hon. Fred McGee who is mentioned there. He had no connection with the post office at all and I desire to clear his name after it has been dragged into this case.

Mr. HANSON: There is not the slightest reflection on Mr. McGee.

Mr. POULIOT: It is not a reflection, it is just a remark.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. leader of the opposition states that Griffith is a thief, that Griffith embezzled and used for his own purposes public moneys which he had acquired and for which he had made no returns to the department until after he had held it for a certain period. If the record is correct—I believe it is as the hon. gentleman has read it—rightly or wrongly Griffith was allowed by the financial department, then in charge of Mr. Glover, to become guarantor for the full amount of the defalcations, which amounted to over $900. During a period of months he collected certain amounts and every cent of the money collected by him was paid into the Post Office Department and the department has received full credit for it.

Mr. STEVENS: Not until after he was charged with defalcation.

Mr. VENIOT: He was never charged with stealing.

Mr. STEVENS: Charged with defalcation.

Mr. VENIOT: He was never charged with defalcation.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes he was.

Mr. VENIOT: Nor did the superintendent ever report him for defalcation, and the records will bear out that statement. When Mr. Woods drew his attention to the fact that he had collected certain moneys which he

had not reimbursed to the Post Office Department, Mr. Griffith came back with the statement that Mr. Woods must have known of the arrangement made between him and Mr. Glover, that he was guarantor for the amount of money. I do not say that he was right in doing that, but he did collect certain amounts and placed them to his own credit, and when that reached a certain amount he would pay it over to the Post Office Department.

Mr. HANSON: When he was caught he had to borrow the money to pay it.

Mr. VENIOT: There is no evidence of that.

Mr. HANSON: There is evidence.

Mr. VENIOT: There is not.

Mr. HANSON: There is a letter on the file.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. VENIOT: There is no evidence on the file except a letter which states, "I can prove that he borrowed the money." I think I am right there.

Mr. ERNST: And the cheque.

Mr. HANSON: And an offer was made to produce the cheque which supplied the money.

Mr. VENIOT: I wish the hon. member would take his seat. The hon. gentleman should not get so excited as to have his pipe in his mouth and be trying to smoke during this discussion.

There is no evidence except the statement by John Emerson, the inspector, to the effect that he could prove that Griffith had to borrow the money to return it. That is the very matter we are looking into now. I want to say to the house that the investigation at St. John will be as thorough as any investigation ever held in the province of New Brunswick, and there have been a good many held in that province investigating the embezzlement of public funds.

I said I was not going to discuss the details of this matter, and it is not my intention to do so. While reading the file the hon. leader of the opposition said that he did not intend to draw any inferences, but it would have been far better, and perhaps more satisfactory to the house, had he dealt with these matters in an inferential way rather than the way in which he did deal with them. So far as I am concerned, as head of the department, with the defalcation by the postmaster at Dupey's Corner post office, let me say this to the house. My attention was first drawn to the matter, at least a year and a half after arrangements had been made for the collection of the money from Hebert, postmaster at Dupey's Corner, by the father of Hebert, who came to my home. I knew there was trouble at Dupey's Corner, but I did not know any of the details at the time he came to me and told me of the trouble into which his son had fallen and his heartburnings on account of the conduct of his son. He wanted me to give an extension of two years in which to pay up the defalcation. I refused that, but I said to the old gentleman in my own home at Bathurst—I think it was around the Christmas holidays—"An extension of four months is as much as you can get for the payment of this amount." The old gentleman went away after promising me that they would make every effort possible to arrange to pay the amount so that his son would not be punished, and that after the amount had been paid, his son would hand in his resignation as postmaster.

The matter ran along for some time and the following summer Mr. Hebert again appealed to me, this time, I think, in writing. I replied that I refused to consent to a further extension, and that is the time I wrote to the Deputy Postmaster General the letter in regard to which he says: "The Postmaster General instructs me to close this matter." Yes, I wanted to close the matter, to see that proper steps were taken to protect the department, and to get the money that we were entitled to receive on account of this defalcation. That is the meaning of that notation that was read by the leader of the opposition. My instructions were to see that as much as possible of the money was obtained; after that the matter would be closed and we would dismiss the postmaster.

Mr. McGIBBON: And it would not be referred to again.

Mr. VENIOT: I wanted it wiped out entirely. The only time it would be referred to would be when that same postmaster's name appeared as one of those dismissed from the service, and our hon. friends opposite would say that the political axe had fallen once more when a man of this kind was dismissed.

I have stated to the committee my connection with the Dupey's Corner matter. Let me now come to the matter of placing William Griffith as a junior inspector in charge of the St. John office in the absence of Mr. W. H. Woods, the district superintendent. I believed in Mr. Griffith. I knew the bad blood that had been created within the last two years in the office between Griffith, Woods

and Emerson. I knew Emerson was playing both ends against the middle, because, as a senior, he believed that Mr. Woods, who was supposed to be exceedingly ill, would soon have to retire and that by playing both ends against the middle, setting Griffith against Woods and Woods against Griffith, he would have a better opportunity of being promoted to district superintendent.

Mr. HANSON: May I ask a question?

Mr. VENIOT: I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman at all and I am not going to allow him to interrupt me. I kept perfectly quiet while all this was going on, and I do not intend to allow hon. gentlemen opposite to take up my time by asking questions.

There was also a vacancy for a postmaster in the city of St. John. Again jealousies crept in and it looked at one time, from the inside workings and special information that we were able to obtain, that this row between the two inspectors and the superintendent was spreading to the main office. We had to undertake to check this. Knowing all this; knowing the differences between these men; knowing that, according to the records of the Post Office Department, Griffith was an expert in postal administration; knowing that Mr. Emerson was playing the game that he was playing; knowing that Mr. Woods had no confidence in Griffith—owing to the row between them and not because of lack of ability, because as regards administrative ability Woods gave Griffith one of the best records that can be given to an inspector—and knowing further that there was special work to be done in the postal district, which work, owing to Mr. Woods' ill health, could not be done by him, I placed in charge the man that I considered the best fitted, from an administrative standpoint, to carry on. The record of his administration will show that there was more reorganization, more activity and more useful work done during the period of the few weeks he was in office than has been the case in regard to any other inspector during the last twelve months in the city of St. John. The men in charge of the records can show that when an investigation takes place. As I say, knowing all that, I placed Griffith in charge.

Not a soul in New Brunswick will believe that W. F. Griffith, who was born in the city of St. John of honest parents and who is well known in that city and all over the province, would take to his own use for the purpose of stealing or embezzlement one dollar that did not belong to him; and no man will dare say in public what he says in the house, when he calls Griffith a thief. If W. F. Griffith held over $180, or $150, as the case may be, I know that he conscientiously believed he was justified in doing so under the guarantee he had given to the department to make good the amount of the defalcation of this postmaster at Dupey's Corner, and only in that regard might he be considered to have acted irregularly. I take back water to nobody in my endeavours to instil honesty and discipline in the service over which I have control. Knowing that Griffith was an honest man; knowing that there were things that had to be done that I knew could not be done by Mr. Emerson; knowing that Mr. Woods could not do them on account of his bad health; and having myself suggested to Mr. Woods that owing to the condition of his health, he should take a trip to the West Indies and look after certain interests we have there in connection with the new line of steamboats that were about to carry our mails, I gave an order to install Griffith in that office, and I do not regret doing so. I felt I was doing my duty; indeed, I was convinced I was doing my duty. I was convinced that I was doing no injustice to Mr. Emerson because there is not a rule or regulation of the Post Office Department requiring that the senior officer shall always take charge. I am informed by my head officials that, not very long ago the same thing took place in Toronto and in other large offices. The senior officer, it is true, provided that no orders to the contrary are issued from the department, automatically falls into the position left by the superintendent. In the present case I was doing nothing else than following the precedent that had been established for years under all governments. I issued an order naming the inspector, whether junior or senior, who was to be in charge of that office during the absence of his superior officer, the superintendent.

I am not going to speak about the row that took place on the return from Cuba of Mr. Woods, the superintendent. I know that a row did take place, but there are always two sides to a story. My information—we have nothing definite yet until we get through what we are doing now in connection with the matter—is that there was provocation and encouragement to a volation of discipline. I do not wish to excuse this man Griffith for what he may have said or done to his superior officer, and if it is proven on investigation that Griffith did treat his superior officer in the way stated in the charges made by the superior officer, I shall know what punishment to meet out to a man who is guilty of such a breach of discipline towards his superior officer.

Mr. STEVENS: May I ask the minister—perhaps I should address this question to the Secretary of State—if he will lay on the table at eight o'clock the civil service files regarding Griffith from the time of his appointment to date. I may say that I rang up the Civil Service Commission this morning and asked if the civil service files could be produced, and they intimated that usually they were produced through the Secretary of State, which I admit is the correct procedure; but they are ready, I understand, and can be produced.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

JOLIETTE AND NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY

Mr. C. E. FERLAND (Joliette) moved the third reading of Bill No. 70, respecting Joliette and Northern Railway Company.

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

NIAGARA FALLS MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMPANY

Mr. G. H. PETTIT (Welland) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 22, to incorporate Niagara Falls Memorial Bridge Company.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Speaker, I know that the member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) desires to be present to discuss this bill.

Mr. CAHILL: Where is he?

Mr. MANION: I do not know.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman defer to the request?

Mr. GARDINER: When this bill was before the house last it was ordered to be reprinted. I do not find the reprint on my file.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

CLARENCE PERCY SHIELDS

The house in committee on Bill No. 105, for the relief of Clarence Percy Shields—Mr. Hepburn—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to on division.

On the preamble.

Mr. SPENCER: Are there any children?

Mr. HEPBURN: Not to my knowledge.

Preamble agreed to on division.

Bill reported on division.

DORA TAYLOR

The house in committee on Bill No. 134, for the relief of Dora Taylor—Mr. Hepburn—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to on division.

On the preamble.

Mr. SPENCER: Is the hon. member as fully informed on this bill as he was on the last one?

Preamble agreed to on division.

Bill reported on division.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 89, for the relief of Naomi Pauline Wilson.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 105, for the relief of Clarence Percy Shields.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 114, for the relief of Arnold Whitchurch Little.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 115, for the relief of Arthur James Taylor.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Bill No. 134, for the relief of Dora Taylor.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 136, for the relief of Helen Awrey.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 101, for the relief of Isabell Leach.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 104, for the relief of Alfred Rescorl.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 106, for the relief of Isabella Einboden.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 111, for the relief of Frederick Davenport.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 118, for the relief of Marjorie Grace Coleman.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 137, for the relief of James Lynham.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 139, for the relief of Bessie Stephen Lee.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 143, for the relief of Irene Sagar.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 144, for the relief of Clifford Wilson.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 150, for the relief of Frank Arthur LeNoury.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 152, for the relief of Thomas Booker.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 155, for the relief of Louisa Martha Weston.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 163, for the relief of Bella Solnik. —Mr. Lawson.

Motions for third readings agreed to on division.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 90, for the relief of Harry Babington Millward.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 103, for the relief of Constance Mary Kearns.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto High Park).

Bill No. 108, for the relief of Thomas Southwood.—Mr. Howard.

Bill No. 110, for the relief of Edna Louise Brown.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto High Park).

Bill No. 116, for the relief of Alla Chretter. —Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 117, for the relief of Wallace Evered Gillespie.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto High Park).

Bill No. 133, for the relief of Claude Le Cheminant.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 135, for the relief of Alice Gladys Barkey.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 160, for the relief of Irene Mabel Usher.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 161, for the relief of Anna Estelle DeNike.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 162, for the relief of Elizabeth Spain.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 164, for the relief of Louisa Hitchman.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

MYRTLE VIRGINIA MAULSON

Mr. DAVID SPENCE (Parkdale) moved the second reading of Bill No. 132, for the relief of Myrtle Virginia Maulson.

Mr. SPENCER: I would ask the hon. member if there are any children in this case, and if so, what arrangement is being made to take care of them?

Mr. SPENCE: I will not attempt to explain this case at all. While I have heard many cases in the divorce courts, I am not going to start to explain this case here. Anway, I don't think the hon. member is putting the question seriously.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

[Mr. Spencer.]

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up very much of the time of the committee, but I would like to touch upon a point or two brought up in the discussion this afternoon.

When, as Postmaster General, I first received an intimation of discrepancy or irregularity in connection with the Dupey's Corner post office transaction, I had it looked into. It was shown that there was an irregularity, so to speak, in money being collected and not being returned immediately to the department or to the financial branch of the department. I happened to be in New Brunswick, at St. John, and I called in Inspector Griffith. His explanation to me was somewhat along the lines of that which he gave in a letter to the head of the financial branch of the Post Office Department at Ottawa. Knowing Mr. Griffith as I did and knowing his reputation, I could not for a moment believe that there was dishonesty in the transaction and I let the matter go at that in the meantime.

Later on difficulties developed in the St. John postal district between the superintendent and the inspector, and, I might say, the inspectors, at least two out of the four, and the matter came to a climax on the return of District Superintendent Woods from his trip to the West Indies. At that time there was no charge, but having received the information simply that there had been trouble between Inspector Griffith, acting district superintendent, and the regular superintendent on the latter's return from his West Indies trip, I obtained details. It was immediately decided that two men would be sent from the office at Ottawa to the office at St. John; that as Mr. Griffith and Mr. Woods were implicated in this quarrel, they would be set aside for a short period, and that these two men should take charge, one of the operating end and the other of the financial end, in order to see what could be done to restore discipline and a better system than had been in vogue for some years in the inspectoral part of the office as well as in the main post office itself. These men remained there, I think, the better part of three days. I happened to arrive in St. John I believe the day after they arrived.

Mr. STEVENS: What date was that?

Mr. VENIOT: Around Easter.

Mr. STEVENS: This year?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes. I was home for the Easter holidays.

Mr. STEVENS: That is close enough.

Mr. VENIOT: I met both those officials at the hotel. They reported to me that they had gone into the matter; that they had brought Inspector Griffith and District Superintendent Woods together, and that they discovered that there was a great lack of discipline and of proper system in the work of the inspectoral district as well as of the post office itself. The postmaster was a new one; he had been for years an assistant, and on the retirement on superannuation of the former postmaster, he became postmaster. The system that was in vogue in the main office was due not to the gentleman who was postmaster at that moment, but rather to a sort of routine way of carrying on that had been in vogue for years. I discussed the matter with the two officials, Mr. Fortier and Mr. Underwood. Their report was made to me verbally. They said that they had established a system that would bring about the necessary improvements in the district superintendent's office as well as in the post office itself, and they wished to see it in operation before they continued their investigation any further. They referred to the question of lack of discipline on the part of Inspector Griffith, stating that they wanted to find out exactly what caused this and what, if necessary, should be done to remedy matters. At the same meeting they informed me that it would take them about another day to complete their work; that they would go back to Ottawa, and that at a future date they would return to St. John to investigate the whole workings of the district office as well as of the post office.

At that meeting they were instructed verbally by me that in view of this quarrel, if I may use the term, between the district superintendent and Inspector Griffith, a thorough investigation should be held not only into the method of carrying on and the lack of discipline, but also into the matter of the amount of money collected from the Dupey's Corner post office, going back to 1927. I never mentioned the Leger matter of $15 because, to my mind, it was so trivial. If it had been paid, it was not really money belonging to the department and I had on file in the department Griffith's word that he had no recollection of ever receiving the money, but that if they could show a voucher, which, of course, they could not show, he would hold himself responsible; that knowing these people to be honest, if they said he had received the $15 from them he would have to take their word for it. I did not think it necessary that I should issue instructions to go into a thorough investigation of that matter of $15; but my instructions were that when these men returned to St. John they were to go thoroughly into the matter of the Dupey's Corner defalcation and that was the intention of those men when they returned to St. John. After their return to Ottawa and after making their report to the Deputy Postmaster General as it appears on the file, they went further into the Dupey's Corner matter. There was a dispute about an item of $50 which appeared to be short of the amount supposed to have been received by Griffith from the Dupey's Corner postmaster's father. That matter was cleared up on investigation here. It was distinctly shown that the $50 was duly paid and that the trouble was due rather to a mistake on the part of Hebert than to any fault or discrepancy on the part of Inspector Griffith. The intention is that these officials shall continue this investigation to the end. It is my intention to investigate not only these two matters, but every part of the operation of the office at St. John.

I do not desire to reflect upon the administration of any of the officials in my department, but I wish to say now that in the Dominion of Canada there are three offices which require thorough investigation, on the question not of honesty or efficiency, but of the lack or otherwise of a systematic method of carrying on. According to the reports that have been made to me by the head officials at Ottawa within the last year, or possibly a little longer, those three offices are not measuring up to the proper standard. I am firmly of the opinion that a thorough investigation will disclose that the want of proper administration is the reason for these offices costing more to administer than they should. I am going to name the offices to which I refer, so that the people will be prepared for this investigation and will know that at least I am doing all that is within my power to see that these offices are properly manned and

properly administered. One is St. John, another is Halifax, and the third is the city of Quebec. These investigations must be held because I have to get better results than I am getting to-day from St. John, Halifax and Quebec. I have named three; there may be others, but I have determined that these three offices must undergo a thorough investigation by the experts in the department here at Ottawa with a view to getting matters straightened out so that better results may be obtained. That is all I wish to say at the present time touching the investigation. I want to assure the committee that I am sincere in carrying on these investigations. They will not be carried on by myself personally. I do not intend myself to sit on such a board of inquiry, because, in the first place, it would not be my duty as Postmaster General to do so, and in the second place I would not know enough of the working details of offices such as St. John, Halifax or Quebec to bring out all that should be brought out in such an investigation. These investigations will be held by men of experience, experts in their respective branches in the head office at Ottawa, and the results will be made known to parliament when it meets again or perhaps to the public before parliament meets.

Just one other point and I am through. I have been "pulled over the coals," if I may use that expression, somewhat severely because I promoted, as it were, a junior over the head of a senior inspector to act as acting district superintendent in the absence of the district superintendent on his voyage to the West Indies. Before six o'clock I gave my reasons for taking that action. I pointed out then that it was nothing new for juniors at times to be placed in important positions of that kind over the heads of seniors, and I gave instances of it. It may be said: While that may be correct, you placed over the head of a senior a man who, according to the leader of the opposition, was a thief. I think he used that word; if not, I stand corrected.

Mr. BENNETT: I said that section 98 of the Post Office Act declares than one who takes money as Griffith admits he did is guilty of theft,. and he, I say, is a self-confessed thief on that record. Let there be no misunderstanding.

Mr. VENIOT: I contend, of course, that he did not take this money and did not keep it.

Mr. BENNETT: He says he did.

Mr. VENIOT: They did not lose one single cent.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. BENNETT: No, because he paid it back.

Mr. VENIOT: Where the whole mistake was made so far as Griffith is concerned was in the person at the head of the financial branch of the department in any degree encouraging Griffith to become the guarantor of the amount of the defalcation. That is where the fault came in. So far as I personally am concerned I was not mixed up in it. I am not one at any time to attempt to shirk responsibility for my actions. I have always taken responsibility for my actions, and I am always prepared to do so, but I want to say now that if there was any fault in the administration of the head office it was in encouraging Griffith at any time to become a guarantor to the Post Office department of the amount of the defalcation, which he undertook to collect and reimburse to the government so that the country would lose nothing. That is where the weakness was. Griffith himself states in his letter that he did what he thought was right in trying to collect as much money as he could to hand in to the department. There were irregularities, I must admit, on his part in becoming guarantor for this amount of money.

But leaving that aside, I have been censured, I say, for the passing of a junior over the head of a senior in the administration of an important branch of the postal service, not as a permanent appointment, but as a temporary one. Now, if it is wrong for me to do that—leaving out altogether for the moment the question of money and any irregularities—if I am to be condemned for passing this junior over the head of a senior, what must be said of the appointment of Mr. Woods to district superintendent over the heads of two inspectors who were eight and nine years senior in that office? Mr. Woods was appointed in 1917, and at that date, Mr. Alex. Thomson, later on postmaster of the city of St. John, and retired a year ago under the Superannuation Act, was nine years assistant inspector to Doctor Coulter. Doctor Coulter was retired in 1917, and Mr. Woods was taken on. I am not finding any fault with Mr. Woods. I say he would have been foolish had he not accepted that position when it was offered to him. I mention it simply to show that what is criminal for me is a virtue for my hon. friends on the other side. Mr. Woods was taken clear from the political field, without one minute's post office experience, an honest man, if you like, and with ability perhaps—no doubt he had ability

in the lumber business which he was carrying on, a man perhaps of ability in the sphere of life in which he was brought up. I do not question that at all, but he had absolutely no post office experience, and he was placed in there over the head of men who were his seniors and who had been inspectors for nine and ten years. Is it any wonder then, with the chief of the postal district of the province of New Brunswick without one minute's experience in and without any knowledge of the postal service, without ever having entered for a moment a post office of the class we have in the city of St. John—is it any wonder that there arose a lack of discipline and a lack of system in the administration of the office at St. John? That is what we are up against to-day in the post office in St. John, and that is one of the matters which along with others I intend to have investigated.

As I said when I rose, I do not want to take up much more of the time of the committee, but I did want to place these facts on record.

Mr. BENNETT: I want to ask the minister a single question. Has Mr. Griffith been suspended?

Mr. VENIOT: No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT: Then he is still acting in that office?

Mr. VENIOT: He is still inspector.

Mr. BENNETT: Here is the section of the Post Office Act to which I referred. Section 98 reads:

> Every officer of or connected with the post office who converts to his own use in any way whatsoever, or uses by way of investment in any kind of property or merchandise, or lends, with or without interest, any portion of the public moneys entrusted to him for safe keeping, transfer, disbursement, or for any other purpose, shall be deemed to have stolen so much of the said moneys as is so taken, converted, invested, used or lent, and is guilty of an indictable offence.
>
> 2. Every person who advises or knowingly and willingly participates in such theft is guilty of an indictable offence, and shall, for every such offence, forfeit and pay to His Majesty a fine equal to the amount of the money stolen, and shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding seven years and not less than three months.
>
> 3. The neglect or refusal by any such officer to pay over any public moneys in his hands, or to transfer or disburse any such moneys promptly, on the requirement of the Postmaster General, shall be prima facie evidence of such conversion to his own use of so much of the public moneys as is in the hands of such officer.

And here we have read into the records this day letters from Griffith stating he could not collect the money. But he had used it himself, and when he was called upon to pay it he had to borrow from a man who gave him a cheque for $200, and that man offers to produce the cancelled cheque.

Mr. VENIOT: That is why an investigation should be held. What the hon. gentleman now advances is no evidence of the borrowing of the money.

Mr. BENNETT: It is evidence that from June to November he had that money converted to his own use, and in the meantime sent letters to the office at Ottawa and to other places that he could not collect from the Heberts.

Mr. VENIOT: And the department is holding him responsible under that arrangement for the full amount of Leger's defalcation.

Mr. BENNETT: He was asked to pay and could not. That is the answer, Mr. Chairman. It is incredible that any attorney general or minister of justice of Canada would permit a colleague to make a statement like that. There are men to-day doing time in the penitentiaries of this country who were connected with the post office, and they are there for just the very offence that Mr. Griffiths admits he committed, men without any responsibility, young fellows who took the money and then said, "Oh, well, we will pay when the time comes." And when the time came they could not borrow the money and were found guilty of appropriating the funds of the post office. Yet we have a minister of the crown, not somebody on the hustings, not a politician, but a responsible minister of the crown telling the people of Canada that it was the proper thing for the man to steal this money under this section, and he justifies the man's action by saying he guaranteed to repay it.

Mr. VENIOT: I wish to correct the hon. gentleman. I never used the words that he has just put into my mouth. I said I was not satisfied, and I am not satisfied to-night, that Mr. Griffith is guilty of this offence; and the investigation was begun before this matter was brought up in this house.

Mr. BENNETT: Griffith says he took the money.

Mr. VENIOT: Not in the sense the hon. gentleman wishes to impress upon this house and upon the country. The hon. gentleman is qualifying the statement of Griffith in that letter. If he joined the letter that

Griffith wrote to the Finance department with the admission of Griffith, then the public would fully understand that Griffith was not guilty of what my hon. friend now says he is.

Mr. BENNETT: I read both letters.

Mr. VENIOT: But you read them far apart.

Mr. BENNETT: I read them one right after the other, in the sequences in which they were taken from the files. I am in the judgment of this house and of the country in declaring that no postmaster general can stand up and say that because a responsible official who received money, mark you, from a defaulting postmaster, put it in his pocket and lied about it for six months, and then, because his superior went down to the Dupey's Corners post office and found out the situation, came through with the money by borrowing it from someone else—I say no postmaster can justify such conduct. And yet behind Griffith to-night stands this minister of the crown. Let the people of Canada know that behind him stands the government of the country.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman is hardly fair.

An hon. MEMBER: Very fair.

Mr. VENIOT: I am forced to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman does not wish to be fair.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot but express that opinion.

Mr. BENNETT: I never quarrel with your opinion after what I hear.

Mr. VENIOT: Nor will I quarrel with yours, because your opinion changes so often that it is hardly worth while quarrelling with.

Mr. BENNETT: All right.

Mr. VENIOT: I am not behind Griffith an the ground of appropriating to himself funds, or stealing, as my hon. friend would interpret the law to be, but because the very moment my attention was drawn to what might appear to be something as laid down by the hon. gentleman I ordered an investigation, and not as a result of anything that has taken place in this house this session.

Mr. DUNNING: Long before.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. VENIOT: I started to look into the matter and finally came to the conclusion that I would investigate thoroughly the disciplinary system they have there, as well as this matter of supposed retention of funds.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And you promoted him in the meantime.

Mr. VENIOT: Under the British law he is innocent until he is proven guilty.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And subject to promotion.

Mr. POULIOT: As we are all gentlemen of the jury in this case, I desire to give my impressions of it. The hon. leader of the opposition stated that he was acting, as crown attorney at the preliminary inquiry, where the doubt is against the accused; at the trial the doubt is in his favour. That is a great difference. I believe the hon. leader of the opposition read too much and thought too little. I have followed this debate very closely. We must remember who are the actors in this melodrama. First of all, there is Mr. Woods. Mr. Woods is a saint, because he was appointed from the Tory ranks to his position in the civil service. He was a lumberman who had had no experience in postal work. He asked for a little holiday to visit, not the southern states, but the enchanted island of Cuba. Someone had to act for him during his absence. There were four assistants, two of whom have been mentioned in this discussion, Mr. Emerson and Mr. Griffith. Mr. Emerson had been the senior to Mr. Griffith in the office, just as another gentleman had been senior to Mr. Woods when he was appointed by the Tory party in 1917. A bad example was set by the Tory party in the first instance, and the trouble of the Liberal party is that they followed that bad example. In other words, what was right when our friends were on this side of the house is wrong when we are here. But anyhow, what happened even before that? There was a postmaster named Leger at Shediac. He seems to have been an honest citizen; but he had a crooked son who was a thief, and several times that crooked son stole money from the drawer in the Shediac post office. Then what happened? Griffith—that bad Griffith—went there as a good Samaritan and said: I will try to help you; I will be your guarantor, I will take full responsibility for the whole thing towards the department.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

Mr. POULIOT: Yet, this is the fact according to what my hon. friend read from the file. Griffith said to Leger senior: If you are

not able to pay right away what your son owes to the post office, well, I will pay it myself. And so they became joint debtors to the department. Leger senior, the father, and Griffith, the inspector, became responsible to the department for the debt of the son, and if Leger had not paid a cent to Griffith, Griffith would have had to pay the whole amount. Whether it is right or wrong according to the formality usually followed in the department, I cannot say, but I think that morally no one can object to it, and it shows a good spirit on the part of Mr. Griffith towards Mr. Leger. At that time Mr. Leger was still holding this post office as postmaster. Afterwards, what happened. Perhaps the son stole some more; I do not know. But for some reason or other Leger had to quit the office, and then the trouble started. And what evidence have we? There is no receipt on the files showing that Griffith had received a certain amount of money from Leger. There is no receipt for the amount which my hon. friend said this afternoon had been embezzled. There is no proof of that. The only proof, so-called, which would not be admitted in a court, is a simple affirmation on the part of a man who is not under oath, and who, because he is not under oath, may lie. And nothing shows us that he is not a liar. That affirmation is to the effect that he gave a certain amount of money at several intervals to Griffith. But is there a sworn statement to that effect? There is none. Does Griffith admit that he had received money from that man?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. POULIOT: No; he says, "It might be, but I don't remember it". It shows his honesty.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friends laugh, but if they had the right idea of what honesty is in politics they would not laugh. They have the wrong idea. What about the carloads of mail bag padlocks which were bought by the Hon. Mr. Pelletier when he was Postmaster General? It was before my hon. friend from Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Ernst) entered politics. There were so many padlocks, I am told, that there are still several carloads of them in the department. They are all rusted; they are of no use. I will not dwell to any greater extent on a matter of that kind. I simply want to show that there is no evidence to the effect that Griffith had embezzled a cent of the money handed in by Leger. And not only that; he was generous enough to assume himself the full responsibility for the debt in order to help that man. Can we blame him for that? I believe that there are very few people who would not have done the same thing under similar circumstances, and no one will really blame the man for having done what he did. It seems to me that the matter has been satisfactorily explained by the Postmaster General and I am sure the mind of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is entirely satisfied in that respect.

May I tell you, Mr. Chairman, what I would say in regard to that post office affair if I were a Tory member in this house? First of all I should have a great respect for my leader and would try to be an example to my colleagues; I should say that what my leader said was all right and that I believed in him. And the other day, sitting in this house, I heard the leader of the opposition say that in itself there was nothing wrong about a dismissal for political partisanship. He was generous enough and broadminded enough to make that admission, and as it was not wrong he admitted that he had done so himself when his party was in power. He did it four or five times. Now we have two hundred and forty-five counties in Canada, and if every member requested four or five dismissals in his own county for reasons of political partisanship we should have over twelve hundred dismissals. Dismissals were made on a large scale when the Hon. Mr. Pelletier was in office in 1911, because inside of six months, I believe, there were at least twelve or fifteen hundred dismissals. Apparently and according to the statement of the hon. leader of the opposition there was nothing wrong about that, and my hon. friends opposite would say that these dismissals took place in the natural course of events. As a matter of fact, even persons who were dead were dismissed; this happened in several cases. As an hon. member remarks, there were post mortem dismissals. This year, on the other hand, the Postmaster General has been very severely criticized for having dismissed since he has been acting as such about one hundred and fifty persons for reasons of political partisanship, although that does not represent one dismissal per county. Surely, in the light of the figures which the files disclose for previous years, especially 1911-1912, this is a very reasonable record. But this is what I would say if I were a Tory member: I would say that the present Postmaster General, in this respect only, is not effective enough; if he were a good. a strong Postmaster General, such as the Hon. Mr. Pelletier was, he would at least dismiss the Tories who have replaced Liberals in that time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have just a word to say in regard to Mr. Woods. I should like to have some more information regarding him; I should like to know whether he is an angel.

An hon. MEMBER: Just like Taschereau.

Mr. POULIOT: Well Taschereau is a name I heard on a broken record in the cabinet of the gramaphone of Mackenzie and Mann. I repeat, I should like to hear something more about Mr. Woods if the Postmaster General can tell us.

Mr. BENNETT: I regret that I cannot look upon this matter in the frivolous light in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pouliot) sees it. It may well be that, to some, this is an occasion for levity; to me it is not. I did not for two hours this afternoon read correspondence, without making any comments to speak of, merely for enjoyment. I did it out of a sense of the duty that devolves upon me in the position I occupy at the moment, and I believe it is the duty of this House of Commons to examine into the administration of this department.

The Postmaster General, I sometimes think, has a faulty memory because his statements are so entirely beside the facts. I find it so difficult to understand how any hon. gentleman who is at all jealous of his reputation for the statements he makes could have made such statements as we have heard from the Postmaster General to-night. For example, here is the fact as reported. Mr. Griffith received money as follows: August 23, $40; September 30, $50; November 8, $200; December 2, $40, or a total of $330. And he paid $150 of that into the department. Thus it will be noted that having received, on November 8, $200, he took $150 out of the $330 and put it to the Postmaster General's credit on December 1, and on the 20th day of June of the next year he paid $180 to the government of Canada. Surely the members of this house realize what that means. The letter of Mr. Woods reads:

> Mr. Griffith has just called upon me and has delivered to me, on account of the shortage of the postmaster at Dupey's Corner, $180, and the same will be deposited in the Bank of Montreal, Saint John, this date.

The receipt follows. How would it be possible for the minister to make the statements he has made to-night in face of these facts, bearing in mind that when the question of Griffith's annual increase came up on August 27, 1927, only two months later, Mr. Coolican puts this note down for the guidance of the inspection service:

> The Postmaster General instructs that Mr. Griffith's annual increase be proceeded with, notwithstanding the report by District Superintendent Woods.
>
> The Postmaster General advises that he knows all the details of the case—hence, the above instructions.

Mr. VENIOT: That was in 1927?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: What case was that?

Mr. BENNETT: The case from which I have just read is the case referred to by District Superintendent Woods when he declined to make the recommendation for Griffith's annual increase because of the Dupey's Corner and Shediac cases. On June 20, 1927, Griffith admitted that he had the money, and he paid it over. There is upon record, unverified it is true, the statement of a gentleman who says he will produce the cancelled cheque whenever it is required. I appeal to the members of this committee: Have you ever heard of a man who, being guilty of such an offence, has not been suspended? To-day that man is down there fraternizing with the officers of the department, and the public service is expected to be carried on while he is the chief rating officer under the directions of the Postmaster General. Is it any wonder that some of us regard a matter of this kind as serious and decline to treat it with levity as it is treated by the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot)?

It has been pointed out by the Toronto Globe, by the Regina Leader, by the Winnipeg Free Press and by the Moncton Transcript, certainly not supporters of the opposition, that we have a Civil Service Act. Here is the Civil Service Act; here we have this responsible official, the rating officer in the St. John district office, and we have the undeniable fact that on June 20, 1927, he paid $180 to the government of this country which he had converted to his own use for over six months. If he had been a poor, unfortunate letter carrier he would have been sent to the penitentiary, and at that he paid over the money only when his superior officer caught him, as the hon. member for Fort William points out. I do not think for one moment that the Prime Minister can look with approval upon this sort of thing, and I do suggest in good part that this man should be suspended. I ask hon. members of this committee if they could expect any sort of public service to be maintained when knowledge of these conditions has gone all over the city of St. John? When I heard the

rumours I could not believe them to be true, but apparently the Postmaster General expects the public service to be carried on in St. John with that man, admittedly an embezzler of $180 for six months, in charge. Is it any wonder that we take a rather serious view of this situation?

The reason I endeavoured, difficult though it was, to dissociate myself from inferences and attacks directed against the Postmaster General in reading these documents this afternoon was because I hoped the house might, if I left the matter free from embittered comments or endeavours to draw inferences, be able to realize the seriousness of this matter. There is not one of us who is not affected, and there is not one of us who does not realize the difficulties and temptations in the paths of poor, underpaid officials in different sections of the country. The Postmaster General said the other day that in some instances he had extended clemency, but here he rewards embezzlement with promotion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no question of saying "hear, hear"; it is not a question of applause but a matter which strikes at the very vitals of the life of this country. Are we to continue in this way or are we not? I think I can say with a clear conscience that I have endeavoured to do my duty by bringing this matter to the attention of this committee, but the Postmaster General brazenly says, "He is not suspended; he is down there bossing the job; I always stand up and take the responsibility." There is the record, and it shows the admitted embezzlement of this amount of money for six months.

What does the Minister of Justice say? Is it his opinion that a minister of the crown should stand up and attempt to justify himself in this way? I put it to the Minister of Justice: Here we have an official who admits that he received $330 over a period of time extending, as he says, from August to December in 1926. He paid over $150 of that total in December, 1926, and retained the balance until his superior officer found out about it, when he rushed in and paid the belance of $180 with, it is alleged, money he had borrowed. Is it just that that man should be permitted to lord it over those who were once his senior officers? Should he be permitted to insult them, to call them liars and scoundrels and all that sort of thing and then have the chief officer of his department, a member of His Majesty's Privy Council, the head of the great Post Office Department of Canada, stand in his place in this house and justify conduct of that kind? I leave that with the Minister of Justice, confident that when he realizes the seriousness of the situation and when he applies the principles of law to the given facts he cannot possibly and would not, as Minister of Justice of Canada, endeavour to justify that conduct.

It is for that reason that we have endeavoured to place this matter fairly before this committee. The Postmaster General says he has not suspended the man; in other words he is defying parliament. Public opinion in Canada is defied; the opinion of this house is defied by the Postmaster General who says, within a month or two after the $180 was paid, that he was thoroughly familiar with all the circumstances, and who instructed that the salary of this man be increased contrary to the report of the district superintendent. We have not the civil service report to which the minister referred this afternoon with respect to this man's rating, so I make no observation with respect to it.

Mr. VENIOT: I referred only to the rating given Griffith by his own district superintendent.

Mr. BENNETT: This afternoon I read that rating from the record, and it will be observed that that rating was not quite so high as the minister would have us believe. The record of Griffith with regard to punctuality, attendance, his attitude towards his subordinates and so on was rated sometimes at 70 per cent and sometimes at 80 per cent, while with respect to his capacity, ability and so on he was rated at 90 per cent. I do submit that this is not a case in which we should be content to merely make the statement; I believe this is a case which calls for action.

Let me put this to the members of the committee: Is there any one of us with a business of his own who would hesitate, having that set of facts before him, in suspending such an employee? Would any bank or any other branch of the public service hesitate for a moment? I can easily recall reasons which have resulted in men being dismissed from much less important positions than this; I can think of cases which I have observed personally of young men, sometimes pleading guilty, being sent to penitentiaries and penal institutions for just such offences as embezzlement. We must remember that, as the statute says, embezzlement consists of the conversion to your own use of money which you have received in your public capacity. Mr. Griffith received that money as the investigating inspector, and having received it as such he declined to pay it over on the excuse, mind you,

that he personally guaranteed it. But he failed to keep his guarantee. Hon. gentlemen must remember the letters I read this afternoon; letter after letter was sent to him during this six months asking for the money. He replied once that the man was sick, once that something else had happened, and the record now shows that the excuses given were untrue, because we have his proceedings register, his record, showing all these details. Still to-day that man is in charge of that office, superior to everyone except the district superintendent, and if the superintendent goes away for a day this man is in complete control of the business of that office. He has to deal with the rural postmaster who is short in his funds; he has to deal with problems of setting in motion the law having to do with those guilty of theft; he has to do all that. The member for Temiscouata thinks it is a joke, but I cannot see it from that point of view. If I could look thus lightly upon what I see to be the responsibility of this house I would be much happier, but I confess that when I read that record I was amazed and astounded; I confess at this moment that I am both amazed and astounded and my amazement is the greater when I find the minister still leaves that man unsuspended in that office and justifies in this house the conduct to which I have alluded. This action would have been unbelievable had it happened in any country other than this. I do submit that some action should be taken by the administration before supply is further granted to enable the minister—to do what? He says, "I am going to conduct an investigation," but there is such a thing as prima facie evidence. The minister knows that the man brought in the $180 six months after he had obtained it. Is there any hon. gentleman in the house who would keep on one of his employees under circumstances of that kind? I think not.

Mr. POULIOT: I did not laugh at what my hon. friend said, but I was smiling at seeing so many of his supporters sleeping while he spoke.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. VENIOT: To enlighten the house further I would draw their attention to the report and ratings given by District Superintendent Woods to Inspector Griffith. In 1927 he examined him and give him good ratings all down the line.

Mr. BENNETT: It would be easy to read it.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. VENIOT: The inspector gives the following ratings in his report:

Quantity of work	90
Quality of work, carefulness and steadiness	80
Industry and willingness	80
Intelligence, resourcefulness and initiative	90
Ability to carry on work without supervision	90
Ability to carry out instructions	90
Knowledge of work of office or branch.	90
Tact in meeting public or in dealing with other employees	80
Willingness to cooperate	80
Fairness towards assistants or conduct in relations with superiors	70
Physical fitness and regularity in attendance	90
Punctuality	80
Ability to plan and supervise work and to instruct and direct others	90
Judgment. Ability to accept and carry responsibility	80
If in charge of staff, indicate with what success	90

Mr. BENNETT: Read the rest of it.

Mr. VENIOT: It is pretty hard to understand, after seeing a rating of that kind, why the following should appear in the report:

Service rendered by Mr. Griffith has been fairly satisfactory.

Mr. BENNETT: You might read question No. 25.

Mr. VENIOT: Then the superintendent goes on to give his reasons for being unable to recommend an increase in salary, as follows:

—regarding shortage in the accounts of the P.M. Dupey's Corner; also report of the 13th July/27 dealing with the claim of Mr. Edward T. Leger—

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman might read the rest of it.

Mr. VENIOT: I was going to point out that in 1927 he was not dealing with the Dupey's Corner matter, but merely with the Leger matter.

Mr. BENNETT: The report says:

—also report of the 13th July/27.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BENNETT: Surely the minister is not to be permitted to read incorrectly.

Mr. VENIOT: The report reads:

—also report of the 13th July/27 dealing with the claim of Mr. Edward T. Leger of Shediac that he had paid the inspector money which was not placed to his credit,—

That is the $15 matter. The report continues:

—the district superintendent cannot recommend Mr. Griffith for increased salary.

That is in 1927, but in 1928 they combine the Leger and Dupey's Corner matter. In 1927, on account of the $15 discrepancy in the Leger case—the other case was not then being considered against Mr. Griffith—he gives him a good rating with the exception of one item. There is certainly a discrepancy of some considerable degree between the rating given the inspector and the final conclusion arrived at by the superintendent.

Mr. BENNETT: I cannot understand the hon. minister. I hold in my hand a copy of the document, certified to as having been compared, and I find that the minister left out the reference to the Dupey's Corner matter. Let me read it.

Mr. VENIOT: I did no such thing; I read the whole of it.

Mr. BENNETT: I have the floor at the moment. This report is headed:

District Superintendent of Postal Service
O. S. S.
Aug. 11, 1927
Saint John, N.B.
Annual Efficiency Report

Question No. 26 and the answer thereto read as follows:

26. In case the employee is not at his maximum, do you recommend him for increase in salary? No. If not, state why: In view of the irregularities of Inspector Griffith as per report from this office of June 20th/27, regarding shortage in the accounts of the P.M. Dupey's Corner; also report of the 13th July/27 dealing with the claim of Mr. Edward T. Leger, Shediac, that he had paid the inspector money which was not placed to his credit, the district superintendent cannot recommend Mr. Griffith for increased salary.

I am going to read the other one.

Mr. VENIOT: I read both of them.

Mr. BENNETT: Question 25 and the answer thereto read:

25. Has employee rendered meritorious service and increased in usefulness in the service? Inspector Griffith has shown a disposition to disregard instructions and in the opinion of the district superintendent has not rendered meritorious service.

Question 26 follows:

26. In case the employee is not at his maximum, do you recommend him for increase in salary? If not, state why: In view of the irregularities as per reports from this office of June 20th and July 13th, 1927,—

That is the one about the Dupey's Corner matter which was read. The answer continues:

—and for the reason expressed above at item 25 the district superintendent cannot recommend Mr. Griffith for an increase of salary.

The minister omitted the Leger matter and referred only to the Dupey's Corner matter, which is the exact opposite to what the minister has said.

Mr. VENIOT: I read both of them.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have only a few words to say about this matter. I would not have spoken at all had I not heard what my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said this afternoon.

It seems to me that there is one element in this case which the hon. leader of the opposition has more or less left out of account, and which I think has considerable bearing on the matter—criminal intention. I have heard the leader of the opposition say that this man is an admitted embezzler, that he is guilty of theft under the section which he has read, but I must say that as a professional man I would think there might be considerable difficulty in convicting Griffith. One of the elements to be considered in proving the crime of embezzlement is that of criminal intention.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the hon. gentleman has not read the section.

Mr. ILSLEY: I know there are a great many cases under sections like that, but I am not familiar with the cases on this particular section.

Mr. BENNETT: This is under the Post Office Act, not the criminal code.

Mr. ILSLEY: There are a great many cases under sections just like that. It has been held very often by the courts of the country that the element of criminal intent must be established even though we have sections of that sort. I submit that is the case in reference to this. My hon. friend says that there are many instances of young men who have been sent to penitentiary for embezzlement, for theft, under circumstances precisely similar to this; but if any of those men had been able to establish that, owing to the fact that they had given a personal guarantee for the amount that was due to the department, they considered the matter as being one between themselves and the department and that they were entitled to collect the money and remit later, they would not have been convicted. That throws a very different light upon the whole situation. Mr. Griffith might very well have believed that he had the right to defer those remittances in view of the fact that he had given to His Majesty the King a guarantee that the money would be remitted.

Mr. BENNETT: He had not done that.

Mr. ILSLEY: No question has been raised in the debate so far as to Mr. Griffith's financial ability to meet the demands that might and would eventually be made upon him by His Majesty the King, and under those circumstances the situation is quite different.

Mr. STEVENS: Would my hon. friend permit me a question? Apropos of his argument, is he aware that in the file which has been read from to-day very freely, there is statement after statement, including letters written by Mr. Griffith between the period when the money was collected in November and when he remitted it in June, in which he declares that he has been trying to collect it; that the postmaster on one occasion was ill and could not pay it; although Mr. Griffith already had the money in his possession for a month or two before he made those statements? Does that not alter the question of the trusteeship which is my hon. friend's argument?

Mr. ILSLEY: Only partly.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ILSLEY: I am not familiar with the file. If my hon. friends will permit me, I am attempting just as sincerely as they are to get to the bottom of this affair, and I deplore extreme language in regard to a matter of this sort. I do not know that the leader of the opposition is quite justified in denouncing this man as an embezzler and a thief in the way he did. I would not like to come to that conclusion without knowing more about the matter than I do at present. My hon. friend says that there are on the file statements in which he denies that he received anything. I did not take that from the letters that were read this afternoon. I am not, however, in a position to speak about that until I go more fully into the file; but before we come to the conclusion that this man would be convicted in any court of theft or embezzlement, we should take into account that element of criminal intent, the mens rea, the animus furandi.

Mr. CLARK: Would the hon. member increase his salary?

Mr. ILSLEY: I am not addressing my attention to that feature of the case; I am referring simply to the statement made by my hon. friend that this man was a thief and an embezzler. I say: Let us not come to that conclusion too quickly. I understand he had been in the service for many years. I did not hear that he had been found guilty of anything of this sort before. The Postmaster General says that he was an efficient man and that he proved his efficiency during the period that he was in charge of the office recently. Those are the only considerations that I have to place before the committee.

Mr. GEARY: Will the hon. member say, having heard what he has, that a prima facie case of theft under the section has not been made out? I would also ask him from the depth of his experience to tell the committee whether he can say that a grand jury would not bring in a true bill on the evidence as read?

Mr. THORSON: May I ask the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat a question?

Mr. GEARY: I am waiting for an answer to my question.

Mr. ERNST: Postpone the Winnipeg strike.

Mr. THORSON: I may deal with that later. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he would be willing to charge openly outside of this house, where he is protected, that this man is an embezzler and a thief?

Mr. GEARY: If it were at all necessary and if I were the member of the government who has charge of the matter, I believe I would be justified in doing so.

Mr. THORSON: The hon. member has not answered my question.

Mr. GEARY: That is precisely an answer to the hon. member's question.

Mr. FOSTER: I do not think I can be accused of taking up much of the time of the house; but knowing Mr. Griffith as I do and knowing a great deal about his family and all his connections, I cannot let this pass without my voice being heard. I have known this man Griffith since he was a boy, and I know his parents and his whole family. No more upright and honest people live in New Brunswick than the Griffith family. An hon. member said that he would like to know a little more about District Superintendent Woods. I have known Mr. Woods too, all my life. I know nothing against him except that when he was appointed inspector he was appointed not because of his qualifications but because he was a political organizer of the Conservative party. As a reward he was appointed post office inspector. He was a good organizer. I do not think I am going too far when I say that he is still a pretty good organizer. That is where the trouble has arisen in the Post Office Department. As regards Mr. Griffith, I should like to know if any hon. member on that side of the house would be prepared to go out in the street

and make the statement that Griffith is a thief, an emblezzler? When one comes to consider the matter, that is not a fair remark for any hon. member to make. I have travelled through the country with Griffith looking after mail routes, and I know him to be a gentleman and an honest man.

Mr. SPENCE: Is Mr. Griffith a good organizer, too?

Mr. FOSTER: Yes, a good post office organizer. I know he helped me to get rural mail routes in many places where we were never able to get them before.

Mr. CLARK: I should like to bring before the committee a matter relating to the post office at Sutton, Quebec. The postmaster there, Mr. Olmstead, was dismissed by the Postmaster General of whom I should like to ask one or two questions before making a statement to the committee in regard to the matter. It appears from the file which has been produced that the Postmaster General ordered an investigation in connection with that post office. He personally wrote a letter to Mr. Gaboury, the Deputy Postmaster General, dated April 4, 1927, reading as follows:

Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of numerous complaints about the way the post office is being run at Sutton, Quebec. I would like to have this matter investigated. I would suggest that you instruct the inspector that in this case especially I want no haphazard investigation. I am enclosing an extract from a letter which will indicate what the people think of the way things are being run at this post office.

There is an extract, Mr. Chairman, an unsigned extract from a letter; it does not state by whom it was written, and I would therefore ask the Postmaster General if he will produce the letter from which this extract which appears on the file was taken.

Mr. VENIOT: The extract was not signed. It was handed to me during a sitting of the house by the member for that county. He said: "Here is an extract from a letter which I got touching the administration of the post office at Sutton." I took that extract and inserted it in my file. My hon. friend has just read from a copy of it.

Mr. CLARK: May I ask the minister whether the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi endorsed the sentiments expressed in the extract?

Mr. VENIOT: He did, verbally.

Mr. CLARK: And did he request the dismissal of the postmaster at Sutton?

Mr. VENIOT: In discussing the matter with me, after giving me the extract, he said he thought an investigation should be held, and I acted upon that extract.

Mr. CLARK: What I wanted to ascertain was whether the hon. member recommended the dismissal.

Mr. VENIOT: He recommended an investigation into the conduct of the postmaster based on that extract.

Mr. CLARK: But he never recommended dismissal?

Mr. VENIOT: I have no record of his recommending dismissal, but he did recommend, I am sure, an investigation.

Mr. CLARK: Then will the Postmaster General advise the committee what were the numerous complaints he had received and which are referred to in this letter?

Mr. VENIOT: I had received these complaints. There was the extract, and also in conversation with me the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi informed me that numerous complaints were being made to him touching the administration of that office, and he cited to me some of the complaints.

Mr. CLARK: Was political partisanship ever mentioned?

Mr. VENIOT: No.

Mr. CLARK: Will the minister state the revenue of that post office in 1924, 1928 and 1929?

Mr. VENIOT: In 1924, $5,562.49; 1925, $5,347.49; 1926, $5,806.98; 1927, $5,810.04; 1928, $5,160.01; 1929, returns not in for the fiscal year.

Mr. CLARK: And the salaries?

Mr. VENIOT: The deputy tells me that he could not get the salaries and allowances after six o'clock as the office was closed, but I will get that information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLARK: I wonder if the minister will admit that the salary has been increased since the dismissal of Postmaster Olmstead.

Mr. VENIOT: The salary is based on revenue in an office of that kind.

Mr. CLARK: I think the Postmaster General is incorrect in that, because I am advised that the salary paid to Olmstead was $1,869 or thereabouts, based on a revenue of $5,562, and that the salary now paid is over $2,000.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman must remember that the commission paid on stamp sales has been increased from 50 to 70 per cent on the first $1,000, also 30 per cent, I believe, from that up to $5,000. That may account for an increase in the salary, although the revenue may be smaller.

Mr. CLARK: Does that apply throughout the country?

Mr. VENIOT: Oh, yes, that is general.

Mr. CLARK: The minister will admit that this particular post office is a Civil Service Commission appointment.

Mr. VENIOT: Oh, yes.

Mr. CLARK: This case, Mr. Chairman, divides itself into several parts. There is first of all, the dismissal of the postmaster without cause, without an investigation—

Mr. VENIOT: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. CLARK: I will come to that and show what investigation there was. There is next the appointment of a postmaster by the Postmaster General, temporarily, it is true, without any lawful authority for such appointment. There is next a very long delay in reporting the vacancy to the Civil Service Commission. Then there is a deliberate delay in sending to the Civil Service Commission the report of the superintendent upon the applicants, and after that a delay by the Post Office Department in furnishing further particulars requested by the Civil Service Commission. Lastly, there is the withholding in the office of the Civil Service Commission of the file for some months until a request arrived from the Post Office Department for a delay in the appointment, and then the admission on the file of one who I believe is a civil service commissioner that he had held the file in his office.

I would first review, Mr. Chairman, the facts that led up to the dismissal of this postmaster at Sutton. In 1924 the then sitting member, Mr. Andrew McMaster, made representations to the Department of Public Works that a building was required at Sutton for the use of the Post Office, Immigration and Customs departments. The Deputy Minister of Immigration stated that such a building was not required because one of the railway companies at that place was furnishing both the Department of Immigration and the Department of Customs with plenty of accommodation. However, some time later, in January, 1925, Mr. McMaster represented that one R. G. Crowell of Sutton had a building which would be an excellent location for a post office as well as for the immigration and customs services. This representation was investigated, and it turned out that the Crowell building was a brick building some twenty odd years old which had been burned down, but the brick walls remained, and the building had been rebuilt with wood and iron, and painted red. About the same time a petition was forwarded to the Postmaster General signed by some eighty-five per cent of the patrons of the post office at Sutton, expressing satisfaction with both the service and the location as it then existed.

Mr. VENIOT: May I interrupt my hon. friend? You are not connecting the present Postmaster General with that phase?

Mr. CLARK: No; but there were investigations during that time, all of which were before the present Postmaster General assumed office. All those investigations indicated that the service and location of the office and the character of the postmaster were absolutely satisfactory.

Now, pressure was brought to bear on the Post Office Department by the then sitting member, and on March 11, 1925, the department wrote the superintendent at Montreal stating:

> This is a special case as Mr. McMaster is personally interested in either the purchase or rental of this building.

On March 21, 1925, the district superintendent at Montreal made a very elaborate report on this building, in which he stated incidentally that there were no complaints whatever in the town of Sutton against the management of the post office by Mr. Olmstead, the then postmaster. But in April, 1925, Mr. McMaster became insistent, and Mr. Dastous, post office inspector at Sherbrooke, went to Sutton to make a further investigation. Mr. Crowell expressed his disappointment at Mr. Dastous being selected to make the investigation. Mr. Dastous made another attempt to interview Mr. Crowell, at a later date and Mr. Crowell stated:

> Tell the Post Office Department that I absolutely refuse to make complaints to you.

Despite these efforts no change was made under the administration of the Hon. Charles Murphy. Every investigation indicated that the administration of the post office was entirely satisfactory. Incidentally it might be stated that the postmaster had been honoured by the citizens of Sutton on several occasions with the office of mayor.

Shortly after the accession to office of the present Postmaster General instructions were

given by him, as already stated, on April 4, 1927, to have this post office investigated. I might repeat the Postmaster General's own words:

> I would like to have this matter investigated. I would suggest that you instruct the inspector that in this case especially I want no haphazard investigation.

He refers to numerous complaints, also. There are no numerous complaints in this file. There is what appears to be an anonymous letter complaining about the postmaster at Sutton. As a result of that letter an investigation was carried out by the inspector at Sherbrooke, Quebec. That inspector once more went to Sutton and interviewed twenty-four prominent citizens. Seventeen of these stated that they were absolutely satisfied, and spoke in the highest terms of the management of the post office. Two stated that they had heard a complaint, but had none to make themselves. One stated that he thought there should be someone in the office who could speak French. It might be observed here that the postmaster himself spoke French. While he was not in the office all the time he was in the adjoining room and was there on call whenever required. One stated that there had been delay in the delivery of some mail, but he had no evidence to produce in that regard. There were two, however, who did complain. One was R. G. Crowell, who has since been appointed to succeed Mr. Olmstead. He referred the investigator to one Mr. O'Brien, who also had complaints to make, particularly in regard to the young lady assistant. Mr. O'Brien referred the inspector to certain others who, he said, had complained.

I should like to observe here that these two gentlemen are reputed, on very good authority, to be the leading Liberals in Sutton. One has been appointed postmaster, and the son of the other has been appointed his assistant. So I do not think we need consider very seriously their complaints, more particularly as they referred the investigator to one Mrs. Bates, who, they both stated, had a very serious complaint to make. The investigator went to the lady who stated she did not wish to make any complaint, and before the investigator left she said:

> Mr. Olmstead is a good citizen, don't you think so? I have nothing to say against him.

One of the other complainants was Henry Chatfield, whose chief cause of complaint seemed to be that the girl assistant must be in love. He noted on one occasion, while she was making distribution of the mail, she stopped to read a letter, and only resumed her work after she had read the whole letter. He stated, however:

> The postmaster is a good fellow, and his boy is very nice.

Meaning the postmaster's son, who was his assistant. That is the report. There is a supplementary report emphasizing the statements made in the earlier report and concluding in these words:

> As already stated, the postmaster is willing to comply with any instructions given, and any requirements advanced by the department in regard to ventilation, accommodation and adequate uninterrupted service if he is reasonably sure of keeping the office.

Every charge contained in the anonymous letter is in one place or another fully and completely answered in these reports, which I regret to say there is not time to put on Hansard in detail.

Now, with these reports before him, the Postmaster General issued a memorandum dated July 29, 1927, some months later, directed to L. J. Gaboury, Deputy Postmaster General, in which he states:

> I have had before me the inspector's report on the administration of the Sutton post office, dated April 16, and followed by supplementary report dated April 25. After carefully considering all the circumstances reported therein, I am convinced that in the interest of the public service there should be a change made at this office. You will therefore make arrangements for the dismissal of the postmaster, but in the meantime hold back the order of dismissal until I am in a position to give you the name of a man to be appointed temporarily in his place. This office comes under the Civil Service Commission.
>
> P. J. Veniot.

Then on August 10, 1927, there is a memorandum to Mr. Gaboury as follows:

> With further reference to the Sutton post office, please appoint Mr. R. G. Crowell as temporary postmaster at that place, pending the permanent appointment by the Civil Service Commission.
>
> P. J. Veniot.

At this stage I think it is well to mention that under the old Post Office Act, section 92, it was provided that the governor in council might appoint all postmasters having fixed salaries in cities and towns, and all other postmasters might be appointed by the Postmaster General. That section has been repealed, and the section which now is in force is section 19 of the Civil Service Act, which reads as follows:

> Save as otherwise provided in this act or in any regulation made hereunder, neither the governor in council nor any minister, officer of the crown, board or commission, shall have power to appoint or promote any employee to a position in the civil service.

Section 21 reads:

Every deputy head shall notify the commission of every vacancy in any position in his department immediately after the vacancy occurs, and whenever such vacancy is to be filled, the deputy head shall request the commission to make an appointment.

The vacancy was created by dismissal on July 29, 1927. The Postmaster General stated that it came under the Civil Service Commission and expressly requested that the dismissal should not go into effect until he was in a position to give his deputy the name of the successor. Now, he did not report that as required by law; nor did his deputy, as required by law, report it to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. VENIOT: When it has to do with a temporary appointment?

Mr. CLARK: The act is perfectly clear. Whether it be temporary or otherwise, there is no power under the Civil Service Act, nor is there any power under the Post Office Act for the minister to make such an appointment. There are some sections under which the minister may argue that he has the right to make temporary appointments, but I shall be quite prepared to reply to him when he so contends. In the meantime I state emphatically that he has no such power; the act expressly requires him, in words which are not at all uncertain, to report to the Civil Service Commission immediately any vacancy occurs. And he did not do so.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: No, he did not do so. He presumes to make the appointment himself, and it is not until October 5 that the Acting Deputy Postmaster General notifies the secretary of the Civil Service Commission of this vacancy, over two months after the vacancy has occurred. In October of 1927 this position is advertised, and there are two applicants recorded on October 14, 1927; one is R. J. Crowell and the other Robert Hill. On November 9 there appears on the file a memorandum wherein the officials are instructed to allow the appointment to stand. No reason is given why this appointment should stand; there is no supporting authority, nor is there any law. It is in absolute controversion of the sections of the Civil Service Act which require an appointment to be made. Following that, on November 19, 1927; on December 27, 1927; on January 18, 1928; on February 9, 1928; on March 12, 1928; on April 10, 1928, and on June 21, 1928, the Civil Service Commission request the Post Office Department to furnish them with the report of the district superintendent at Montreal upon the relative merits of the two applicants for this position—Robert Hill and R. J. Crowell. These requests are ignored, and it is not until a motion comes before this house for the production of papers relating to this post office that any steps are taken by the Post Office Department relative to obtaining the report of the district superintendent upon these two applicants. When that motion is launched a hasty wire is sent, which wire might well be read into the record. The wire is dated Ottawa, May 15, 1928, and reads:

J. Taylor, Esq.,
District Superintendent,
Postal Service,
Montreal, P.Q.

Forward report re Sutton postmastership at once.

P. T. Coolican.

This shows full well that the superintendent at Montreal had been doing his duty and had only been waiting for instructions from the department here to carry out that duty fully. On that very day, May 15, he forwarded his report in reply to the wire.

I have not looked up the records of the house for 1928, but I think that it is pretty safe to assume that when the Postmaster General received this his estimates had fairly well passed the house, or there was no chance of getting this file before the house that year. And no action was taken. That report was not sent to the Civil Service Commission although they had requested it monthly over a period of nine months. It was not sent to the Civil Service Commission until June 29, 1928, when the Deputy Postmaster General forwarded it under a covering letter to the Civil Service Commission. On July 9, following that, the examining board of the Civil Service Commission makes a report upon the applicants in this case, which report concludes:

Under the circumstances the examination branch recommends the appointment of Mr. Hill, who is entitled to the OAS preference.

This is dated July 9, 1928. No action is taken. There is some correspondence. Mr. Coolican writes on August 29, 1928 to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission drawing his attention to the fact that no report has been made by the commission. Nothing further happens until October 10, 1928, when the Deputy Postmaster General writes to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission requesting the Civil Service Commission to—

—kindly suspend action towards the selection of a new postmaster pending the receipt of further information from this department.

This matter has been brought to the personal attention of the Postmaster General.

Now that request of the Post Office department is taken before the chairman of the Civil Service Commission on October 25, in a memorandum as follows:

Attention is drawn to examination branch memorandum of July 9 last, wherein the appointment of Mr. Robert Hill, OAS, to the above position was recommended. A communication is now at hand from the Acting Deputy Postmaster General requesting that action towards the selection of the new postmaster in this case be suspended pending the receipt of further information from the Post Office Department.

Respectfully submitted for the information of the commissioners.

Doctor Roche, the chairman of the commission, has endorsed upon this file—I assume, in his own handwriting—the following:

I do not know why this file has been held for the last three months without being passed on by the commissioners. It has only been placed before me this morning, October 25, and in the meantime the department has placed the office in charge of the least competent applicant of the two.

Following that appears this memorandum dated November 8, 1928:

Memo. to Mr. Bland.

I think, in view of the chairman's memo, you should attach a memorandum to this file showng where and why it was held.

This is signed "W. F." I presume that means William Foran, secretary of the Civil Service Commission. A further memorandum, addressed to Mr. Bouchard, is as follows:

For report, please, as above, for the period June 30th (when D. S. report was received)—October 12 (when file was forwarded to me).

Then there is a memorandum to Mr. Bland, which I assume is the memorandum of Mr. Bouchard, dealing with the delay in submitting to the commissioners the report on the postmastership at Sutton. This is a detailed report in regard to the manner in which the files are held in the Civil Service Commission office. I presume that this officer is in charge of those files, and he very conclusively clears himself of any suggestion that he might have had the file in his office. He concludes with these words:

I can only, therefore, conclude that whoever had the file held it until the looked-for communication of the department to suspend action arrived.

(Sgd.) J.L.B.

That looked-for communication from the department was dated October 10, 1928; the details have been placed on Hansard already. In that communication the Post Office department request that the selection of a new postmaster be deferred pending further information. Endorsed on the margin of this same investigation these words appear under date of November 16, 1928:

I accept responsibility for holding this file in my office.

J.E.T.

I can only conclude that those are the initials of Mr. J. E. Tremblay, one of the three civil service commissioners. Thus we have a delay from July 29, 1927, to June, 1928, by the Postmaster General in giving the required information to the Civil Service Commission, and following that we have a file not lost and not missing but taken by one of the commissioners.

Mr. VENIOT: That is not the fault of the Postmaster General.

Mr. CLARK: I do not know; I shall be much interested to hear the explanation of the Postmaster General as to the relationship between himself and this civil service commissioner.

Mr. VENIOT: I have no explanation to make, because I have no relationship with him.

Mr. CLARK: I will leave it to the house to determine whether or not such relationship exists; to me the inference is pretty plain.

Mr. VENIOT: Always suspicious.

Mr. CLARK: No, I hope not, but so much has occurred in this chamber in the last few weeks with regard to this department that the suspicions of any man are easily aroused, regardless of whether or not he is naturally suspicious.

Mr. POWER: Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he thinks there was anything improper in the conduct of Commissioner Tremblay?

Mr. CLARK: Decidedly yes; Commissioner Tremblay should be brought before the bar of this house to explain his conduct. In this case we not only have the provisions of the Civil Service Act disregarded and defied by the Postmaster General, but it seems that we have collusion on the part of one of the Civil Service Commissioners to defeat the terms of the very act which he is sworn to administer. I certainly think he should be brought before the bar of this house to answer for his conduct. The charges which were made against the two commissioners who were dismissed a year or two ago were serious, but in my opinion the charge against this commissioner, contained in his own writ-

ing in which he accepted the responsibility for retaining in his office for a period of months, a file which he was bound by oath to deliver, is far more reprehensible than the conduct of the commissioners who were dismissed by the Prime Minister some time ago.

Mr. POWER: May I just interject that I am very glad someone on the other side of the house has come to the conclusion that all commissioners are not infallible. I arrived at that conclusion long ago.

Mr. CLARK: I am very glad my hon. friend agrees with me.

Mr. VENIOT: If I made that statement it would be a crime.

Mr. CLARK: Personally there is one feature of this case which affects me, in a sentimental way at least, more than any other which has been brought out by the documents contained in this file. That feature has to do with the records of the two applicants. Mr. Crowell, the gentleman chosen by the Postmaster General, according to this court document which I have in my hand, apparently is in the same position as an undischarged bankrupt. I have here a certificate signed by the deputy prothonotary of the superior court of the province of Quebec in and for the district of Bedford, in which he certifies that on October 15, 1914, Robert G. Crowell did make an abandonment of all his property for the benefit of his creditors. This document is dated at Sweetsburg, April 26, 1929, and is signed by J. A. Perras, D.P.S.C.

Mr. VENIOT: What is the date of that abandonment?

Mr. CLARK: October 15, 1914. Since that time this gentleman has carried on business in the name of his wife, and was carrying on business in her name at the time negotiations were entered into for the leasing of his building. At the time the Postmaster General's appointee abandoned all his property for the benefit of his creditors in an action brought against him by George E. Chart, the other applicant, Robert Hill, attempted to enlist. He was turned down because of physical unfitness, and a little later he underwent an operation in order to fit himself for service. He was then accepted and served in France from June, 1916, until after the armistice, with very great credit to himself and to his country. He was awarded the meritorious service medal for his services while in the field.

These gentlemen made their applications and were reported upon by the superintendent at Montreal, and nothing appears in the report as to the past business record of Mr. Crowell. However, I would draw the attention of the committtee to the following remarks from the report of the superintendent:

Robert G. Crowell: Educational qualifications: fair.
Robert Hill: Educational qualifications: good.

The residential qualifications are practically the same in each case. The report continues:

Robert G. Crowell: Integrity: good.
Robert Hill: Integrity: very good.

The only difference is that Robert Hill has had no post office experience. He is yard manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Sutton and assistant secretary of the Butter and Cheese Manufacturing Association of Sutton. Robert G. Crowell was postmaster at Dunkin for nine years, and acting postmaster at Sutton for the last seven months—illegally appointed, as I said before. I charge the Postmaster General with being personally responsible for the delay in this appointment. I must accept the statement which has been made by the hon. Postmaster General, but I would ask him to search his records and search his mind because I believe when he has done so he will find that he personally is the man who is responsible for this file having been lost in Mr. Tremblay's office for several months. I base that thought upon a memorandum which appears in the file, signed P. J. Veniot, and dated January 17, 1929, long after this file is discovered in the office of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission. This memorandum reads as follows:

Have inspector report on whether applicant Hill, returned soldier, is reestablished. It would appear he is, as he is stated as being yard manager of Canadian Pacific Railway at Sutton since 1919 and has been in their employ for twenty years with exception of years at war.

I wonder why the Postmaster General is so much interested in hounding this poor returned soldier by asking whether he is reestablished. Why does he suggest to the investigator that it appears that he is? Why is that investigation requested unless it is for the purpose of establishing that this gentleman is not eligible? I would draw to the attention of the Postmaster General the fact that it does not matter whether or not he is re-established; he is entitled by law to the position even if he is. Did the Postmaster General say no? May I ask the Postmaster General what his interjection was?

Mr. VENIOT: I did not interject.

Mr. CLARK: You did, and I would like to know what it was.

Mr. VENIOT: I think there is a misunderstanding somewhere.

Mr. CLARK: I think there is some confusion in the minds of members of the house with regard to the preference afforded retured soldiers by the Civil Service Act. Subsection 4 of section 29 of the act states quite clearly and concisely that returned soldiers regardless of disability and regardless of whether they are re-established have preference over all civilians. I suggest that the Postmaster General was labouring under a misapprehension when he requested this last investigation. I further suggest that it is not at all consistent with his declaration made a few days ago that he is favourable to the employment of returned soldiers. In this case he has preferred a man who does not pay his debts to one who has fought for his country. He deliberately defies the act in order to see that the man is appointed, even temporarily.

In this case, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we have a dismissal contrary to every principle of justice and one which ignores even the indifferent standards laid down by the Postmaster General in regard to dismissals. He stated the other evening that no postmaster had ever been dismissed without an investigation under oath. There has been no such investigation in this case, and there have been no charges made. However, there was a request by the late postmaster, Mr. Olmstead, for an investigation, but his request was not even acknowledged by the Postmaster General and the letter does not appear on the file. We have the appointment of R. G. Crowell, for which there is no lawful authority, an appointment which defies the provisions of the Civil Service Act and defies the will of parliament. For nine months the Postmaster General has deliberately ignored the express requests of the Civil Service Commission for information which they were entitled by law to have. We have a deliberate attempt by a civil service commissioner to thwart the provisions of the act he has sworn to administer, in an effort to further the sinister ends of the Postmaster General. We have a deliberate and determineted effort by the Postmaster General illegally to maintain a political friend in an office to which he has no legal claim, and to defeat the right of a returned soldier with a distinguished record, who has qualified for the post and who under a statute of this parliament is entitled to the appointment.

Mr. VENIOT: The Minister of Finance informs me that it is necessary that he should put in a supply bill, and as it is now approaching eleven o'clock, I suggest that he have an opportunity to do that.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS AND STEAMSHIPS

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $15,825,161.25, being one-fourth of the total amount to be voted by vote No. 336 for loans to the Canadian National Railway Company, vote No. 337 for a loan to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, vote No. 338 for a loan to the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships, Limited, and votes 339 and 340 for amounts required under the Maritime Freight Rates Act, as set forth in the estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1930, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1930.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. ROBB moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1930, the sum of $15,825,161.25 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Robb thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 172, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1930.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. ROBB moved the second reading of the bill.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): We who sit to the left of the Speaker believe that this form of legislation is bad. We do not believe that money for the railway services of the country should be voted through a supply bill, because taxation is not resorted to, so far as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) is concerned, to raise the money, and the money is not granted to His Majesty in the narrow and technical sense of that term. I am making this observation so that when the matter is before the house

for discussion, the granting of this supply, which, as I undestand it, is necessary in the public interest, shall not prejudice our right to object to the principle of the supply bill or the details of the measure itself.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—BRANCH LINES

QUEBEC ORIENTAL AND ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RAILWAYS

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Canadian National Railway Company may purchase the undertakings and railways of the Quebec Oriental Railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, at a price of approximately $3,500,000; and that the governor in council may guarantee the principal and interest of securities to be issued for this purpose by the Canadian National Railway Company, not exceeding in aggregate face value such amount as the governor in council may consider sufficient to raise the said sum.

He said: Perhaps I might make a brief general statement as to the method of dealing with all these financial resolutions which appear in my name.

Mr. BENNETT: As the hon. gentleman has three of them and desires to advance them a stage to-night, if he intends to have the house go into committee of the whole on the bills—

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, after they come back from the railway committee. I intend to ask the house to submit all these bills to the railway committee.

Mr. BENNETT: The special committee or the general committee?

Mr. DUNNING: The general committee. The special committee is not enpowered to deal with such matters as these.

Mr. BENNETT: I should be glad to assist the hon. gentleman in advancing his legislation to that point, provided that when the bills are before the committee of the whole, we have the fullest opportunity of discussing them on their merits, which discussion, strictly speaking should take place before. I understand it will be advancing the business of the house if the hon. member proceeds in the way he suggests.

Mr. DUNNING: I am quite willing to accede to the suggestion of the hon. member.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. DUNNING: I have a brief statement covering the two railways which serve the Gaspe peninsula, and it is my intention to ask that these bills be referred to the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines to the end that officers of the company may give full information regarding the negotiations. The negotiations in all of the cases at present under discussion were undertaken as a result of what transpired at the last Dominion-provincial conference with reference to the acquisition of various lines of railway in different parts of Canada. The whole of the negotiations have been undertaken with the respective parties, in some cases the provinces themselves, by the management of the Canadian National Railways, who, after reaching tentative agreements with the owners, have in every case convinced the government of the merit of the proposals having regard to all the circumstances. These matters can be gone into very thoroughly before the committee on railways and canals, and in addition I shall be pleased to encourage the fullest discussion when the bills come back from that committee to the house.

Mr. STEVENS: May I ask a question in regard to this particular resolution, No. 20, dealing with the Quebec Oriental and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railways? Was a report made previously, about 1923, 1924 or 1925, I am not sure just when, by the management of the Canadian National Railways in regard to the purchase of this line, which report was adverse to the purchase? If so, will that report be laid before the house or before the committee?

Mr. DUNNING: Numerous reports in connection with the Gaspe railways were made by the former management of the Intercolonial, and one, I believe, by the Board of Railway Commissioners, who at one stage investigated the whole matter. There is a report, not going so far back I think as my hon. friend mentions, which was adverse to the purchase of the road by the Canadian National Railway, while setting upon the road a higher value than that for which it is now proposed to acquire it. There was no question of the road not being physically worth the amount here provided, but the report was adverse viewed purely from the Canadian National traffic standpoint, and having regard to the traffic which the Canadian National was then receiving from the road.

Mr. STEVENS: May we have that report laid on the table?

Mr. DUNNING: Certainly. The report will be made available to the railway committee, and if necessary I will table it also.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not a member of that committee, so I would like the report made available here.

Mr. DUNNING: I will see that my hon. friend sees the report.

Mr. GEARY: I would like to support the suggestion made by my hon. friend that the statement which the minister proposes to make should be placed on Hansard so that the members of the committee may be able to acquaint themselves with the information before they go into committee. I would also ask the minister to try to arrange that the sittings of the two railway committees will not clash.

Mr. DUNNING: I certainly will. The Quebec Oriental extends from Matapedia to West Paspebiac, a distance of 100 miles, and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western extends from West Paspebiac to Gaspe, a distance of 102.5 miles. These lines traverse the north coast of the bay of Chaleur and pass through a country whose chief activities consist of farming, fishing and lumbering. Latterly some activity has been shown in the development of lead, zinc and copper mining on the height of land of the Gaspe peninsula and about forty miles from these railroads.

The population served is 50,000 and the chief centres through which the railway passes are as follows:

Escuminac	Gascons
Carleton	Newport
Cascapedia	Chandler
New Richmond	Perce
New Carlisle	Douglastown
Port Daniel	Gaspe

The tonnage handled by the Quebec Oriental last year was 175,000 tons, and by the Atlantic, Quebec and Western 140,000 tons. The principal commodities were forest products, manufactured and miscellaneous products, coal, and products of agriculture. This territory has substantial possibilities from a tourist point of view.

The purchase price is $3,500,000, which was arrived at after negotiation with the trustees, and represents the cost of reproduction new less depreciation less subsidies paid. The Gaspe railways were exploited by Alfred M. Carpenter, at one time proprietor of the Charing Cross bank which became bankrupt a great many years ago, and the property has since been operated by trustees for the bond holders. The mortgage position may be briefly outlined with respect to the Quebec Oriental railway as follows:

Matapedia section prior lien 5 per cent bonds due January 1st, 1933, for an authorized amount of $487,000, of which $178,242 has been issued, $60,388 being pledged with the bankers to secure an overdraft. These bonds are a first lien on the line from Matapedia to New Carlisle.

Matapedia section first mortgage 5 per cent bonds, dated July 26th, 1910, due January 1st, 1935, for an authorized amount of $974,000, all of which have been issued. These bonds are secured by a mortgage on the railway from Matapedia to New Carlisle, ranking next after the prior lien bonds.

Matapedia section second mortgage 5 per cent bonds dated June 25th, 1910, due January 1st, 1935, for an amount of $974,000, all of which have been issued. These bonds are secured by a mortgage on the same section as the two above-mentioned issues and rank after them.

With regard to the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, there is an issue of first mortgage 5 per cent debenture bonds due July 1st, 1935, amounting to $2,548,675. This issue is secured by a first mortgage on the whole property of the railway. Cash (received as subsidy) was deposited with the trustee sufficient to meet the interest until June 30th, 1916. This issue is also secured by the deposit with the trustee of securities acquired by $994,893 of the proceeds of the sale of subsidy lands.

There is an issue of second mortgage 5 per cent debentures amounting to $2,050,000 issued at par in settlement of balances of construction account. This issue is a floating charge on all the property of the railway.

Briefly summarized, the capital structure of the two companies is as follows:—

Quebec Oriental

	Authorized	Issued
Capital stock	$ 500,000	$ 120,776
Prior lien bonds	487,000	178,242
1st mortgage bonds	974,000	974,000
2nd mortgage bonds	974,000	974,000
	$2,935,000	$2,247,018

Atlantic Quebec & Western

Capital stock	$ 5,000,000	$2,000,000
1st mortgage debentures	4,590,000	2,548,675
2nd mortgage debentures	2,050,000	2,050,000
Total	$11,640,000	$6,598,675
Capital stock	5,500,000	2,120,776
Bonds	9,075,000	6,724,917
Total	$14,575,000	$8,845,693

Interest on the bonds of both the Quebec Oriental and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western has been in arrears for a number of years. In the case of the Quebec Oriental, the

amount of interest accrued and unpaid at December 31st, 1927, was $876,600 of interest on first mortgage bonds and $759,720 on second mortgage bonds, or a total of $1,636,320.

In the case of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western all money received as subsidy from the Dominion government was deposited with the trustee and used to pay bond interest. This was sufficient to meet full interest until June 30th, 1916. The proceeds of the sale of lands granted as a bonus by the Quebec government amounting to £205,132 were likewise handed over to the trustee and invested for the benefit of the first mortgage bondholders. Interest at 2½ per cent on the first mortgage bonds was paid January 1st, 1917, from the proceeds of these investments, since which date no interest has been paid. A supplemental mortgage was executed on June 30th, 1917, modifying the original trust deed of 1906, by which the bondholders agreed as follows:

(1) Income from investments was to be used primarily to aid working expense of the line, the surplus (if any) to be applicable towards payment of bond interest at the end of the year.
(2) All bond interest not earned or available from income from investments to be foregone.
(3) Capital of the investments might be applied from time to time at the discretion of the trustee for the purchase of rolling stock and equipment and for other capital purposes including the provision of working capital.

This supplemental trust deed was to become void if a receiver were appointed or if a general meeting of bondholders passed an extraordinary resolution declaring it void. This supplemental trust deed expired June, 14th, 1920, at which time the bondholders agreed to the sale of the investments from time to time at the discretion of the trustee, the proceeds to be applied:—

(a) To enable the company to operate the line.

(b) To provide capital requirements.

Interest accrued unpaid on first mortgage bonds of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western at December 31st, 1927, was $1,832,578. Interest on the second mortgage bonds was to be paid out of income, if earned, so that there is no unpaid interest accrued on this issue.

The following is a summary of unpaid interest of the Quebec Oriental Railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway at December 31, 1927—

Quebec Oriental 5 per cent 1st mortgage bonds	$ 876,600
Quebec Oriental 5 per cent 2nd mortgage bonds	759,720
Atlantic, Quebec & Western 5 per cent 1st mortgage bonds	1,832,578
	$3,468,898

[Mr. Dunning.]

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Dunning thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 173, respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the Quebec Oriental Railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times, and referred to the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Canadian National Railway Company may purchase the undertakings and railways of the Saint John and Quebec Railway Company, and the interest of His Majesty in the right of the province of New Brunswick in such undertakings and railways, for a total price of $6,000,000, inclusive of certain outstanding debenture stock secured by mortgage, and the payment at maturity of certain debentures issued by the province; and that the governor in council may guarantee the principal and interest of securities to be issued for this purpose by the Canadian National Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. STEVENS: We are agreeable to this passing on the same general conditions.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. The St. John and Quebec Railway Company was incorporated by New Brunswick statute in 1910 for the purpose of constructing a railway from the city of St. John to a junction with the National Transcontinental railway at Grand Falls, a distance of 225 miles, but there has actually been constructed only the portion of the line between Westfield Beach and Centreville, a distance of 157.8 miles. Access to the city of St. John is obtained through running rights over the Canadian Pacific railway from Westfield Beach, a distance of 15 miles.

The railway received a guarantee from the province of New Brunswick of an issue of 4 per cent first mortgage bonds, and also received a subsidy of $1,000,592 from the Dominion government.

An agreement was entered into between the company and the Dominion government whereby the railway, when completed, was to be leased to the Dominion government at a rental equivalent to 40 per cent of the gross receipts. Financial difficulties arose in connection with the construction of the line and eventually the province of New Brunswick

took over the property and completed the construction as far as Centreville. The railway passes through Gagetown, Oromocto, Fredericton, and Woodstock. The population of the country served is 27,000. The territory traversed by the railway is for the most part very well adapted to agriculture, the upper portion being exceptionally well adapted to potato growing and large crops are raised annually. Other sections are especially adapted to the raising of sheep. There are distinct possibilities of mining developments about twenty miles west of Fredericton and in the vicinity of Woodstock. The valley of the St. John is very beautiful, and presents an excellent opportunity for development as a tourist resort.

The traffic handled by the railway consists of about 140,000 tons, products of agriculture, especially potatoes, predominating.

The purchase price agreed on is $6,000,000, based upon the cost of reproduction less depreciation of the property, and less the amount of the subsidy paid by the Dominion government. The arrangement does not involve any immediate cash payment on the part of the Canadian National Railways, but involves the assumption by the company of a portion of the first mortgage 4 per cent debenture stock guaranteed by the province in the hands of the public, which amounts to $2,727,977.40, and the payment to the province of the balance of the purchase price in amounts as set out in the bill for the purpose of retiring bonds issued by the province to raise moneys in connection with this railway, and the payment by the Canadian National Railways of 5 per cent interest upon the balance outstanding from time to time.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Dunning thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 174, respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the St. John and Quebec Railway.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and referred to the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

KENT NORTHERN RAILWAY

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Canadian National Railway Company may purchase the undertakings and railways of the Kent Northern Railway Company, in the province of New Brunswick, at a price of $60,000; and that the governor in council may guarantee the principal and interest of securities to be issued for this purpose by the Canadian National Railway Company, not exceeding in aggregate face value such amount as the governor in council may consider sufficient to raise the said sum.

Motion agreed to, and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. STEVENS: On the same general conditions?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. The Kent Northern railway is twenty-eight miles in length, and extends from Kent Junction, New Brunswick, on the Canadian National Railway, easterly to Richibucto on the straits of Northumberland. The road is at present controlled by the Walmsley estate and administered by the National Trust Company of Toronto.

The population tributary to the Kent Northern railway is estimated as 8,000. The settlement is confined to the shores of Northumberland straits and of the estuary of the Richibucto river. The principal point touched is Richibucto which has a population of 1,158.

Considerable timber resources are tributary to the railway and a number of small mills are established along the line. The principal forest products consist of pulpwood, lumber and laths. The tonnage handled is 10,500 tons.

It is proposed to purchase the undertaking for the sum of $60,000. This is in accordance with the arrangement proposed under appropriation act No. 2, chapter 52, statutes of Canada 1918, which was not accepted by the owners at that time, and is about equivalent to the scrap value of the material embraced in the railway property.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Dunning thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 175, respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the Kent Northern Railway.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and referred to the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

INVERNESS RAILWAY

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Canadian National Railway Company may purchase the undertakings and railways of the Inverness Railway in the province of Nova Scotia, at a price of $375,000; and that the governor in council may guarantee the principal and interest of securities to be issued for this purpose by the Canadian National Railway

Company, not exceeding in aggregate face value such amount as the governor in council may consider sufficient to raise the said sum.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. STEVENS: On the same general conditions?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. The Inverness railway extends from a junction with the Intercolonial Railway at Inverness Junction and runs through Port Hood, Mabou and Inverness on the west shore of Cape Breton island. The length of the line is sixty miles.

The company was reorganized in 1902 under the present corporate title with an authorized capital of $7,500,000. It absorbed the Inverness and Richmond Collieries and Railway Company of Canada, Limited, the properties of the latter company consisting of coal mines at Inverness, Chimney Corner and Port Hood in Cape Breton, covering an area of 55,000 acres. On May 1, 1915, the company defaulted on payment due of the semi-annual interest on its first mortgage 5 per cent bonds. On July 6, 1915, the exchequer court of Nova Scotia appointed J. M. McGillivray, Inverness, N.S., receiver of the property on application of the mortgage trustees (The National Trust Company). On July 23, 1919, Mr. McGillivray resigned as receiver and the Eastern Trust Company of Halifax was apointed his successor. The railway properties were operated under receivership until February 1, 1924, when they were leased to the Canadian National Railways for a term of three years at a rental of $25,000 per annum, with an option to purchase for $500,000. Since the expiration of the lease, January 31, 1927, the railway properties have been operated by the Canadian National Railways on a monthly rental basis.

The total estimated population tributary to the Inverness railway is 16,000.

The chief natural resources of the tributary area consist of coal. The coalfields of Inverness county include a series of narrow, low, carboniferous areas extending for over fifty miles along the western shore. The estimated probable coal reserves, to a depth of 4,000 feet, of the known deposits in Inverness County, are as follows:

	Metric tons
Land area..	22,000,000
Submarine area..	73,000,000
Total..	95,000,000

The known fields are as follows:—
Port Hood
Mabou
Broad Cove (Inverness)
Chimney Corner

[Mr. Dunning.]

Development has taken place in these fields at Port Hood, Mabou, and Broad Cove, all of which are adjacent to the Inverness railway. The Chimney Corner field is located some 12.6 miles beyond the present terminus of the railway.

The tonnage handled by the railway is 115,000 tons.

The purchase price is $375,000, which is about $6,250 per mile, and was a compromise made with the Eastern Trust Company who had bought the railway under foreclosure proceedings to protect advances made of $475,000.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Dunning thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 176, respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the Inverness Railway.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and referred to the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, May 1, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

INDUSTRIAL AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CAMERON R. McINTOSH (North Battleford) presented the second report of the select standing committee on industrial and international relations as follows:

Wednesday, May 1st, 1929.

The select standing committee on industrial and international relations beg leave to present the following as their second report:

Your committee has had under consideration a resolution adopted by the house on February 14th, 1929, as follows:

That the committee on industrial and international relations be authorized to investigate and report on insurance against unemployment, sickness and invalidity.

The following witnesses appeared before your committee to give evidence on the subject matter of investigation:

A. Grant Fleming, M.D., Professor of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Montreal; J. G. Fitzgerald, Professor of Hygiene and Preventive Medicine, University of Toronto; Gerald H. Brown, Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, Ottawa; R. A. Rigg, Director of Employment Service of Canada, Ottawa; Andrew D. Watson, Dominion Department of Insurance, Ottawa; W. Stewart Edwards, Deputy Minister of Justice, Ottawa; Robert H. Coats, Dominion Statistician, Ottawa.

Dr. Grant Fleming and Dr. Fitzgerald gave evidence dealing specially with sickness insurance.

1. Your committee would reaffirm the position taken in the final report adopted on June 6th of last session, namely:

That your committee accept and endorse the principle of unemployment insurance, based on compulsory contributions derived from the state, employer and employees.

2. Your committee recognizes that, while it is highly desirable that such legislation should be uniform in all the provinces, and while social insurance has a federal aspect, nevertheless, according to the Department of Justice, under our constitution legislative jurisdiction in relation to the establishment of a compulsory system of unemployment insurance is vested exclusively in the provincial legislatures.

3. Your committee finds that the provinces, on being consulted by the Department of Labour with regard to their attitude towards the establishment of a general scheme, do not appear to be prepared to take immediate action.

4. Under these circumstances, your committee submits the following recommendations:

(a) That with regard to sickness insurance, the Department of Pensions and National Health be requested to initiate a comprehensive survey of the field of public health, with special reference to a national health program. In this, it is believed that it would be possible to secure the cooperation of the provincial and municipal health departments, as well as the organized medical profession.

(b) That in the forthcoming census, provision should be made for the securing of the fullest possible data regarding the extent of unemployment and sickness, and that this should be compiled and published at as early a date as possible.

(c) That the federal government be requested to bring the subject matter of this reference before the next federal-provincial conference; and your committee suggests, when the agenda for such a conference is being arranged that the provincial governments be invited to send representatives of the employer and employee to discuss the subject matter of this report.

Your committee further recommends that 750 copies in English and 200 copies in French of this report, and the evidence upon which it is based, be printed in blue book form, and that standing order No. 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) Cameron R. McIntosh,
Chairman.

Mr. HEAPS: May I ask a question arising out of the report? When will the chairman of the committee move its adoption?

Mr. McINTOSH: I intend to ask the house on Friday to adopt the report. Notice of motion will be given to-morrow.

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following letter:

Ottawa, May 1, 1929.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Hon. Mr. Justice Duff, acting as deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the senate chamber this day at 5.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

James F. Crowdy,
Assistant Secretary to the
Governor General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

PAPERS TABLED RESPECTING VARIOUS POSTMASTERSHIPS

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): I beg to lay on the table the reports asked for by the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Jones) with reference to postmasterships at Shanklin, Forks, Jemseg, and Jordan Mountain, N.B.

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I wish to table copies of documents in possession of the Civil Service Commission relating to the postmastership at Hawkesbury, Ontario. Concerning this report I may say that it is the last of the files requested by hon. members on the other side to complete the files already tabled by the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) with reference to certain postmasterships. In certain cases the Civil Service Commission have pointed out that the files tabled were already complete and that they had no documents to add thereto.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

The house resumed, from Thursday, April 25, consideration of the motion of Mr. Parent for concurrence in the second report of the select standing committee on public accounts.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (Cartier): On Thursday last a report was presented to this house by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent) from the public accounts committee, in which it was asked that the powers of the committee be enlarged in order to include certain items which are not contained in the Auditor General's report for the year 1928. I may say that the only matter before the public accounts committee at the present moment is the Auditor General's report which was referred to it on motion of the Minister of Finance in February of this year.

In the course of the discussion in the public accounts committee it was found desirable to investigate certain items, not in the current Auditor's General's report, and inasmuch as we felt that we did not have the power to grant this request it was thought advisable to refer the matter to this house, which is the creator of the public accounts committee, in order that the house might give us the necessary instructions. There seems to have been a protracted debate on this question, as I note by Hansard, all parties agreeing that

these items should be investigated, with some thinking it was unnecessary and others believing it advisable to obtain authority from this house in view of the fact that a precedent was being created. There seemed to be a general consensus of opinion that if an item appearing in the report of this year which related to previous years could be traced back, it could be investigated and discussed, and that being the case we agreed to accept this suggestion of the house, which was very helpful to us and which put an end to our difficulty. However, there appear to be certain items in the Auditor General's report for the year 1927 which I understand are not related to anything in the report of this year; consequently we thought it would be advisable to obtain authority to investigate these particular items. Although only certain items were asked for, the committee, in its desire to give the inquisitors, if I may use the term, the fullest latitude, thought it well to request that the entire report of the Auditor General for last year too be brought down in order that we might have it before us. Hon. gentlemen opposite asked for only two or three items, but we felt that it would not be fair to those who are conducting the inquisition to limit them to those items; we felt that that would not be enough. They asked for one little loaf and one little fish but we are willing to multiply that by the five thousand items in the report so that every hungry member on the other side may be satisfied.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the report presented on March 24 by the hon. member for Quebec South be adopted.

Motion (Mr. Parent), agreed to.

STANDING ORDERS

Mr. PAUL MERCIER (St. Henri) for Mr. Morin (Saint Hyacinthe-Rouville) moved:

That the third and fourth reports of the select standing committee on standing orders, which were presented to the house on the 23rd of April, as set forth at page 290 of the votes and proceedings, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

BOYS IN PENITENTIARIES

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. How many boys under eighteen years of age detained in penitentiaries of Canada are first offenders?
2. What were the offences for which they were punished by penitentiary confinement?
3. How many came from institutions of detention under provincial control?

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. Lapointe:

1. 40.
2.

Manslaughter	3
Breaking, entering and theft	17
Theft	5
Indecent assault	1
False pretences	1
Forgery and uttering	1
Robbery with violence	2
Theft from mails and burglary	1
Theft of automobile	2
Sending letters of threats	1
Robbery from person	1
Shopbreaking and theft	2
Breaking, entering, stealing and burglary	2
Shopbreaking, theft of auto, garage-breaking and theft	1

3. 26.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—EXPENDITURE

Mr. SPENCER:

What was the estimated expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1914, for national defence?

Mr. RALSTON:

Naval votes, $1,056,000.

Militia and defence votes, $11,465,040.

The above sums only cover strictly military expenditure. They do not include any of the civilian activities of the department of Militia and Defence or of the department of the Naval service, such as radio, hydrographic surveys, fishery protection fleet, etc. Neither do they cover such items as aviation, pensions, battlefields memorials, War Graves Commission, adjustment of war claims and similar items which now appear in the votes for the Department of National Defence.

MALTING PLANTS IN ONTARIO

Mr. EMBURY:

1. How many malting plants are operated in Ontario?
2. What licenses or fees were paid by malting plants in Ontario for the calendar year 1928?
3. How many malting plants are operated in Canada?
4. What licenses or fees were paid by malting plants in Canada for the calendar year 1928?
5. What customs duties were collected for the calendar year 1928, on barley or other grains to be used for malting purposes?
6. What was the total amount of excise tax collected from the malting industry for the calendar year 1928?
7. What was the total amount of sales tax collected from the malting industry for the calendar year 1928?

Mr. EULER:

1. Two.
2. $400.
3. Eight.
4. $1,450.
5. Figures are not available of duties collected on grains imported for malting purposes as distinguished from grains imported for other purposes.
6. The excise duty collected on malt entered for consumption by maltsters during the year 1928 = $2,437,329.03.
7. $8.93.

RUSSELL HOUSE PROPERTY

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. Did a fire occur on the property generally known as the Russell house after the government had arranged to purchase the property?
2. If so, to whom was insurance paid, if any?
3. If insurance was paid, what was the amount?

Mr. ROBB:

1. Yes.
2. To the Russell Company and by them transferred to Federal District Commission.
3. $13,498.90.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton):

1. What are the names of the officials of the Department of Health in the inside service and their respective salaries?
2. How many physicians are employed in: (a) the inside service; (b) the outside service?
3. What is the total number of persons employed by the Department of Health?

Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1.

Dr. J. A. Amyot	$8,000
Dr. J. J. Heagerty	4,620
F. H. Brown	3,480
G. Heidman	3,480
Maurice Morisset	3,420
Henry O'Brien	1,680
Miss M. I. Hickson	1,680
Miss G. Drouin	1,680
Miss E. Slater	1,680
Miss K. E. Brownrigg	1,680
A. M. Dare	1,680
Miss Lucille Roy	1,200
Miss M. M. Smiles	1,200
Miss D. M. Maginnes	1,140
C. G. Morgan	1,500
W. J. Reilly	1,380
Miss R. F. Stringer	1,020
E. A. Parson	540
J. Gale	2,400
G. L. Morse	1.620
Miss L. O'Brien	1,380
A. E. Bennett	1,080
A. H. F. Ross	$1,020
W. J. Tanner	1,020
H. M. Lancaster	5,220
A. LeMoine	3,540
W. V. Kitto	3,300
F. C. Collier	2,700
L. E. Johnson	2,700
R. D. Whitmore	2,700
James Dick	2,700
Miss S. E. Wright	2,700
A. L. Davidson	2,460
F. E. Artlett	2,340
A. Wright	2,160
D. J. Potter	1,260
Jos. Ladouceur	1,480
E. Pilon	1,440
Miss M. A. Brouse	1.140
Miss V. Clement	1,380
Miss M. F. Lembert	1,140
L. P. Teevens	3,420
Miss V. M. Argue	1,620
Mrs. M. L. Proulx	1,380
Miss M. B. Lavell	1,380
Miss A. H. Gavin	1,320
Miss B. Trepanier	780
C. H. L. Sharman	3,300
K. C. Hossick	2,520
F. T. Wall	1,920
W. E. Caswell	1.680
Miss E. M. Durack	1.380
Miss M. E. O'Brien	1,380
Miss M. E. Jamieson	1,140
Miss M. O. Fitzgerald	960
Miss R. M. Crilly	720
J. Anderson	3,600
A. T. Allen	2,700
J. F. Shaw	2,400
J. V. Noonan	1.920
John Lynch	1,680
W. A. Buchanan	1,440
Miss K. M. Dunbar	1,680
H. C. Quevillon	1,380
Miss Margaret E. Hill	1,380
Miss Lola Belliveau	1,380
Dr. J. D. Pagé	5,300
G. H. Parry	2,880
Miss Mary E. Hill	1,680
Miss E. E. Washington	1,500
Miss H. A. Kemmis	1,080
Dr. Helen MacMurchy	4,500
Miss W. O'Connor	1,680
Miss M. J. Cassidy	1,320
Miss H. Finley	1,020
Miss E. C. Gourley	1,380
Dr. N. M. Harris	5,120
Dr. F. W. Ward	4,140
Jas. Gibbard	2,940
C. W. Chapman	2,820
B. W. Culyer	2,160

L. Farrell	$1,200
F. R. Browning	1,020
E. S. Meston	780
J. M. Lee	780
Miss G. Leyden	600
Miss M. A. Lallier	1,620
W. J. Henry	1,320
B. Evan-Parry	3,420
Aubrey Fraser	1,080
C. E. Campbell	1,080
Ernest D. Haines	1,080
C. A. Skuce	720
Miss Rose Levitin	1,080
Miss M. T. D'Aoust	1,080
Miss M. L. Devlin	1,080
Miss E. McKay	1,080
Miss M. I. Stewart	720
R. Pelland	720
M. S. Hunt	420
J. Naubert	1,140
Miss G. Racicot	720

2. (a) Inside service:

Full time	5
(b) Outside service:	
Full time	44
Part time on salary	62
Part time on basis of fees for services rendered	45

3.

Full time	307
Part time on salary	68
Part time on basis of fees for services rendered	45

These figures do not include the various collectors of national revenue who act for the department in the collection of sick mariners' dues under the provisions of part V of the Canada Shipping Act, R.S. 1927.

IMPORTATIONS FROM AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton):

What were the importations of butter, cheese, eggs, mutton and beef from: (a) Australia; (b) New Zealand, during the first three months of 1929 into Canada?

Mr. RINFRET:

Canada's Imports of Butter, Cheese, Eggs, Mutton and Beef from (a) Australia; (b) New Zealand

(Three months ended March 31, 1929)

Commodity	Unit of Quantity	Imports from Australia		Imports from New Zealand	
		Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
			$		$
Butter	Pound	78,400	33,371	17,518,302	6,179,980
Cheese	Pound	.....	.....	195,886	37,059
Eggs in the shell	Dozen	.....	.....	.....	.....
Eggs, n.o.p.	Pound	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mutton and lamb, fresh, chilled or frozen	Pound	2,304,335	296,906	19,469	2,941
Beef, fresh, chilled or frozen	Pound	876,425	72,597	287,383	25,909
Beef, pickled, in barrels	Pound	.....	.....	.....	.....

NOTE:—Impossible to segregate imports of mutton from "mutton and lamb."

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS SUPERVISION COMMITTEE

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. In reference to the government contracts supervision committee, in what years were reports issued to the government or to parliament since this committee was set up with a staff under Colonel L. R. LaFleche?

2. If no reports have been issued by the staff responsible for the work of the government contracts supervision committee, why has this not been done?

Mr. ROBB: Regular month to month reports of all purchases, sales and transfers are made to the Minister of Finance.

[Mr. J. H. King.]

SWAN LAKE RESERVE

Mr. LOVIE:

1. Who was medical inspector of Indians on the Swan lake, Manitoba, reserve from 1917 to 1922?

2. Who was medical inspector on said reserve from 1922 to 1926?

3. Who has been medical inspector from 1926 to the present date?

4. When changes of medical inspector of Indians on the Swan lake, Manitoba, reserve took place, what were the reasons for the changes, and upon whose recommendation were they made?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1. Dr. G. Pennefather, Holland, Man., 1917-Sept. 1922.

2. Dr. G. H. Johnston, Swan Lake, Man., Sept. 1922-Aug. 17, 1926.

3. August 17th, 1926, to July 12, 1927, Dr. G. Pennefather, Holland, Man., July 12th, 1927, to date Dr. G. H. Johnston, Swan Lake, Man.

4. In 1926 it was decided to change from the call system to salaried medical attendant for the Swan Lake Indians. The position was advertised by the Civil Service Commission and Dr. Pennefather of Holland was appointed. It was found that the Indians could not receive as good service from Holland, a distance of 14 miles from the reserve, as from Swan lake, a distance of 4 miles from the reserve where Dr. Johnston was located, and the call system was reverted to in July, 1927, and Dr. Johnston appointed by the Department of Indian Affairs.

RUSSELL K. ODELL

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond-West Cape Breton):

1. What is the position and salary of Russell K. Odell in the Department of the Interior?

2. Did he have any technical or professional training before appointment to this position, other than mere office work?

3. Does he hold any degree from a university or school of science?

4. What is the justification for paying this man such a large salary and placing him over the head of technical and professional men in the same department?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1. Assistant Director, Natural Resources Intelligence Service, $4,620 per annum.

2. Yes.

3. Equivalent qualifications satisfactory to the department and Civil Service Commission.

4. His ability to perform the duties of the position to the complete satisfaction of the department.

GEORGE P. MACKENZIE

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond-West Cape Breton):

1. What is the position and salary of George P. Mackenzie in the Department of the Interior?

2. Did he have any technical or professional training before being appointed to this position, other than mere office work?

3. Does he hold any degree from a university or school of science?

4. Has he a seaman's certificate?

5. What is the justification for paying this man such a large salary and placing him over the head of technical and professional men in the same department?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1. Exploration and development officer, Canadian Arctic, $5,120, and $3,000 living allowance per annum.

2. Equivalent qualifications satisfactory to department and Civil Service Commission.

3. No.

4. No.

5. His ability to perform the duties of the position to the complete satisfaction of the department.

ALFRED PEAT PLANT

Mr. CANTLEY:

1. Has the Department of the Interior finished its experimental work at the Alfred peat bogs, and, if so, what conclusion has the department arrived at with regard to the feasibility of producing and marketing peat fuel upon a commercial basis?

2. Is the plant which has been assembled at Alfred now completely efficient for the recovery of peat fuel and is it an adequate commercial unit for economical operation? If not, what remains to be done, and what alterations or additions does it require, and what will be the cost of necessary additions?

3. Will the government operate the Alfred peat plant this year?

4. If so, what tonnage of commercial fuel is expected to be recovered from the seasons's operations?

5. Has the peat bog plant at Alfred been transferred by the Department to Peat Fuels Limited? If so, at what date and under what terms and conditions of lease, sale, operation or otherwise?

6. Is it the intention of the government to merchandise and market the production of said plant or will the same be handled as prior to 1927 or by Peat Fuels Limited?

7. Has the government considered the policy of paying a bounty based upon tonnage to be payable to producers who might embark in the industry?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1 and 2. The Department of Mines, and not the Department of the Interior, is responsible for the experimental work done at the Alfred peat bog.

The operations in 1928 indicated that additional power was necessary for operation of the plant at full capacity. A complete commercial demonstration is contingent upon the installation of this power.

The marketing problem has not been specially investigated by the Department of Mines, but is believed to be mainly a question of advertising and salesmanship.

3 and 4. The government considers it inadvisable to answer these questions at present.

5. No.

6. The government considers it inadvisable to answer this question at present.

7. Consideration has not been given.

HOUSE OF COMMONS TYPEWRITERS

Mr. COOTE:

1. How many typewriters are in use in the stenographic branch of the House of Commons?
2. What makes are they?
3. How many years have they been in use in this branch?
4. How long were they in use before being taken to this branch, and in what departments?
5. How many new machines, if any, were bought in each of the last ten years?
6. What is the longest time any of the machines in this branch have been in use?
7. Were any of the machines now in use salvaged from the fire?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. 80.
2. Underwood, Remington, L. C. Smith, Monarch and Royal.
3. From 1 to 16 years.
4. No information.
5. 2.
6. 16 years.
7. Yes.

INVERNESS COUNTY PREVENTIVE OFFICERS

Mr. MACDOUGALL:

1. How many preventive officers are there in the county of Inverness?
2. Who are they?
3. What is the salary of each?
4. How much did each receive for wages and for expenses during the year 1928?
5. How many seizures were made by each during 1926, 1927 and 1928?

Mr. EULER:

1. The preventive service is a mobile force and officers are appointed for the whole province and not for any particular county or district.

There are four officers with headquarters at Cheticamp, Inverness, Mabou and Port Hood.

2 and 3.

	Salary	$1,320 per annum
A. Burns	"	"
A. J. Campbell	"	"
R. D. MacDonald	"	"
J. S. MacLean	"	"

4.

	Salary	Expenses
A. Burns	$1,230	$16.25
A. J. Campbell.	1,290	28.30
R. D. MacDonald	1,230	3.30
J. S. MacLean	1,260	54.90

5.

	1926	1927	1928
	Not in employ		
A. Burns	in 1926	6	4
A. J. Campbell	"	10	11
R. D. MacDonald	"	—	—
J. S. MacLean	"	7	1

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSIONERS

Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Who were the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the House of Commons for the years 1926, 1927, 1928 and 1929?
2. How many meetings of this committee have been held in each of these four years and on what dates were they held?

Mr. SPEAKER:

1. 1926—Hon. Messrs. J. H. King, W. R. Motherwell, E. M. MacDonald and George H. Boivin.

1926-27—Hon. Messrs. W. R. Motherwell, J. H. King, J. C. Elliott and Fernand Rinfret.

1928—Hon. Messrs. W. R. Motherwell, J. H. King, J. C. Elliott and Fernand Rinfret.

1929—Hon. Messrs. W. R. Motherwell, J. H. King, J. C. Elliott and Fernand Rinfret.

2. (a) 1926—4.
1926-27—2.
1928—1.
1929—1.

(b) 1926—1st of February, 1926.
15th of February, 1926.
22nd of February, 1926.
25th of March, 1926.
1926-27—14th of December, 1926.
9th of March, 1927.
1928—8th of May, 1928.
1929—16th of April, 1929.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

DEPARTMENTAL PURCHASING

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

What are the names and salaries of members of the civil service in each department who devote full or part time to the duty of public purchases and correlative duties connected therewith, and including the names and salaries of stenographers, typists and other clerical assistance?

SURVEYS AND OTHER SPECIAL SERVICES

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

What are the names of the departments or branches of the public service which support establishments and equipment for: (a) precise levelling; (b) topographical maps; (c) surveying work; (d) multigraphing, mimeographing and duplicating service; (e) photostat, blue printing, photo-lithographic and photographic service; (f) book bindery work?

TRIPS ABROAD OF CIVIL SERVANTS

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. How many civil servants in the past year were deputed by the government to represent it in various foreign countries at conventions or for other purposes, or were sent abroad by the government for research work of a scientific character?

2. What are the names of the said civil servants, in what department are they employed, and were their expenses paid by the government?
3. If the government paid all expenses, what was the total of said same?
4. What was the specific purpose of such visits to said foreign countries, and did each civil servant make a report to the government?
5. Is it the intention of the government to discontinue the practice of giving members of the civil service a trip abroad as mentioned above, at the public expense?

Mr. RINFRET: In connection with this question I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that the government should not be asked to reply to the fifth paragraph, which concerns the intentions of the government. It is not customary to disclose the intentions of the government in advance, and further I submit that the question is more in the nature of a demand rather than a request for information. With that reservation this might stand as an order for return.

BRITISH PREFERENCE

Mr. ADSHEAD:

1. Items in the customs tariff which are free under British preference?
2. Items which have British preferential duties.
3. How many of these have been put on since 1921.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

C. H. COUTURE

Mr. BLACK (Halifax, for Mr. Cahan):

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents relating to the dismissal of C. H. Couture of St. Bernard, county of Dorchester, province of Quebec, from his office as inspector of weights and measures, in or about February, 1927, and the appointment of a successor to that office.

MAHONE BAY, CUSTOMS OFFICER

Mr. ERNST:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and documents, of whatsoever kind, including therein correspondence of and with the Civil Service Commission, relating to applications for the position of customs officer at Mahone bay, in the county of Lunenburg, and the appointment of Francis Hollaway to that office.

DUNCAN RIVER TRAIL OR ROAD

Mr. ESLING:

For a copy of all correspondence and telegrams as between the members of the provincial government of British Columbia, or any resident of that province, and the Department of Public Works, concerning the construction of a trail or road along the Duncan river, as provided for in a vote of $7,500 at the last session of this parliament.

RENATA, B.C. POSTMASTER

Mr. ESLING:

For a copy of all correspondence and documents necessary to complete the file as contained in return No. 163 tabled by order of the house at the last session of this parliament, and relating to the appointment and dismissal of the postmaster at Renata, British Columbia.

BRAZIL LAKE, N.S., POSTMISTRESS

Mr. ERNST:

For a copy of all papers, letters, correspondence and other documents relating to the dismissal of Mrs. Tupper as postmistress at Brazil Lake, in the County of Yarmouth, in or about the year 1927.

DISTRIBUTION OF HANSARD

Mr. J. ARTHUR DENIS (St. Denis) (Translation): Three weeks ago, I requested that the French speaking members be placed on the same footing as their English speaking colleagues in regard to the distribution of Hansard, I mean that Hansard should be delivered to us at 11 a.m.

Notwithstanding the assurance given to us, Sir, we do not yet receive it at that hour. I again request that we be placed on the same footing as the English speaking members, and, if nothing further is done, I shall be forced to demand the dismissal of the official in charge of the distribution of Hansard.

Mr. PAUL MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): The French and English versions?

Mr. DENIS (Translation): Both.

Mr. SPEAKER (Translation): Instructions will be given to that effect.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): I would like to ask the right hon the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) if the government is willing that trade delegations from Russia should be established in Canada along similar lines to those already established in England, Australia, South Africa and the United States, and whether the government is willing to vise the passports of the trade delegates?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am sorry that I am not wholly familiar with the manner in which Russian trade delegations are established in the United States, Great Britain and other parts of the empire, but possibly I can give the hon. member the information which he desires.

When the trade agreement between Canada and Russia was terminated it was made plain that the government had no desire to discourage trade between Russia and Canada and that we did not intend to embarrass bona fide trading between the two countries. The agreement terminated certain quasi-diplomatic privileges which the Russian agency in Montreal possessed at the time. I understand that it is customary for buying and selling commissions from Russia, to visit the United States, Great Britain and other parts of the empire and that they have been permitted to come into these different countries freely for the purpose of trading transactions. This country has always been prepared to grant similar privileges to these trading commissions.

Mr. ADSHEAD: And to vise the passports?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In order to get into the country the passports may have to be vised.

CIVIL SERVICE

PROMOTION WITHIN DEPARTMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): I desire to call the attention of the house to a return tabled on April 26 by the Secretary of State (Mr. Rinfret) on behalf of the Civil Service Commission. The return had reference to a question which I placed on the order paper early in the month of April and which was passed as an order for return on April 10. The first part of my question read as follows:

In cases of promotion within the departments, is it customary for the Civil Service Commission to hold examinations when a candidate has: (a) received from the department the highest rating; (b) has had the longest term of service; (c) has been recommended for promotion by the commission's own board of examiners?

The answer received from the commission was as follows:

The commission holds written examinations in connection with cases of promotion only when there is sufficient closeness between the rating of the leading candidates to justify such a course being taken, or when it appears necessary to obtain further evidence of the qualifications of the candidates by means of a written test.

The second question is not material. The third question was as follows:

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Since June, 1925, in how many cases, when all the elements favourable to an applicant as outlined in question No. 1 appear on the record, has the ordinary procedure been disregarded and examinations ordered?

That appears to me to be a pretty plain question, but it is answered by the Civil Service Commission as follows:

Answered by question No. 1.

I would ask the Secretary of State to instruct the commission that when questions are asked and passed by this house to the commission, proper answers should be given. I would ask the Secretary of State so to instruct the Civil Service Commission in order that I may obtain a proper answer to my question.

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I will bring the matter to the attention of the commission. In submitting replies from the commission, which is an independent body, I do not, of course, accept responsibility for the replies.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): Would the right hon. the Prime Minister advise whether a new gentleman's agreement has been entered into with Japan regarding the entry of Japanese into Canada, as was suggested by his remarks of last session, and if so, will he give the house the particulars regarding same?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I gave the house last session particulars of the revision of the agreement which we had restricting and limiting the number of Japanese immigrants entering Canada. The new arrangement contemplates the admission of not more than 150 per year, which includes women and children as well as men. It was contended by Japan that the old agreement contained no limitation with respect to women and children, but the new provision limits the total immigration to 150 per year.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I understood that there were to be further negotiations.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The arrangement was fully consummated at the time. Advantage was taken of the arrangement whereby each country was to appoint a minister to the country of the other, by providing that the passports of Japanese immigrants coming to Canada would be vised by the Canadian minister residing in Tokyo, or by some member of his staff, and that the provisions would go into full effect as soon as the Canadian legation was opened in Japan.

SUPPLY—ADMINISTRATION OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. H. A. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, some days ago, on a similar motion, I moved an amendment which was in the nature of a vote of censure upon the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot). It was based upon his action in connection with the appointment by the Civil Service Commission of a postmaster at the town of Simcoe and the rejection of that appointment by the Postmaster General. That amendment was defeated. In the debate however many facts which were not known to me when the motion was launched, were brought out, and in the discussion that has taken place during the last few days in committee of the whole on the estimates of the Postmaster General, further information has come to the attention of the house. Had that information been available when I moved the first motion, I would have made it more general in character, and I propose to-day to move another motion. The facts that have been disclosed during the past few days must, I feel sure, have startled the house, the press and the people of Canada. The discussion has not at all been completed; only a comparatively small number of the files that have been brought down have been examined, but sufficient has been disclosed, as I have said, to startle the people of Canada. The background, of course, of all this discussion, is the Civil Service Commission and the attitude of the Postmaster General toward that commission. I do not propose to take up very much time in reviewing the result of the discussion of the past few days, and, indeed, I do not think it is necessary to do so, because the house is thoroughly familiar with what has occurred. As the Postmaster General desires to go to Great Britain as Canada's representative at the postal congress—

Mr. VENIOT: Please do not let that interfere with the accomplishment of your duties.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): —and as under the rules of the house there would be no other opportunity of making a motion such as I have been proposing to make for several days, it appears desirable that the opinion of the house should be at this time crystallized. Therefore, I propose to move an amendment. As I have said, the background of all this is the Civil Service Commission and the attitude of the Postmaster General toward it.

Let me review some of the facts that have been disclosed in the last few days. In thirty-two instances the Postmaster General rejected the appointments of the Civil Service Commission. Some of the files have been examined, but the examination is not completed. I am told by some hon. gentlemen, who are particularly interested in these files and who have examined them, that in some cases returned soldiers have been rejected in favour of civilians. In at least one case, that of Spruce Lake, there were two rejections in succession. In the case of Picton, the Postmaster General rejected the appointment of the Civil Service Commission although that appointment followed the recommendation of his own inspector. A gentleman who had been assistant postmaster for many years was passed over, and another gentleman who had been instrumental in formulating charges against the postmaster, who was dismissed really on a suspicion, was appointed to the office. We have therefore the example of one man being dismissed for partisanship and another appointed for the same reason. I asked for some information regarding the number of appointments made by the Civil Service Commission where dismissals of postmasters had been made, and I refer to sessional paper No. 211, brought down by the Postmaster General. It reads:

Memorandum

On Friday the nineteenth instant Mr. Stewart (Leeds) referring to the number of postmasters dismissed from the 1st October, 1926, to the 1st February, 1928 (421), asked how many of these were appointees of the Civil Service Commission.

The answer is 98.

The answer is 98 up to 1st February, 1928, date mentioned by the hon. member for Leeds, but since February, 1928, to April, 1929, there were eight more—making 106 in all to date.

Sixty-three of these were appointed previously to 1922, but these officers were made departmental appointments on recommendation of the commission which exempted all offices below $400 annual revenue. This leaves 43 dismissals in offices under Civil Service Commission at time of dismissals.

So we have this record of rejections and dismissals which is without a parallel, I think, in the history of Canada—

Mr. DUNNING: Nonsense.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): —under similar circumstances. Since the establishment of the Civil Service Commission with authority over these offices, I challenge the Minister of Railways, who seems to say, "Oh, no," or any other hon. gentleman to point to anything approaching it.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend did not introduce his qualification until I called attention to the nonsensical nature of his statement.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I said: Under similar circumstances.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member did not say it until after I made my interjection.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I want to pass on to the action of the Postmaster General in endeavouring to justify the dismissals and in quoting the opinion of the Department of Justice. Let me point out that he quoted only a portion of that opinion, and that when he was asked to lay it upon the table, it was found that it was only a partial opinion. Later on, when the full opinion was brought down, it was perfectly clear that a very relevant and important part had been left out. I wish to point out that in many instances files laid on the table in answer to orders of the house, were found, upon examination to be incomplete, although we had the assurance of the Postmaster General that they were complete, and he has had on different occasions to supplement these files. In some instances the Postmaster General justified the dismissals of postmasters on the ground that there were shortages, and I think he referred to the shortages in those cases as instances of stealing. In some of these cases the amount was very trifling, but notwithstanding that, the unfortunate postmaster or postmistress was dismissed. We had disclosed to us yesterday in connection with the St. John post office an instance in which an inspector had appropriated to his own use moneys that had been paid to him, and had made inaccurate and misleading statements in connection with the receipt of those moneys, all of which came to the knowledge of the Postmaster General, but notwithstanding that knowledge, and against the recommendation of the inspector, he ordered the salary of this man to be increased and appointed him to a position of superior responsibility. Apparently it is a crime for a postmaster in a small office to be a little short in his accounts when an inspector calls, but it is a matter of merit for an inspector himself to withhold and misappropriate public moneys. The one case calls for condemnation, the other calls for commendation.

The Civil Service Commission was established in an honest and serious attempt by the Canadian people to get rid of the undoubted evils of patronage that existed, and it has in a large measure accomplished the desired result. The action of the Postmaster General and his record in reference to the Civil Service Commission is one of utter disregard, one of defiance, and I would say one of contempt. He has done a great deal to impair the efficiency of the Civil Service Commission and to render its work impossible. I may say to him that if you leave out the patronage-mongers and the camp-followers, the Civil Service Commission occupies a very high place in the esteem of the Canadian people, and they are determined, Mr. Speaker, that that commission shall have the chance to function. They are determined on that course in the interests of the people at large, for the security of the public service and for the permanence and efficiency of the service as a whole. The Postmaster General is the champion political executioner of Canada, and I want to tell him that the people of Canada are not yet ready to accept the decision of a dictator in any department of the government of Canada. We do not want a Mussolini in this country, and we expect that the Postmaster General shall follow and have regard for the statutes.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, the serious nature of the amendment which I am about to move because under our rules it may be, and I believe is, treated as a motion of want of confidence in the government; but results more serious than the defeat of this government or the defeat of any government may happen in Canada, and I cannot think of anything that could be more detrimental than that ministers of the crown should openly defy and disregard the statutes of this country. I am reminded of the old maxim, fiat justitia, ruat coelum—let justice be done though the heavens fall. The Postmaster General has brought upon himself any criticism that may have been offered in this house. He has brought that criticism upon himself by his own action and by his attitude in this house and in relation to the criticisms that have been offered. I therefore submit for the approval of this house an amendment which I think will commend itself to the judgment of hon. members, and I hope that notwithstanding political exigencies many of the members on the other side may feel justified in supporting it because it is based upon the facts that have been disclosed here, and it is mild and moderate in its terms. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that if this amendment is rejected here, we must carry it in

appeal to the great jury of the people of this country. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Stinson):

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

In the opinion of this house, after consideration in the committee of supply of the estimates of the Post Office Department, it is apparent the administration of that department by the present Postmaster General has been characterized by inefficiency, disregard of the provisions of the Civil Service Act, the Post Office Act and other statutory authority, and merits the disapproval of this house.

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, in rising to reply to the argument advanced by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart), may I be allowed to point out to the house that while in his amendment he has contented himself with certain general statements with regard to the Postmaster General, his inefficiency, his disregard of the provisions of the Civil Service Act, the Post Office Act and other statutory authority—I wonder if there is any other statute he could have quoted—he states that for the reasons thus given my administration merits the disapproval of the house.

The hon. gentleman has not undertaken to enlighten this house as to the way in which my administration of the department has been inefficient. He has taken very good care not to point out in what particular I have violated the provisions of the Civil Service Act or of the Post Office Act. During the debate that took place while my estimates were before the committee of the whole house, we dealt with certain phases of the amendment which has just been moved, and it is not my intention to repeat or to deal at all with the arguments I then advanced on the points at issue in an attempt to defend my course as Postmaster General.

But there are one or two points which I think I should bring out. I have been told, and it has often been repeated here—in fact, the hon. member for Leeds referred to it in passing this afternoon—that in many cases I disregarded the certificates issued by the Civil Service Commission. I have rejected, Mr. Speaker, for very valid reasons thirty-two certificates issued by the Civil Service Commission since I have been at the head of the Post Office Department of Canada. Being at the head of the department I found that, owing to the unworkable system under which the qualification of applicants was attempted to be ascertained, persons were being appointed to the department over which I had the control and administration who, I became convinced, were not able efficiently to carry on the duties of the positions to which they had been appointed. Being in possession of that knowledge it was, and is, my duty not only to myself, not only to the department for the administration of which I am responsible to the people of Canada, but also to the mail service throughout the Dominion that I should reject such appointments. I am not disregarding the Civil Service Act when I do that because the government in 1919 when they amended the old Civil Service Act provided distinctly—placing the authority, it is true, in the hands of the deputy minister—that for sufficient reasons the deputy could reject any appointment made by the commission. It goes as a matter of course that the deputy will not reject unless he has consultation with his minister, and it goes also as a matter of course that the minister is not going to take upon himself the responsibility of rejection unless he is in a position to know what he is doing, so that the responsibility can be accepted and the action defended by him on the floor of parliament. I have authority therefore under the act to exercise the power that was conferred on the Post Office Department—or any other department of the government—to reject a certificate of the Civil Service Commission if I am satisfied, and my deputy is satisfied, that the acceptance of such certificate would not inure to the efficiency of the postal service of the Dominion.

Now, among those thirty-two rejections there were sixteen returned soldiers. And because I had to reject sixteen returned soldiers' certificates I have been accused of being uncharitable. Some of the newspapers said I had a hard heart, others attempted to show that by my actions towards the returned soldiers I have displayed a certain amount of disloyalty to Canada. Mr. Speaker, I need not repeat it, because the other day when I attempted to show what sympathy was in my heart for our returned soldiers, the retort was hurled across the floor of the house that I had spoken only of myself and my family. I considered that retort from the leader of the opposition unworthy of a gentleman occupying the high position that he occupies in this house. I did not refer to personal matters on that occasion for the purpose of lauding my family before the Dominion. There was no need of doing it, Mr. Speaker. The record stands out there before the people of Canada, and they know it, and they know that the Veniot family takes second place to none in its loyalty to British institutions and to the Canadian constitution. Let me say

right here to our friends that the loyalty that is in the breasts of the Acadians is firmer and more firmly grounded than the loyalty that is to-day to be found in and is expounded by our English-speaking people.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. VENIOT: Why do I make that statement? It is this.

An hon. MEMBER: Cheap.

Mr. VENIOT: No, there is no shame in this.

An hon. MEMBER: Cheap.

Mr. VENIOT: No, it is not cheap. You English-speaking people of British descent—

An hon. MEMBER: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. VENIOT: Will the hon. gentleman please keep silence. I did not interrupt anybody on the opposite side when he was speaking. But a reflection has been cast on my loyalty in connection with the administration of the Post Office Department, and I have a perfect right to defend my record.

Mr. ERNST: There is no reflection on any Acadian.

Mr. VENIOT: I am an Acadian—

Mr. ERNST: That is only a coincidence.

Mr. VENIOT: —and I am proud of it. The loyalty—I was going on to say, sir,—which I claim is in the heart of the Acadian must be stronger than that in the heart of the British-born because of the following fact. You of British descent, you who came from the shadows of the old flag to Canada to make your home, are descended from British people, and are loyal by nature. But we Acadians who had to suffer as history shows were a conquered people. After the years rolled by we found that under the British flag we were given rights and privileges, and we became loyal by gratitude; we became loyal because we were grateful to the British crown for the way they treated a conquered people; and I say that a man who becomes loyal through gratitude is firmer in his loyalty than a man who by descent is a British subject.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Will the hon. minister permit me?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it a question of order or of privilege?

Mr. MACDOUGALL: It is a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: A question of privilege?

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Yes. The question of privilege is this. The interpretation placed on the words of the Postmaster General now will be that members of the opposition accuse the Acadian race in this country of dislcyalty.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I object to that.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to see that the hon. gentleman has put a misinterpretation upon my language.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I have put no misinterpretation on the hon. minister's language.

Mr. VENIOT: I certainly did not intend for a moment to show that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, or the Tory party, were attempting anything of the kind. I was merely defending my own course, and dealing with certain statements made—

Mr. MACDOUGALL: That is not called in question at all.

Mr. VENIOT: —that because of my conduct toward the returned soldiers I was not as loyal as I should be to the empire. Why, what does the statement of the Toronto Globe mean? It threw out this taunt: "What has this man Veniot or his family ever done for the British Empire?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, coming down to the cases of the returned soldiers, let me go over a few of them. First, I will take the Hawkesbury case. When I reached Ottawa at the call of the Prime Minister, he conferred upon me the honour of a seat in his cabinet, that of Postmaster General. After being in office a very few months I was informed by my officials that there were several cases left undecided in connection with post office appointments. One of the first brought to my attention was the Hawkesbury case. That is one of the sixteen cases relating to returned soldiers. I found the Hawkesbury post office had become vacant in 1922 or 1923, that advertisements had been circulated to fill the vacancy, and that the matter had been left in abeyance from 1923 until I took charge in September, 1926. It was really later than that, for it was not until some time in January, 1927, that my attention was drawn to this case. A returned soldier by the name of McAllister and another one by the name of Berthiaume had applied for this position, and McAllister had received a certificate from the

Civil Service Commission. I did not think it was incumbent upon me at once to handle a case that had been standing over for five or six years, that former Postmaster Generals had refused to deal with. I wrote to the commission pointing this out and they informed me—I was not then very well acquainted with the act—that under the act before they could proceed to a new advertisement I should have to refuse the certificate that had already been issued by them. I did so and asked that the office be opened anew. The vacancy was again advertised and in reply to the last advertisement there was only one applicant, a man named Berthiaume. He got the position, and he was a returned soldier. That was the case of Hawkesbury.

Now let us take the case of Alexandria. I found when I took charge of this case that it had been standing for two years. Certain applications had been submitted and certain representations made to the Civil Service Commission, and there was on the files of the department an opinion or interpretation asked for of the Justice department as to the reestablishment of a certain one of the candidates in the case. The Department of Justice gave an interpretataion that did not agree with the interpretation laid down by the commission and again there was turmoil. I again cancelled the whole thing and asked for new advertisements. I was not going to mix into this trouble, coming new into the department; I was not going to take upon myself anything left undone by former ministers, things that were not settled in a proper way, especially in this case where there was a dispute touching the interpretation of the act as between the Civil Service Commission, the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice. That place was re-advertised, and it is not yet filled. Other troubles arose in my time—difficulties of bilingualism, difficulties of people demanding that this place, Alexandria, with a large French population, comprising almost if not quite the majority—I am told that the majority of the people are French—should have a bilingual postmaster. During my absence the place was advertised; and from correspondence coming in from different sources in the county wherein Alexandria is situated, as well as from Alexandria itself, the advertisement was issued for bilingual applications. The bilingual advertisement did not run its full course and it was withdrawn, under some protest, during my absence from Ottawa. That case stands today unsettled. And there is the history of the turning-down of a certificate issued in behalf of another returned soldier.

Now let us take New Glasgow, P.Q. It became vacant. A returned soldier named Grattan applied for the position. Grattan was reestablished as a returned soldier, and the widow of the postmaster was also an applicant. She had children to bring up, left in poor circumstances. When the whole situation was reviewed, when I received a certificate from the Civil Service Commission on behalf of Grattan, knowing as I did all the circumstances connected with the case, knowing as was stated in the report that Grattan was reestablished, knowing all this, I refused his certificate. The only other applicant was the widow of the late postmaster and I let the position go to her on choice from the Civil Service Commission, so that she might earn a living for her little family. I felt I was justified, and I feel to-day that I am speaking on behalf of the large body of returned soldiers in Canada when I say that no returned soldier who had gone over to France and fought for liberty and freedom, who had gone and fought for the supremacy of justice, would ever consent, if he were a real returned soldier, to accept the bread from the mouth of that widow and those little children.

Let us come to Enterprise. I am not going to take up much of the time of the house on this case because it was fully discussed on the floor of the house in 1928 while the late lamented member for the county then occupied a seat; I name Dr. Edwards. I went into that case fully. I did refuse a certificate on behalf of Cooper. I pointed out that he had been turned down by the Civil Service Commission in 1921 or 1922 because, on the report of the inspector, he was not considered properly qualified; and the position was given by the commission to a civilian at that time. When this came up again in 1926 and the same Mr. Cooper was an applicant, the report of the inspector in his favour was no better, if not worse, than what it was in 1921 and I felt I was justified under such circumstances in refusing that certificate.

Let us take Brigden. This is a case where a man by the name of Such applied for the position. Mr. Such had come to this country a few years previously with money in his possession. I find no fault with this; I am proud to know that he had it. He came to this country and located at Brigden and he had sufficient money to buy a one-third interest in a large butter or cheese making factory. He became not only its manager but the operator; and under the operations of the factory, with the assistance of two young boys, he was drawing a salary or fee or revenue of

$3,800 a year. Brigden becomes vacant. The salary attached to the office was $960 a year. Mr. Such applied for it and I, having some hesitation about accepting the certificate issued in his favour, looked into the matter. I could not understand how a man drawing a revenue of $3,800 and paying $700 of that for assistance, leaving him a net revenue of $3,100, with one-third of the profit or dividends added to that, should apply for an office that brought in a revenue of only $960. After I had looked into the matter carefully Mr. Such came to my office and interviewed me. It is true he told me that he wanted to give up his position and take this office. I asked him how he expected to make a living out of it. He told me he did not; he could not give all his time to it; and in the report of the inspector he said so at first. But afterwards, when he saw how things were going, he said he would give his time to the office. He intended to engage a young lady by the name of Smith to do the work for him and he would supervise it, paying her $500 a year and putting the balance of $460 in his pocket. Notwithstanding what statements Mr. Such might make to me, I refused to believe that he had any other intention with respect to the office. And the proof of that has lately come out. I was attacked in the press in London—the Free Press especially—in connection with the Brigden case. What did I find? I found, after that attack had appeared, that a reporter of the London Advertiser went down to Brigden and got an interview touching the whole situation. He meets this Miss Smith, who was then married, and she gives a statement over her own signature and published in the London Advertiser, that Mr. Such had made a bargain with her to run the office for him at $500 a year and to take absolute control of it. I refused that certificate and I feel justified in having done so; I have no regret for my action.

Now let me come to the case of St. Boniface; here again we had a mixup. St. Boniface was growing and becoming an important centre and was served directly from the office of Winnipeg; the street distribution of mail in St. Boniface was carried on directly from Winnipeg. The people of St. Boniface were loudly proclaiming their rights; they claimed that their street distribution should be carried on from their own office and that they should not be connected at all with Winnipeg. The gentleman who then was postmaster of that place was dismissed for certain irregularities, and he was incompetent to carry on an office like the St. Boniface office if it were to be separated from the Winnipeg office. It became necessary to appoint a man; advertisements were published and applications received from two men, one named Pelletier and the other named Vermander, the first a returned soldier and the second a civilian. Vermander had six or seven years experience as an assistant postmaster, and at that time was employed in one of the banking institutions in St. Boniface. Pelletier had no post office experience whatever and was not sufficiently qualified with regard to education to undertake the administration of such an important office as St. Boniface.

On my own initiative I collected all the available information in order to satisfy myself that I would be doing no injustice to this man Pelletier, and I found that Vermander could speak four different languages, English, French, German and Swiss, all of which were in use in that district. Knowing that St. Boniface would become a very important office and that it would be necessary to have in charge a man of the highest ability and with the greatest possible experience I refused the certificate which had been issued in favour of Pelletier, the returned soldier. Before doing so, however, and after consultation with the postmaster at Winnipeg, I offered Mr. Pelletier a position in the Winnipeg office which he could fill, to which was attached a good salary, and which carried with it a chance of promotion. Mr. Pelletier refused to accept that position, so I felt that I had no alternative but to ask the Civil Service Commission to make another choice, and their second choice was Mr. Vermander.

Now let us take the case of Brussels, in the province of Ontario. When I assumed control of the Post Office Department I found that Brussels was in an even worse turmoil than Hawkesbury or Alexandria; I found that the office had been vacant for a number of years, with a temporary postmaster in charge, and I found that an investigation had been held by the Post Office Department on the complaint of a good many of the residents of that place, in which they stated that the inspector who had been sent to examine the applicants had not done justice in that he had discriminated against certain applicants. This investigation was carried on before I took charge of the department but no decision was reached; the matter was left in abeyance with the result that late in 1927 I discovered the embroglio, if I might use the term, and undertook to straighten it out. I found that a Mr. Scott, the son of the late postmaster,

was in charge of the office, and I found that a returned soldier with a disability, named Kuntz, had received a certificate from the Civil Service Commision. That certificate never had been acted upon, so I communicated with the Civil Service Commission and as a result decided that the certificate should be refused, advertisements issued, and returned soldiers and civilians given an opportunity to apply for the position.

The office was advertised vacant some four or five months ago, and several applications were received, among them one from a man named Bell, a returned soldier. Strenuous efforts were made, letters were written to me, and influence was used to have me advise the Civil Service Commission to appoint Scott, the assistant postmaster and son of the late postmaster, over the head of a returned soldier. The file will show that I wrote to the different parties who communicated with me stating that if a returned soldier who was physically fit and able to carry on the duties of the office applied for the position he would get the appointment if he obtained the certificate of the Civil Service Commisison. The examinations were held, and the Civil Service Commissison issued a certificate in favour of Bell, the returned soldier. That certificate was accepted and Bell is now the postmaster at Brussels.

Now let us come to East St. John, in my own province; this is another case which occurred in my own time. There was no mixup at this place; everything was plain sailing; the vacancy was created when the postmaster East St. John was found dead. I will say no more about that at the moment. The vacancy was created and a man by the name of Macdonald was appointed temporary postmaster. The vacancy was advertised and two applications were received, one from Macdonald and one from a man named John W. Mackenzie, a returned soldier. After examination and report by the Civil Service Commision Mackenzie was given the certificate. I knew the record of this man, who was connected with the Canadian National Railways, and knowing that record I felt that I should ask for a further report before accepting the certificate. So the inspector was asked for a further report and it was pointed out to him by myself why that report was requested. I felt that with the record on the files of the Canadian National Railways, and from my personal knowledge of the record of this man, he would not be a fit and proper person to meet the public as a postmaster. The files of the Canadian National Railways were produced and forwarded to Ottawa, and Mr. Mackenzie took up the matter with Canadian Legion headquarters at Ottawa, through the St. John branch of that organization. Mr. Herwig, secretary of the Canadian Legion, came to see me about the matter and I showed him the file and asked him to examine it. I showed him also a letter which bore out what was contained in the file with reference to this man's qualifications for meeting the public. He had written me a letter in which he stated that Inspector Peck had discriminated against him on behalf of Macdonald and he said he had no faith in our inspector. Here is a man, an applicant for a position, writing me a letter in which he says that he has no faith in the very man under whom he has to work and under whom he had to administer that office. I placed this matter before Mr. Herwig and he made the following suggestion: Will you agree to name a man from your own department, have the Civil Service Commission name a man and the legion at East St. John name a third man; let them take the file, let them go to St. John and bring Mackenzie before them and if they decide, after going into this matter, that he is a fit and proper person to administer that important office, will you appoint him? I said: Yes, I will accept the certificate. Mr. Herwig informed me that the Civil Service Commission had told him that having given their verdict they would not interfere any further in the case. When Mr. Herwig had given me the result of his communication with the commission he made the following suggestion: that I name a man and he would pick a man from the legion in St. John. I agreed to that, and he brought me two names which were recommended by the legion in St. John, one a returned soldier, a colonel in the army, and the other a civilian. I then appointed Mr. Green, superintendent of the Quebec district, to go to St. John and meet this returned soldier chosen by the legion and have Mr. Mackenzie appear before them when they could go into the case and make a report. They made the following unanimous report: After having interviewed Mr. Mackenzie and having gone into the case fully, they were of the opinion that Mr. Mackenzie was not a fit and proper person, owing to his temperamental conditions, to meet the public in the capacity of postmaster at East St. John. I, therefore, refused the certificate.

The next case is that of Oliver, B.C. This is another certificate which I refused. The certificate had been issued to a returned soldier, but the one who got it was also a returned soldier. A vacancy occurred at

Oliver, B.C., and James K. Anderson applied for the position. Anderson and another returned soldier both got equal ratings, but information reached my department that Mr. Anderson had since been employed by the telephone company as local manager. I thought that there being another returned soldier in the field who was free and his own master I should not have as postmaster at Oliver a man who would be subject to two masters, and I refused Mr. Anderson's certificate and the other returned soldier got the position.

I know I am taking up a good deal of the time of the house, but I think it is worth while. The next case is that of Norton in the province of New Brunswick. This position was declared vacant before by time and after an investigation as to political partisanship against the postmaster name Price. When I entered office I found that a returned soldier by the name of Ward had received a certificate from the Civil Service Commission. Considerable turmoil had been created before I took charge. I intended to start with a clean sheet and I declared that this vacancy still existed and asked for new advertisements. Some time elapsed before this was done because the case at Norton was not called to my attention until some time in 1928. In the meantime Mr. Price, who was a very old man, was left in charge of the office although he had been found guilty of political partisanship. I understand that Mr. Ward was the victim of a very serious automobile accident.

Mr. JONES: It was another returned soldier by the name of Harmer.

Mr. VENIOT: I am coming to that case. I declared the office vacant and called for new advertisements. The Civil Service Commission advised me that if I wanted to do that I would have to dispose of the certificate already issued in favour of Ward. I did so, and the vacancy was advertised and I believe Ward is an applicant as well as Harmer. At the present time a civilian is temporarily in charge of the office with the distinct understanding that it is only temporary and that returned soldiers with qualifications are to have preference. That is the Norton case as it now stands and no decision has been reached as yet in that case.

The next case is Wabamun in Alberta. A certificate was issued in favour of R. W. Thursfield, which certificate has been refused by me. The report of the inspector shows that this man had only lately arrived in the town and was very little known. The other applicant was a returned soldier by the name of E. B. Howley who was an eighty per cent disability case. The inspector reported that Howley's personality and mentality were such that he would not be suitable for such a position. A man by the name of White was acting postmaster and was rated very high for efficiency.

The next case is that of Macoun, Saskatchewan. The inspector's report in this case shows that Harry Huntley, a returned soldier, had rather a bad character before enlistment and apparently had not mended his ways since his return. I hate to say this, but the report shows that he had a bad character before enlisting. He was the only returned soldier and I did not feel like going to the extent of accepting a returned soldier for the position in the face of a report of that kind.

The next case is that of Woodbridge, Ont. The certificate of James Morgan, soldier, was rejected. The certificate was issued in 1922, four years and some months before I took charge of the department. I found another mix-up here and I refused the certificate so that the case would be reopened to the public. When I came into office in 1926 I found this: There was another man who had been acting since the first vacancy. J. J. Dean was a temporary employee in the office at Toronto, and when the vacancy occurred he, having experience, was brought from Toronto to his home town and placed in temporary charge in the office at Woodbridge. He was a man with a year or two of experience, a returned soldier who had done his bit at the front and had come back with a good character. My attention was drawn to the matter, and this certificate was refused. I may say that in the Woodbridge case as in the case of Alexandria, a dispute arose between the Civil Service Commission, the Post Office Department—this was before my time—and the Justice department. The Justice department gave a ruling and an interpretation that in their opinion Morgan was properly reestablished and had no preference under the law. I found further that the Civil Service Commission had named Morgan and that one of the reasons they gave before the Justice department for issuing the certificate to Morgan was, as I discovered later, that the building in which Morgan was to have the office was better located. The Justice department rightly pointed out to the Civil Service Commission that they had no right whatever under the act to base the issue of the certificate upon post office location in any section; that belonged to the department. On those grounds I refused to accept Morgan and a returned soldier named J. J. Dean is the

one who has the position. He is a 30 per cent disability man. The certificate was issued to Dean in May, 1928.

I think I have taken up sufficient of the time of the house. I have reviewed fourteen, fifteen or sixteen of these cases to show that I have not disregarded the Civil Service Commission in my conduct of the department; that I was perfectly justified in every case where I refused a certificate appointing a returned soldier, and that in many of those cases where a certificate was refused in favour of one returned soldier, it was always another returned soldier who got the position.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Would the minister kindly deal with the Spruce Lake case?

Mr. VENIOT: The Spruce Lake case does not come under the returned soldier class.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It is one of the rejections.

Mr. VENIOT: I know it is. It involves one of the sixteen civilians and I feel I should have no qualms of conscience when I reject a civilian in favour of another civilian, especially when I am satisfied that I am doing right. I have dealt only with the cases of returned soldiers so as to prove to the house and the country that the devil is not as black as he is painted.

While I am on the question of returned soldiers, let me say that since I have been at the head of this department, fourteen returned soldiers have been appointed to the head office staff, and I have given positions to 996 returned soldiers in post offices as mail carriers, letter distributors and temporary employees. My hon. friends opposite cannot show any such record, although they have accused me of being unfriendly to the returned soldiers.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): How many of those were appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. VENIOT: There were 164 appointed by the commission in the case of straight post office appointments, and 82 by your humble servant. It is not reasonable to suppose that there is a returned soldier for every post office vacancy throughout the Dominion. Many post office vacancies occur in outlying and country districts where the salary is so small that a returned soldier would not be looking for a position of that kind. Consequently, those offices would have to go to civilians. Let me say further, as regards the dismissals to which my hon. friends refer, and this terrible wielder of the political axe: in 1928 I discussed the question of 421 dismissals and I think clearly proved to the house that not one-half, not one-quarter were dismissals along political lines; that there were grave and proper reasons for many of them. Since that time there have been 84 dismissals. I have the record under my hand showing 473 previously and 84 since, making 557 changes and dismissals in post offices throughout Canada since I have had the honour to be appointed to the head of the Post Office Department. In regard to the last 84 who were dismissed, what do I find? I find that 40 were dismissed for irregularities, shortages and incompetence, the list being as follows:

Causes	Number of dismissals
Irregularities and mismanagement	14
Shortages	13
Arrested violation of civic laws	5
Advanced age	1
Office closed	2
Non-performance of duty	1
Unsuitability of postmaster	1
Political interference under investigation	3
Total	40

That is 40 out of the 84. The balance were dismissed for departmental reasons, in some cases on account of unsuitability of site; in others, in order to give, in the opinion of the department, a better service to the public. Who is best able to judge whether a postmaster is giving to the public the service that he should give, if it is not the officials of the department and the Postmaster General guided by them? Am I as Postmaster General to be guided by the advise of my hon. friends on the other side and to decide according to their dictum what a postmaster should be and how he should administer the office over which he is placed in charge? This country would be in a pretty mess if the government had to depend upon the advice and reasoning of our hon. friends opposite in order to carry on the administration of affairs. What would become of responsible government? I have taken some of their advice, and I am sorry to-day because I did so. I foolishly listened to the advice of some of our hon. friends opposite and there are some of them who will say: Yes, when we went to see Veniot, he treated us right. There are many over there who are honest and I think they will say this when the time comes. That being the case, how can it be expected that we on this side of the house are going to be guided always by what our hon. friends opposite advance when we know it is certainly advanced not in the interest of this party but rather for their own political aggrandizement? There is one thing that

seems very singular to me in connection with the attacks that have been made upon my department and myself, because evidently the department of the Postmaster General has been singled out as that department which they can perhaps attack to the best advantage to themselves. Why? Because there are 38,750 employees in the Dominion of Canada under the Postmaster General. The Post Office Department handles resources of revenue, including savings bank deposits and so on, ranging from $41,000,000 or $42,000,000 to $50,000,000 and more. We have from 12,000 to 13,000 postmasters distributed throughout the length and breadth of Canada. Our communications are with the entire world. No department of the government comes more directly under the public eye, and in the case of no department is there closer intimacy with the public. And, sir, it is significant, in view of the attacks that have been made in this house upon the Postmaster General and upon the administration of his department, and in view also of the attempt to create a scandal in connection with the post office of the city of St. John, that our friends opposite have been unable to find anything that resembles even the shadow of a scandal, except some irregularity in connection with the St. John post office. Having had three years of experience in this department, I am in a position to appreciate to the very fullest degree the responsibilities which weigh upon my shoulders. Although I have been accused of inefficiency, it is not my purpose to take up the time of the house in an attempt to outline the great improvements that have taken place in the department since your humble servant has been at the head of it. I am going to let the public judge of that, because they are the best judges.

Remember, I want it distinctly understood that I do not attribute to myself the whole credit for the reorganization and the immense improvements that have taken place in the department—for the extension of the rural mail routes, the extension of the railway mail service, the inauguration of the air mail service, the delivery of mail in winter time to those isolated spots which had never before received mail during that season, thus bringing comfort to the people of the Magdalen islands, the north shore of the gulf of St. Lawrence, the northern sections throughout the Mackenzie river district, Cold lake, Flin-Flon and away up to the Yukon—all during the administration of your humble servant.

An hon. MEMBER: And penny postage.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. VENIOT: I am not going to touch on that because penny postage speaks for itself. It is a means of binding closer together the bonds of empire throughout the whole British realm. While I do not desire to claim any great credit for the improvements that have taken place, I do wish to pay a tribute to the able and conscientious and devoted men who work under the present Postmaster General. I wish to pay a tribute to their honesty, and when hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to reflect upon the honesty of the administration of the department, they are reflecting more upon these faithful servants than upon the Postmaster General. I think it is my duty to stand in my place in this house and point this out, that there could be no more faithful servants in any department of this or any government than those who are to-day working under the control of the Postmaster General. At every turn, at every opportunity and on every occasion, when a policy is laid down by the government and they are requested to carry it out, they devote themselves night and day to seeing that those policies are put into effect, and they spare neither time nor labour to ensuring that under those policies the best possible service shall be given to the people of Canada by the postal department of this country.

In my closing remarks I wish to refer to something that was stated by the hon. member for Leeds. He made a reference to the difficulties at the St. John post office, which were discussed on the floor of this house last night in committee of supply. It will be remembered that I stated that long before any mention was made in this house of any difficulties at St. John, I had taken up the task of having that office thoroughly investigated. When first the rumour even of irregularities reached my ears, I endeavoured to get all the information possible so that I could see exactly how matters stood, and, if it became necessary because of contradictory statements and contradictory evidence, institute an investigation that would bring matters to a proper head. That investigation has been going on, started in part in St. John through disciplinary measures, and laying the foundation here in the office at Ottawa, getting the proper evidence and information along the line of reported irregularities.

The other day when the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) brought the question up on the floor of this house he stated, as it was his right to do, that he had received information which pointed to very grave irregularities in the postal district of the province of New Brunswick at St. John.

and I was asked by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) if I would bring down the correspondence in connection with the matter. At the time we were in a heated discussion on some other subject, and I did say to the hon. member for York-Sunbury that I would bring down the correspondence, but the next day, when the orders of the day were called, I stated to the house that while I had made that promise the day before, in view of the fact that an investigation was being carried on by the officials of my department in connection with the alleged irregularities and in connection with the disciplinary measures to be taken, I did not feel justified in placing these papers on the table of the house, and I was borne out in that attitude by the leader of the opposition and by both sides of the house, as can be seen from their statements. I was then requested to have the original files placed in the custody of some of my officials so that a committee of our friends on the other side of the house— I do not know whether the word "committee" was used—could get together and examine the original files in the custody of my officials. I said yes, and that evening at eight o'clock I produced all those files in my own room in the charge of three officials from the different branches of the department connected with this matter. The gentlemen of the opposition, some six or seven in number, assembled in that room, and I left my officials with them. I told the officials to produce absolutely everything, give them everything, show everything on those files, and I left them in the hands of that committee. I went further even than that. When I saw that they wanted to go into those files minutely and believed that they did not have time to do it with only the originals in their possession, I had copies made of the originals. Those copies were handed to these six or seven gentlemen in that room that night, and the promise was given there that those copies would not be used publicly but only for their own personal information. Yet when the matter was brought up yesterday, without any notice to me on the part of our friends opposite, it came like a bolt from the blue to hear those files quoted from in the house. I thought that that was a bargain that would be adhered to, and I consented to give those official files—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. STEVENS: I am quite certain that the Postmaster General has no desire to do an injustice to the leader of the opposition or to members on this side of the house.

Mr. VENIOT: Not at all.

Mr. STEVENS: I think he will recall that the point in the whole request for these files was this: There are a great many files, and the Postmaster General intimated that it would take some time and a good deal of labour to copy them. My leader said that in order to avoid the necessity of copying files which might not be required, members from this side of the house would examine the original files and request such files as were needed in dealing with this question. It was with that distinct understanding that these files were so examined.

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. gentleman tells me he is speaking on behalf of his leader I will accept his word, but I understood it differently.

Mr. STEVENS: May I add one further word. I direct this more to the government as a whole. The opposition, or any member of the house, is entitled to the examination of the files of any of the various departments of the government.

Mr. VENIOT: I am not going to raise any point of order on that, because I have my opinion. I think to a great extent I am right when I say that confidential files between officials of a department are not open to the public.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: But there are none of these confidential.

Mr. VENIOT: I am not going to raise any discussion on it. That is the position I take. I make reference to the point because it shows that I have nothing to fear, nothing to hide; no matter who is guilty of irregularities, I produce everything and hide nothing.

Let me go on. Yesterday in the discussion the hon. leader of the opposition read from the files and placed them on Hansard. I have no fault to find with him, absolutely none, except this, that confidential reports between officials never should have been placed on Hansard, because the very moment you do that you violate the confidence within that department where officials have to make secret reports, and you are breaking down the discipline that should exist there. But those confidential reports are on Hansard now, and the leader of the opposition has taken the responsibility of placing them there.

He has assumed another responsibility. From the files as he found them he felt that he was justified last night on the floor of this house in charging Mr. Griffith, the inspector in question, with being an embezzler and a

thief. That is a serious charge to make. Up to that moment, not having completed the investigation, not having sufficient evidence to prove to me that there was even anything approaching such delinquency, I felt justified in keeping Mr. Griffith in the position that he occupied until the completion of the investigation that I am carrying on. But the leader of the opposition, occupying the responsible position that he occupies in this house, and before the country, having stood in his place and made a charge of that kind, claiming it is based upon the papers found in those files, I considered that the case had reached the stage where on that charge there must be action taken, and this morning after reviewing the whole situation, after weighing carefully the charges made upon the floor of this house, after considering from whose lips those charges had fallen, and bearing in mind the responsible position of the gentleman who made them, I authorized my deputy to wire the suspension from duty of Mr. Griffith. To-day he awaits the result of the investigation of the charges made by the hon. leader of the opposition. Let me repeat, the investigation was going on just the same. It had been started long before the case was brought up in the house. I had felt right along that I should not suspend this man, but once a responsible member of this house had stood in his place and accused this man of being a thief and an embezzler, then upon the strength of that statement I suspended Mr. Griffith. To-day he is in the service, if you will, but not performing any duties until the result of the investigation which the department is now carrying on is known.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been accused of being the champion political executioner of the Dominion. Well, I have only this to say, that if, because of some political dismissals which it is claimed I have made I am to be styled the political executioner of the Dominion, I should like to find a name applicable to our friends opposite. I do not think any suitable word has yet been discovered in the English language that would adequately describe the executionary methods of hon gentlemen opposite. I will not attempt to go over their record, I have gone over it before. But their record of dismissals between 1912 and 1917 is such that when it is held up to the public gaze there is no wind strong enough to prevent it from stinking in the nostrils of the Canadian public. That record stands out conspicuously, and you can read it, I would not say in golden letters, but in large letters. The Tories of Canada were from 1912 to 1917 the political executioners par excellence. Even when they were in power during the short three months from July 1 to September 14 they were active in nearly every county in the Dominion. In the county of Northumberland every fish warden was dismissed by telegraph. Throughout the whole province of New Brunswick every returning officer was dismissed by one fell swoop of the pen. The only one who was left in office was the hon. gentleman who now represents the riding of Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Foster). He was then sheriff of the county, and our Tory friends offered him the position, but he refused to act under the "shadow government," and to-day, as I have said, he is the member for that county in this house. Our friends opposite tried to buy him over by offering him the position, but he was too manly to accept it. He preferred to go down fighting rather than accept a position under our Tory friends. Let me go further. Every returning officer in the Dominion was dismissed by one fell swoop of the pen by our Tory friends. They were not satisfied with playing the political game along the line of dismissal of officials, they were not satisfied with the dismissal of every returning officer so that they could have the whole election machinery in their hands, but they undertook to influence the returning officers and forced them in many cases to divide up the polls in certain sections in order to segregate the Liberals and get a majority for the Tories. That is what our hon. friends opposite did, the hon. gentlemen who to-day call the Postmaster General the political executioner of Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, having exposed my friends opposite to that extent, I will close my remarks with the following statement. I have been Postmaster General of Canada since September 23, 1926. If I am to judge, and I do not say this in any laudatory mood at all, or in any boasting mood—no, I leave the boasting to our Tory friends; they are used to it—I am not saying it in any boasting mood at all, but if I am to judge by such newspapers as the Montreal Standard, the Montreal Star, and the French organ of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, L'Evénement, Veniot is a pretty good postmaster general. You will not see the Montreal Star denouncing Veniot for inefficiency in his department. On the contrary, Tory as it is, dyed-in-the-wool as it is, it is fair enough to recognize the ability and efficiency of a man when they see it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. VENIOT: Our friends will not accept the Montreal Star. Then I must take it

they are repudiating the Star. They are repudiating it because of its editorial utterances, pointing out the efficiency of the Post Office Department under the Postmaster General.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. VENIOT: Well, I am glad my hon. friends have taken that stand, and no doubt the Montreal Star will take notice of it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the house for the kind attention given me. There are a great many more things I could deal with, and I know I have some staunch and true friends; if not many on the other side, I know I have quite a few on this side, and I think I can leave any further defence of the department in the hands of those who will follow me.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY: (Peace River): Some days ago I called the attention of the house to a case in which I thought the Postmaster General had violated the spirit of the Civil Service Act, and I wish to refer now to another case, one which the minister has mentioned to-day, namely, the Wabamun post office in Alberta. The Postmaster General stated that he rejected the appointee of the Civil Service Commission because he had "only lately" come into the district, and I take it that in his opinion the man was not a bona fide resident of the district. I think I can state in ten or fifteen minutes the facts in connection with this case, and in any event I shall do so as briefly as I can.

The post office at Wabamun is of course an office to which appointments must be made by the Civil Service Commission. In 1927 the then postmaster, Mr. McCusker, was dismissed from the office. He was a returned soldier, but he got into trouble with Mr. Henry White, from whom he rented the post office. He wanted leave to move to another building and this was granted him, but it was afterwards refused. He moved anyway and was dismissed. With that phase of the matter I will not deal this afternoon. The Civil Service Commission was of course notified of the fact that a new postmaster was required at Wabamun. They advertised for applicants and received half a dozen applications. The applicants were as follows—and they are placed here in order of merit so far as their qualifications for the position were concerned:

1. Henry White.
2. Sidney Robert Walley Thursfield.
3. Charles McCusker.
4. Edward Beaufoy Hawley.
5. Mrs. Louisa McCusker.
6. Arthur Sunley.

The following were eliminated: Mr. Henry White, because he was not a returned soldier; Charles McCusker, a returned soldier, rejected because he was a recently dismissed postmaster; Edward B. Hawley, "O.A.S.," in regard to whom the inspector who conducted the personal investigation states:

His personality and mentality are such that he would not be suitable.

Henry White, owing to the regulations giving preference to qualified "O.A.S." applicants, was rejected. And Mrs. Louisa McCusker and Arthur Sunley were rejected for the same reason. The only remaining candidate was Mr. Thursfield. The record states:

Mr. Thursfield, forty-two years of age, married and father of two children, is a British subject, born in England, and has been in Canada twenty-two years, nineteen months of which have been spent at Wabamun.

I wish the house to pay particular attention to the fact that he was a resident of Wabamun, receiving his mail through the Wabamun post office for nineteen months; yet he was rejected as having only recently arrived in Wabamun. For nineteen months he had been established in a business way, and I cannot see why he can be excluded from the list of bona fide residents of the post office district of Wabamun, entitling him to his status as an applicant under subsection 3 of section 21 of the act. The record goes on:

Education: High school, three years; Brandon college; one year.

Experience: Stenographer, two years; farmer.

O.A.S.: England and France; gassed and trench fever, for which he is in receipt of a 10 per cent pension; farming previous to enlistment and states he is unable to pursue efficiently this calling.

Remarks of inspector: Applicant is a newcomer to the district and practically unknown.

In the event of his appointment, Mr. Thursfield would provide suitable accommodation and location for the post office. He is well recommended.

This is signed "C.H.B., Assistant Secretary and Chief Examiner." Mr. Thursfield was appointed by the Civil Service Commission. I do not think it is necessary to cite again the fact that he was in receipt of a pension, but I want to read the report of the oral interview of Mr. Thursfield by the Civil Service Commission, appearing on page 15 of this file:

Postmastership of Wabumun, Alberta

1. Name of Applicant: Sidney Robert Walley Thursfield.
2. Address of Applicant: Wabamun, Alberta.
3. Age: 42.
4. Length of residence in the district served by the office in question: 19 months.
5. Is applicant a patron of the P.O. in question? Yes. If so, since what date? For 19 months.

6. What seems to be the educational qualifications of the applicant? Good.

7. Have you any information as to the character and habits of the applicant? Any information obtainable good.

8. Do you know anything in the life of the applicant which in your opinion would render him ineligible for the postmastership? No.

9. Along what lines has been the past experience of the applicant? Stenography and farming.

10. The various characteristics of the applicant impress me as being Very Good, Above Average, Average or Poor, as rated hereunder:

Characteristics—	Rating
Appearance..	Average
Bearing..	Average
Physique..	Above average
Tact..	Average
Conversation..	Average
Mentality..	Average
Personality..	Average

12. How does the accommodation and location offered by this applicant compare with that of the other candidates? Location about 100 yards from present site.

13. Do you consider this candidate sufficiently qualified as to education, experience, personality, character and integrity, accommodation and locality, to meet the needs of the office in question? (Yes or No.) If No, specify your reasons: Yes, applicant is, however, a newcomer to the district and is practically unknown.

The other day the Minister of National Defence and several other members of the house quoted the opinion given in 1919 by the Deputy Minister of Justice, and I wish to read just one section of it:

The fact that the man selected is not as good as his predecessor; or, in your words, not a man of reputation or outstanding ability, would not, I should think, in the absence of other objections, justify the deputy to reject him, provided we have passable qualifications.

I leave it to any member of the house, after what I have read as to the qualifications of this man Thursfield, who was appointed by the Civil Service Commission to the postmastership at Wabamun, to say whether or not he had passible qualifications. The only thing which might be at all questionable is the fact that he was unknown. But an examination of the file shows that two factions were fighting bitterly for the post office at Wabamun, and I submit that a man who was not connected with either of these factions, but was carrying on a business in the district really possessed an additional qualification for the position. No one with any intelligence would have any trouble in mastering the details of the office and becoming known to the patrons in a very short time. Notwithstanding this fact, the Postmaster General arrogated to himself—that is the only word that I can think of—the right to reject this applicant under section 24 of the Civil Service Act, a right which in my judgment he was not justified in exercising in view of the fact that he had in his possession the opinion of that section given by the Deputy Minister of Justice in 1919.

Mr. RALSTON: What was the ground of rejection?

Mr. KENNEDY: I will read it; it is marked No. 50 in sessional paper No. 235 of this year:

Ottawa, February 18, 1928.

P. T. Coolican, Esq.,
Acting Deputy Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—

With further reference to the question of the vacancy in the Wabamun post office, I beg to say that in looking over the report of the inspector and finding that he states that Mr. Thursfield has only lately arrived in Wabamun and is not very well known, I have decided not to accept the certificate issued in his favour. There seems to be another returned soldier by the name of Ed. B. Hawley, who has a disability of 80 per cent. In this case the report of the inspector is not at all favourable, because he states as follows: "His personality and mentality are such that he would not be suitable," and he further states that his physical condition is rated as poor.

I further find that Mr. White, the present acting postmaster is rated as first in post office experience and efficiency and in my opinion this is the person who should get the nomination if we are to keep up the efficiency of our service.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) P. J. Veniot.

If it is open to the Postmaster General or anyone else to say that a person with nineteen months' residence in a district must be regarded as only lately arriving there; if it is open to the Postmaster General to say that this man is not qualified—I suppose under subsection 3 of section 21 of the Civil Service Act, which confines applicants to bona fide residents—you can make any section of the act mean whatever you like. I submit that it is absolutely impossible to say that this man was only recently arrived in the sense that would exclude him from being acceptable as the postmaster of the village of Wabamun.

Further, in this letter the Postmaster General practically rules out everyone with the exception of Mr. White, and makes it plain to the commission that as far as he is concerned Henry White is the only acceptable applicant.

Mr. THORSON: What did the commission do?

Mr. KENNEDY: The commission appointed Henry White. I am told that Henry

White was the Liberal candidate in the constituency of Lac Ste. Anne in the last provincial election in Alberta. I have here the Canadian Parliamentary Guide for 1928, where I find that the candidates in that constituency were M. C. McKeen, E. R. Barker and Henry White. So I submit that as far as I can see, and as this file reveals, this is purely a case of exercising political patronage, ruling out the commission and ruling out the applicants who were returned soldiers. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, serious as this amendment is, I feel that I must support it. In this corner of the house we have taken the stand that all appointments should be made by the Civil Service Commission and that all or practically all those civil servants who are now appointed by other means than the Civil Service Commission should be brought under the scope and operation of the act. As far as this motion is concerned, I must support it because of the experiences I have had in cases with which I have been familiar and which I have personally investigated and followed up. If these facts do not reveal a case of political patronage in the appointment of a postmaster in the village of Wabamun I do not think it is possible to establish such a case anywhere.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Stewart (Leeds), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Barber,
Bell (Hamilton West),
Bell (St. Antoine),
Black (Yukon),
Black (Halifax),
Bowen,
Boys,
Brady,
Campbell,
Cantley,
Casselman,
Charters,
Clark,
Cowan,
Dickie,
Edwards (Waterloo South),
Embury,
Ernst,
Esling,
Evans,
Fraser,
Gardiner,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Hanson,
Heaps,
Irvine,
Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria),
Jones,
Kaiser,
Kellner,
Kennedy,
Lawson,
Lucas,
Luchkovich,
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdonald (Richmond-West Cape Breton),
Macdougall,
MacLaren,
MacNutt,
McGibbon,
McQuarrie,
McRae,
Manion,
Matthews,
Maybee,
Peck,
Perley (Sir George),
Pettit,
Plunkett,
Quinn,
Rennie,
Ross (Kingston City),
Ryerson,
Senn,
Short,
Sinclair (Wellington North),
Smoke,
Speakman,
Spence,
Spencer,
Spotton,
Stevens,
Stewart (Leeds),
Stinson,
Stirling,
Thompson,
White (London).—68.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead,
Allan,
Baldwin,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Benoit,
Bettez,
Blanchard,
Bock,
Bothwell,
Bouchard,
Bourassa,
Bradette,
Brown,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Cayley,
Delisle,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Donnelly,
Dubuc,
Elliott,
Euler,
Fafard,
Ferland,
Fiset (Sir Eugene),
Forke,
Foster,
Gershaw,
Gervais,
Glen,
Goulet,
Gray,
Hall,
Heenan,
Hepburn,
Howard,
Howden,
Ilsley,
Jacobs,
Jelliff,
Jenkins,
Johnston (Long Lake),
King (Kootenay East),
Lacombe,
Laflamme,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Letellier de St. Just,
Macdonald (Glengarry),
MacLean (Prince),
McLean (Melfort),
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McMillan,
McPhee,
Malcolm,
Marcil,
Mercier (St. Henri),
Millar,
Milne,
Morin (Bagot),
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Neill,
Parent,
Perras,
Power,
Prévost,
Ralston,
Raymond,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robitaille,
Ross (Moose Jaw),
St-Père,
Sanderson,
Séguin,
Smith (Stormont),
Steedsman,
Stewart (Edmonton West),
Sylvestre,
Taylor,
Thorson,
Totzke,
Vallance,
Veniot,
Young (Saskatoon),
Young (Weyburn).—92.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

King, Mackenzie,
Cannon,
Rinfret,
Dunning,
Morin (St. Hyacinthe),
Sinclair (Queens),
Langlois,
Bissett,
Rhéaume,
Tobin,
Pouliot,
Lacroix,
Ward,
Mercier (Laurier),
Duff,
Fontaine,
Bennett,
Arthurs,
Cahan,
Chaplin,
Ryckman,
Bell (St. John-Albert),
Tummon,
MacDonald,
Church,
Harris,
Lennox,
Rowe,
Garland (Bow River),
Geary,
Smith (Cumberland),
Anderson (Halton),

Chevrier,	Anderson (High Park),
Lovie,	McGregor,
Kay,	Wilson,
Lanctôt,	White (Mount Royal),
Rutherford,	Gott,
Odette,	Robinson,
Cahill,	Simpson,
McDiarmid,	Price,
Dussault,	Cotnam,
Hay,	Hubbs,
McPherson,	Ladner,
Guérin,	Maloney,
Boivin,	Hocken,
Lang,	Young (Toronto),
Bowman,	Hodgins.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was paired with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. DUNNING: I was paired with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. RINFRET: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. TOBIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto-Scarborough (Mr. Harris). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. POULIOT: I was paired with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Lennox). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. WARD: I was paired with the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. ARTHURS: I was paired with the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Morin). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. COTNAM: I was paired with the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Dussault). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BELL (St. John-Albert): I was paired with the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Sinclair). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. TUMMON: I was paired with the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Langlois). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

[Mr. Kennedy.]

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): I was paired with the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Bissett). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON (Toronto-High Park): I was paired with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier), Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GEARY: I was paired with the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): I was paired with the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff), Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): I was paired with the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fontaine). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ROWE: I was paired with the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Lacroix). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

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

Motion (Mr. Robb) agreed to.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Care of patients and medical examination of pensioners, $2,600,000.

Hon. J. H. KING (Minister of Pensions and National Health): It was not intended that we should discuss this item this afternoon. The purpose is simply to bring the item up and then proceed with the Post Office Department item.

Mr. McGIBBON: When will we take up this item again?

Mr. ROBB: As soon as we get through with the Post Office Department.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It will be either to-morrow or Friday.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Salaries and allowances, $17,295,464.40.

Mail service, including mail service by air, $16,305,000.

Miscellaneous, including Lucien Pacaud, secretary of the High Commissioner's office, as the representative of the Canadian government on the Pacific Cable Board, at $1,500; and $5,000 for the payment of compassionate allowances to employees injured while in the performance of their duties, or to dependents of employees killed while on duty, such payments to be made only on the specific authority of the governor in council, $1,176,175.

Yukon territory, $150,000–Total, $34,926,639.40.

The CHAIRMAN: The first item is salaries and allowances, $17,295,464.40.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I wish to draw the attention of the committee to the record of this department as I find it on page 12 of the report of the Postmaster General for the year ended March 31, 1928. The record shows that from the establishment of the Post Office Department in 1868 down to 1901 there was a deficit each year; that in the year 1902 we began a series of surpluses, and that these surpluses continued down to the year 1915 when there was a deficit. In the year 1916 and each year following down to the year 1922 there were very substantial surpluses, the amounts being as follows:

Year	Surplus
1916	$2,849,271 16
1917	4,601,805 81
1918	3,298,836 58
1919	2,329,128 71
1920	3,675,531 77
1921	1,669,856 71

Then, from 1922 on, the deficits or surpluse are as follows:

Year	Surplus	Deficit
1922	.....	$1,566,886 53
1923	$1,467,730 89	.....
1924	794,555 35	.....
1925	.....	1,291,809 53
1926	524,778 48	.....
1927	.....	1,629,001 49
1928	.....	1,850,040 89

The Postmaster General has brought down a statement covering the actual figures to the 1st January, 1929, and an estimate since then. According to that statement he estimates that the deficit for the year which expired on the 31st March last, will amount to $2,363,588. That seems rather a serious situation. This department, which was on a surplus-producing basis, now seems to have gone into the period of deficits. I should like the Postmaster General to explain to the committee the details of how this deficit arises.

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): The hon. gentleman is taking the year 1926, and he has shown there was a surplus of $524,778.48, and that during the years following, 1927 and 1928, there were deficits ranging from $1,629,000 to $1,850,000. He should have remembered that in 1926 the reduction from three cents to two cents was made in postage; that with one stroke of the pen the receipts of the Post Office Department, had there been no increase in volume of business, would have been reduced by $6,000,000, but the volume of business has so increased since 1926 that we have almost brought that deficit down to a negligible amount. As to the estimated deficit reported for the fiscal year ended March 31 1929, it is true that deficit is estimated at approximately $2,500,000. I am dealing now with round figures. That is not surprising when it is considered that we have opened many new rural routes during last year and the year before; that we have extended the air mail service; that it cost last year somewhere in the vicinity of $400,000 or $500,000 more than we expended in the past; that under the Civil Service Act there have been statutory increases in the salaries of the employees of the postal department, and many more increases which I can explan as each item is taken up. For instance, in the item under discussion, there is an increase in salaries and allowances of $339,530. The total estimate for salaries and allowances for the fiscal year 1929-1930 is the amount provided for the fiscal year 1928-1929, plus $339,530, which is made up as follows: 1878 statutory increases which could not be avoided, and which are granted after the approval of the Civil Service Commission, amounting to $206,202; 235 additional positions required, owing to the increased volume of mail and to provide for the new and improved postal facilities afforded the public, $132,310—

Progress reported.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

A message was delivered by Major A. R. Thompson, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour, the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the senate.

Accordingly, the house went up to the senate.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the house that His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the royal assent to the following bills:

An Act respecting the Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada.

An Act to amend The Grand Trunk Act, 1906-7, with respect to pensions.

An Act to further amend The Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.

An Act to amend the Militia Pension Act.

An Act to amend the Technical Education Act.

An Act respecting certain patent application of Stanley W. Hayes.

An Act respecting a certain patent of Catelli Macaroni Products Corporation Limited.

An Act to incorporate The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada.

An Act to incorporate The Railway Employees Casualty Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate The National-Liverpool Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate Barclays Bank (Canada).

An Act respecting the Pension Fund Society of the Bank of Montreal, the Molsons Bank Pension Fund, and the Merchants' Bank of Canada Pension Fund.

An Act respecting The Protective Association of Canada.

An Act to incorporate The Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company.

An Act respecting The Quebec Railway Light and Power Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Root Vegetables Act.

An Act respecting Chartered Trust and Executor Company.

An Act to incorporate Canadian Re-insurance Corporation.

An Act to incorporate The Wapiti Insurance Company.

An Act for the relief of Effie Margaret Hill.

An Act for the relief of Lera Ethel Vallance.

An Act for the relief of Frances Gwendolyn Snow Lott.

An Act for the relief of Edward George Croucher.

An Act for the relief of Elsie Alice Hervey.

An Act for the relief of Hunter Wilbert Faulkner.

[Mr. Veniot.]

An Act for the relief of William Henry Blackwell.

An Act for the relief of Mabel Lorene DeClute.

An Act for the relief of Emily Munnings.

An Act for the relief of John William Telfer.

An Act for the relief of James Ross Curry.

An Act for the relief of William Greig Green.

An Act for the relief of Janet Gee.

An Act for the relief of Sylvester Wilfred Kerr.

An Act for the relief of Florence Velma Strachan.

An Act for the relief of William Henry Laverty.

An Act for the relief of Ernest Carl Bouck.

An Act for the relief of James Clayton Powell.

An Act for the relief of Mina Thompson.

An Act for the relief of Clare Doutre Walters Bertram.

An Act for the relief of Margaret Duffield.

An Act for the relief of Dorothy Madeline Hanson Campbell.

An Act for the relief of William Thomas Taylor.

An Act for the relief of Naomi Pauline Wilson.

An Act for the relief of Isabell Leach.

An Act for the relief of Alfred Rescorl.

An Act for the relief of Clarence Percy Shields.

An Act for the relief of Isabella Einboden.

An Act for the relief of Frederick Davenport.

An Act for the relief of Arnold Whitchurch Little.

An Act for the relief of Arthur James Taylor.

An Act for the relief of Marjorie Grace Coleman.

An Act for the relief of Dora Taylor.

An Act for the relief of Helen Awrey.

An Act for the relief of James Lynham.

An Act for the relief of Bessie Stephen Lee.

An Act for the relief of Irene Sagar.

An Act for the relief of Clifford Wilson.

An Act for the relief of Crank Arthur LeNoury.

An Act for the relief of Thomas Booker.

An Act for the relief of Louisa Martha Weston.

An Act for the relief of Bella Solnik.

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Lacombe and North Western Railway Company.

An Act respecting The Essex Terminal Railway Company.

An Act respecting The Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the publlic service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1930.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1930.

At six o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, May 2, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

On motion of Mr. Marcil the fifth report of the select standing committee on standing orders was concurred in.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ASCENSION DAY ADJOURNMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): It has not been customary for the house to sit on Ascension day. By unanimous consent I would move:

That when this house adjourns on Wednesday, the 8th instant, it stand adjourned until Friday, the 10th instant.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MEDICAL OFFICERS

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. How many medical officers have been appointed or engaged for the staff of: (a) Pension Board; (b) Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; (c) Department of Health, in Canada, from the year 1925 to date?

2. How many of said officers have been removed by: (a) resignation; (b) dismissals; (c) termination of agreement?

3. What amount of retiring allowance has been granted by each department to officers whose services were dispensed with for any reason?

Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1.

(a) On staff 31st December, 1925, full time.. 8
Appointed since.. 2

(b) On staff 31st December, 1925, full time.. 98
On staff 31st December, 1925, part time.. .. .. 107 — 205
Appointed since, full time... .. 9
Appointed since, part time.. .. 19 — 28

(c) On staff 31st December, 1925, full time.. 27
On staff 31st December, 1925, part time.. .. .. 63 — 90
Appointed since, full time.. .. 8
Appointed since, part time.. .. 13 — 21

2. Pension Board—(a), (b) and (c), none; Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (now pensions division of Department of Pensions and National Health):

(a) Part time.. 10
Full time.. .. .. 16 — 26

(b) Full time.. 1

(c) Part time.. 14
Full time.. .. .. 7 — 21*

*Termination in 6 cases, 3 part time and 3 full time, was caused by death, in 8 cases, 6 part time and 2 full time, by transfer to payment by schedule of fees instead of salary or to other government departments and in 7 cases, 5 part time and 2 full time, by reduction in work at district offices, so that these officers were surplus to requirements.

Department of Health (now health division of Department of Pensions and National Health):

(a) Part time.. 7
Full time.. .. .. 7 — 14

(b) None

(c) Part time.. 7
Full time.. .. .. 5 — 12

*Termination in 7 cases, 3 part time and 4 full time, was caused by death, in 3 part time cases by transfer to payment by schedule of fees instead of salary, in 1 part time case to termination of agreement and in 1 full time case to superannuation.

3.

Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (now pensions division of Department of Pensions and National Health)	$ 32,958 32
Department of Health (now health division of Department of Pensions and National Health)	4,249 31
Annuity	655 67

BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Have any bovine tuberculosis free areas been established in Saskatchewan during the past year?
2. If so, how many and where?
3. What was the proportion of: (a) reactors; (b) number of reactors; (c) reactors slaughtered?
4. What compensation was paid to the owners for animals so slaughtered?
5. How did the percentage of reactors correspond with former years?
6. What supervision is kept over these areas?
7. Under what department is the control and supervision of this work?
8. Is compensation paid to the owners for reactors slaughtered after the second and all subsequent tests?
9. What are the names of veterinarians in charge of these tests in the province of Saskatchewan?
10. Are they all fully qualified practitioners?
11. What test is used?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Yes.

2. One—the File Hills Indian reservation.

3. (a) 7.4 per cent at the initial test of the area; (b) twenty-three at the initial test of the area and three at the retest of herds in which infection was found; (c) twenty-three after the initial test and three after the retest of the herds in which infection was found.

4. Compensation paid for animals that were slaughtered as a result of the initial test of the area $544. Compensation paid for animals slaughtered as the result of subsequent tests—$76.

5. The File Hills area was tested last year for the first time and the reactors numbered 7.4 per cent of the animals tested. In the first general test of cattle in the Last Mountain area the first and only other area in Saskatchewan, the reactors numbered 0.8 per cent of the animals tested.

6. A salaried veterinary inspector is placed in charge of a restricted area and he works under the supervision of the veterinary officer in charge of the province in which the area is established.

7. The Department of Agriculture.

8. Yes.

[Mr. J. H. King.]

9. Drs. F. A. Humphreys and M. J. Neely conducted the tests in the File Hills area under the supervision of Dr. M. Barker, district veterinary inspector.

10. Yes.

11. The intradermal test in the initial general test of all animals. The intradermal test in the retest of range cattle and the intradermal and ophthalmic tests combined in the retest of farm cattle.

POST OFFICE—WELLAND

Mr. PETTIT:

What was the gross revenue, the expenses, and the net revenue of the post office in the city of Welland for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1929?

Mr. VENIOT: (a) $29,709.39, (b) $20,445.83, (c) $19,263.66.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE

Mr. CAHAN:

1. What number of hours, during each week, does each employee of the post office of the city of Montreal regularly attend to the duties of his employment?
2. How many are employed on Sundays?
3. What extra remuneration is given to those employed on Sundays?
4. What extra remuneration is given to those who are employed for more than forty-four hours during any week?
5. Is there any law or regulation which provides that any employee, who works extra time, should receive regular pay for that time, and a half time in addition?
6. If so, is such law or regulation adhered to in the postal service of the city of Montreal?

Mr. VENIOT:

1. If on day duty, 44 hours. If on night duty, 38½ hours. If combination day and night duty, proportionate time. Christmas rush season, 48 hours day duty and 42 night duty.

2. Varies according to the work to be undertaken. Averages, approximately, 242 employees for a period of 6 hours each Sunday.

3. 50c. an hour for each hour of duty performed.

4. Extra duty undertaken in excess of the 44-hour week day duty, or 38½-hour week night duty (exclusive of work performed on Sundays) which cannot be liquidated by allowing time off within the month following the month in which the overtime is worked, is paid for in cash at the overtime rate of pay, viz., time and a half.

5. Order in council of the 2nd August, 1919, P.C. 1613.

6. Yes, except that work undertaken on Sunday is not comprehended within the week's work but is paid for in cash at the rate of 50c. an hour for each hour worked.

REBATE OF DUTY ON COAL

Mr. CANTLEY:

1. What persons or corporations, during the year 1928, received refunds by way of 99 per cent rebate of duty on foreign coal imported for use of iron or steel makers, and what was the amount of refund in each case?
2. What persons or corporations, during the year 1928, received refunds by way of 99 per cent rebate of duty on foreign coal imported for use of other than iron and steel manufacturers, and what was the amount of refund in each case?

Mr. EULER:

1 and 2. It is contrary to the practice of the Department of Customs and Excise to give information which would disclose the business of an individual concern.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

CATTLE SLAUGHTERED—FRASER VALLEY

Mr. BARBER:

1. How many cattle were slaughtered as reactors in the Fraser valley, British Columbia area, during the twelve months ending January 31, 1929?
2. What are the names and addresses of the owners of the cattle slaughtered in this area during the said period?
3. How many did each owner lose?
4. What compensation was awarded in each case?
5. What amount of compensation was actually paid in each case previous to April 30, 1929?

INTERNATIONAL PEACE

OPTIONAL CLAUSE—PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): I wish to direct the attention of the Prime Minister to a despatch appearing in the press this morning with reference to a debate in the English House of Lords with regard to Canada's attitude toward the signing of the optional clause. The Lord Chancellor is reported to have stated that he could not give the correspondence to the press without Canada's consent, and the question I wish to ask the Prime Minister is whether Canada has given her consent to the publication of the correspondence and if, when this consent is given, the Prime Minister will lay on the table the correspondence between Canada and Great Britain in this regard.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I do not recall having received any communication asking Canada's consent to the publication of this correspondence, but so far as our own correspondence is concerned if it were requested by Great Britain there is no reason why it should not be brought down. With regard to any correspondence the British government may have had with us, I would have to obtain the consent of the British government before laying that correspondence on the table.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the Prime Minister make it clear that there is no difficulty so far as this government is concerned?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I made a statement in the house in this connection some time ago, and since the morning papers have a reference to what was then said it might be well for me to read my remarks on that occasion. On February 19 I made a short statement which is all I have said in this connection and which covers the position of the Canadian government with respect to the optional clause. That statement is found at page 248 of Hansard and was made in answer to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) as follows:

> My hon. friend will recall that during the last imperial conference a desire was expressed on the part of the governments assembled there that no one part of the British Empire should formally accept the optional clause without giving to the other parts of the empire an opportunity of discussing that particular subject. We have advised the other parts of the empire that in our opinion Canada should sign the optional clause, and we are at present receiving communications from other parts of the empire in reference thereto. We are carrying out our undertaking at the conference not to sign formally until there has been an opportunity for discussion, but we have made known that it is our desire to sign the optional clause.

I noticed that in the press report there seemed to be an impression that I had expressed some view as to what other parts of the empire were to do with respect to the optional clause. I expressed no such view either at that time or at any other time; I spoke in reference to Canada only. So far as we are concerned our correspondence could be brought down at any time, with the consent of the governments with which we have been corresponding.

PRIVILEGE—MR. JACOBS

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (Cartier): On the first page of the Ottawa Journal of May 1 appears the following statement:

> Charges That Liberals Block Public Accounts Inquiry.

As chairman of the committee I wish to say that the statement is a malicious falsehood.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. PETTIT (Welland): I would like to ask the Secretary of State (Mr. Rinfret) if he will supplement reference No. 107 with the information relating to the Senate and House of Commons Library.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Salaries and allowances, $17,295,464.40.
Mail service, including mail service by air, $16,305,000.
Miscellaneous, including Lucien Pacaud, secretary of the High Commissioner's office, as the representative of the Canadian government on the Pacific Cable Board, at $1,500; and $5,000 for the payment of compassionate allowances to employees injured while in the performance of their duties, or to dependents of employees killed while on duty, such payments to be made only on the specific authority of the governor in council, $1,176,175.
Yukon territory, $150,000—Total, $34,926,639.40.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I would be doing my duty if I allowed this vote to pass without commenting on many of the statements which were made yesterday by the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) in defence of his department. It would take at least two hours to make out the full case and spread it on Hansard. The Postmaster General said that he would deal with a certain number of postmasterships as they came under the Civil Service Act. He dealt with Hawkesbury, Alexandria, New Glasgow, Brigden, St. Boniface, Brussels, East St. John, Oliver, Norton, and one or two others. If the Postmaster General made similar misrepresentations with reference to all the other post offices as he did concerning Norton then his argument falls very flat and there is not one word of truth in the utterances of the hon. gentleman with regard to Norton.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. JONES: This is what the Postmaster General stated yesterday.

I know that I am taking up a good deal of the time of the house, but I think it is worth while. The next case is that of Norton in the province of New Brunswick. This position was declared vacant before my time and after an investigation as to political partisanship against the postmaster named Price. When I entered office I found that a returned soldier by the name of Ward had received a certificate from the Civil Service Commission. Considerable turmoil had been created before I took charge. I intended to start with a clean sheet and I declared

that this vacancy still existed and asked for new advertisements. Some time elapsed before this was done, because the case at Norton was not called to my attention until some time in 1927.

The Postmaster General as a responsible member of the cabinet and the present administration says that this matter was not called to his attention until 1928, but before I am through I intend to prove to the satisfaction of any reasonable person in this country that the Postmaster General did know all about the Norton case as far back as 1924—when he was the premier of the province of New Brunswick. The Postmaster General's statement continues:

In the meantime Mr. Price, who was a very old man—

I might state that he is not as old as the Postmaster General.

—was left in charge of the office although he had been found guilty of political partizanship. I understand that Mr. Ward was the victim of a very serious automobile accident.

I interjected at this point and said:

It was another returned soldier by the name of Harmer.

Then the Postmaster General continued:

I am coming to that case. I declared the office vacant and called for new advertisements.

Mr. VENIOT: I was referring to Mr. Price.

Mr. JONES: No, you referred to Mr. Ward and I corrected you. Mr. Harmer was in an automobile accident as well.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not know that.

Mr. JONES: Oh yes, you knew Mr. Harmer. The statement continues:

The Civil Service Commission advised me that if I wanted to do that I would have to dispose of the certificate already issued in favour of Ward. I did so, and the vacancy was advertised and I believe Ward is an applicant as well as Harmer. At the present time a civilian is temporarily in charge of the office with the distinct understanding that it is only temporary and that returned soldiers with qualifications are to have preference. That is the Norton case as it now stands and no decision has been reached as yet in that case.

I intend to deal with the case from March, 1924. Order in Council, P.C. 326, dated March 7, 1924, was passed for the dismissal of Allan Price. A letter was written by Hon. Charles Murphy, the then Postmaster General, to Doctor McAllister, the defeated Liberal candidate in 1921, informing him that Mr. Price had been dismissed by order in council and that he had better send in an applicant for the position. Dr. McAllister replied to the

then Postmaster General stating that as this was a very important office he wanted to see a good man appointed. This occurred on March 11.

A letter dated March 17, 1924, was written by Dr. McAllister to Hon. Charles Murphy recommending William A. Reynolds, which stated that reasons would be given later on. This Norton file which appears to be stripped of a good deal of the correspondence does not contain any letter setting forth the further reasons why Mr. Reynolds should be appointed. In his letter of March 7 to Dr. McAllister, Mr. Murphy referred to the fact that Mr. Reynolds had been recommended by Hon. P. J. Veniot, premier of the province of New Brunswick. The Postmaster General now comes forward and states that he knew nothing about this case until he assumed office.

On March 21 a letter was written by Mr. Coolican to the district superintendent at St. John with reference to advertising the position. I have all the papers under my hand, but as I said before, it would be impossible to read all the correspondence.

On May 29 notice of the advertisement was posted, signed by W. Foran, Secretary of the Civil Service Commission.

On May 28 there is a letter from W. H. Heine, enclosing a petition signed by ninety-two residents of Norton in favour of the retention of Mr. Price.

On April 15, 1924, there is a letter from Mr. L. J. Gaboury, Deputy Postmaster General, to the district superintendent at St. John re Fred E. Sharp, an applicant for the position. I may say that Mr. Fred E. Sharp was the defeated Liberal candidate in the 1917 federal election, and he was also on a previous occasion a defeated candidate for the New Brunswick legislature. This letter called the attention of the district superintendent to the fact that Mr. Sharp was an applicant and asked him to put Mr. Sharp's name on the list of applicants for the postmastership at Norton.

On April 15 there is a telegram from Doctor McAllister to the Hon. Charles Murphy, then Postmaster General, asking him to carry out his recommendation regarding Mr. Reynolds, but giving no further information as to his qualifications or why the position should be given to him over the heads of a large number of returned soldiers.

On April 17 there is another letter from Mr. L. J. Gaboury, Deputy Postmaster General, to Doctor McAllister, pointing out that the Norton post office was under the Civil Service Commission.

On May 8, 1924, there is a report from the district superintendent to the Postmaster General, stating that ten applications had been received for the Norton post office. I wish to pause at this point for a moment or two in order to give the ratings of the different applicants for that office. The report from the district superintendent is dated St. John, New Brunswick, May 8, 1924, and it contains nine pages. I will just give a list of the applicants:

George Ward, a returned solder.
Ivan William Reid, a returned soldier.
Fred E. Sharp.
Miss Lucy Jane Campbell.
William A. Reynolds.
Ernest Nelson Myers.
William E. Harmer, a returned soldier.

This man enlisted in the 104 battalion. After he had enlisted he was taken with appendicitis. He was operated on and could not go to the front, but later on he went to work in a munitions plant and did everything he could to help win the war.

Miss Mary E. Saunders, Bloomfield Station.
Preston Douglas Price, a returned soldier formerly of Norton, but now of Concord, New Hampshire.
Charles Thomas Homer, Southfield, N.B.

That is five miles from Norton. It would take up too much time to read the whole report and I do not wish to dwell on the matter any longer than necessary. I will now give the report of the district superintendent in regard to George Ward, as follows:

Educational qualification: Good common school education in England.
Accommodation offered: Suitable.
Location offered: Present site.
Residential qualifications: Has been living in the vicinity of Norton since April, 1921.
Experience: A little post office experience and has had experience in meeting the public.
Character and integrity: Good.
Time willing to give to post office: Full time.
Whether returned soldier: Yes.
Whether disability case: No,—but is in receipt of a small pension.

That was the report on Mr. Ward, No. 1 on the whole list. There were practically as good reports on Ivan William Reid, another returned soldier; William Elias Harmer, a returned soldier; Preston Douglas Price, another returned soldier who saw service in France; and Charles Thomas Homer, another returned soldier who saw service at the front, and who, by the way, was a school teacher before he went to the war.

I wish to give a further report regarding George Ward, the man who received the certificate from the Civil Service Commission:

Mr. George Ward; twenty-eight years of age; unmarried; is a returned soldier who enlisted in 1915; went overseas in 1916 and saw service at Vimy Ridge, Hill 70 and Passchendaele;

was wounded in November, 1917, and lost two fingers of his left hand; was discharged January, 1919, and is in receipt of a small pension per month. After his return from the war he took a course through the vocational department of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and has been employed as a telegraph operator on and off at intervals since March 6, 1920. For the past three months has been a clerk in the store of W. A. Saunders, at Bloomfield station in the parish of Norton six miles distant from Norton. He has had a little post office experience, having assisted the postmaster at Bloomfield station during the period the office was in Mr. Saunders' store (about one year). He is a man of good appearance, and comes well recommended by the members of the Empire Soldiers Club at Norton; by the secretary-treasurer of the G.W.V.A., and by King and McDonald, wholesale grocers of St. John; by the chief train dispatcher of the Canadian National Railways, Moncton, N.B., and by the Anglican Bishop of Fredericton, as per letters herewith enclosed.

There are no recommendations on the file. The file has been stripped of all those.

After his return from the war Mr. Ward met with an accident in a saw-mill which crippled his right hand slightly but his war and other injuries would not in any way interfere with his carrying on post office work. If appointed, Mr. Ward would provide a suitable location for the post office.

I do not intend to take up any more time. As I stated, this report of the district superintendent is nine pages long. I wish to lay this case before the committee in order that it may be judged on its merits.

On May 14, 1924, there is a letter and a petition from William E. Harmer, returned soldier, who had enlisted in the 104th battalion. This was sent to the Hon. Charles Stewart, at that time Acting Postmaster General.

On May 20 there is a letter from the Deputy Postmaster General to Doctor McAllister informing him again—there is no reference on the file to any letter from the doctor—that returned soldiers would have the preference under the Civil Service Act, as it is the law of the country. The Deputy Postmaster General who wrote that letter is the same deputy who is in charge to-day.

Next is a letter, dated May 27th, from William E. Harmer to the Hon. Charles Murphy, the then Postmaster General, informing him of Ward's record and of his joining the 104th battalion, and so on. It is a very long letter.

Then appears the certificate of the Civil Service Commission, dated July 30, 1924, of the apointment of George Ward as postmaster at Norton. I might point out that there were no strings attached to this certificate, as was the case, I understand, with some others.

[Mr. Jones.]

This was a straight certificate appointing Mr. George Ward, postmaster at Norton.

About a week later, Mr. E. J. Underwood, chief superintendent of post office service, writes to Mr. W. A. Reynolds, one of the applicants, informing him of the appointment of Mr. George Ward as postmaster at Norton.

Then on August 8, 1924, Doctor McAllister writes to the Hon. A. B. Copp, Secretary of State, as follows:

I am writing you again re Norton P.O. affair Little did I expect the Civil Service would choose Geo. Ward, not only for his being an emigrant to this country but for his incapabilities. It is true that he was overseas but he has been fully compensated since his return. The federal government gave him a course in telegraphy and the local government has compensated him to the extent of five hundred dollars, and I have learned to-day that his employer who runs a general store and had him as a clerk, discharged him for cause. His employer was F. Saunders, Bloomfield, lumber man and merchant. I think this matter should be looked into. Please call the attention of this to the Postmaster General and by so doing you will greatly oblige.

Mr. McAllister was the defeated Liberal candidate in 1921, again in 1925, and again in 1926, and this is the kind of stuff that the local Liberal organization in the constituency of Royal kept putting up to the Postmaster General.

There is a lot of correspondence following the charge that Ward was a defaulter, and finally the matter came into the court at St. John, and after being considered by the grand jury it was thrown out. The correspondence which was furnished to the Civil Service Commission is here, and it shows that there was absolutely nothing in the charge and that it could not be proven.

On August 12, 1924, Hon. Charles Murphy writes to Mr. Copp acknowledging receipt of this letter from Doctor McAllister, saying that Ward had been appointed according to the law and under the Civil Service Commission. I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that this was on August 12, 1924. For nearly two years from that time, until November 17, 1926, there was not much activity in this matter. During all this time the old postmaster was in charge, the man who had been dismissed by order in council. The former Postmaster General, the Hon. Charles Murphy, did not make any move to override the Civil Service Commission, but just as soon as the present Postmaster General assumed office on August 17, 1926, action took place. I will read this letter in full. It is written by the present Postmaster General

to the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and is dated Ottawa, November 17, 1926:

Chairman,
Civil Service Commission,
Ottawa, Ont.

Gentlemen:

I understand that the vacancy for the Norton post office, Queens county, N.B.—

By the way, it is Kings, not Queens county; it is in the constituency of Royal:

—has been standing for a considerable time. It appears that serious objections have been raised to the appointment of one Ward, who, I understand, ranks first in the qualification examination for that position, followed by one Reynolds.

I further understand that your board issued a certificate of appointment in favour of Mr. Ward, but that he was not installed in office, and the former postmaster who was found guilty of political partisanship still remaining in charge of the office.

The hon. Postmaster General knew that this man was in office all the time, and preferred to keep Mr. Price there rather than appoint Mr. Ward, a returned soldier, to the office, as recommended by the Civil Service Commission. The letter continues:

With the knowledge that he had obtained this appointment, Mr. Ward, in the last election took a very active part. My information is that he was even obnoxious in his conduct to those who did not agree with him in politics. In view of this, I feel that Mr. Ward should not now be allowed to take advantage of the certificate that has been issued in his favour.

I would ask that your board give this matter very serious consideration.

The chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Doctor Roche, replied as follows, under date of November 20, 1926:

Dear Mr. Veniot:

I desire to acknowledge yours of the 17th, in which you refer to the fact that Mr. Ward (for whose appointment as postmaster at Norton, Queens county, N.B. a certificate was issued by the commission some two years ago) took an active part in the recent general election, and expressing your view that Mr. Ward should not now be allowed to take advantage of the certificate issued in his favour.

Unfortunately, however, once a certificate of appointment has been issued by the commission the matter passes beyond the jurisdiction of this body, but I have placed your letter before the full board of the commission, and as the commission is awaiting the decision of the Department of Justice on a point in connection with another case that has a bearing on this case, you will be further advised after the commission has received the opinion of the Department of Justice on the point referred to.

Following the receipt of that letter, the Postmaster General did not lose very much time, for on November 24 he writes from his office at Ottawa to the Hon. W. J. Roche, chairman of the Civil Service Commission, as follows:

My dear Sir:

I am in receipt of yours of the 20th in reply to mine of the 17th in which I called your attention to the fact that Mr. Ward (for whose appointment as postmaster at Norton, Queens County, N.B., a certificate was issued by the commission some two years ago) had taken an active part in the last federal election and for that reason I did not think that he should finally receive the appointment of postmaster at Norton. I note what you say about a certificate being once issued that the matter passes beyond the jurisdiction of your commission, but that you have placed my letter before the full board of the commission, and as the commission is awaiting the decision from the Department of Justice on a point in connection with another case that has a bearing on this case, I will be further advised in the matter after you receive the opinion of the Justice department.

A few days after that the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Doctor Roche, wrote the following letter:

December 2, 1926.

Dear Mr. Veniot,

In further reference to the postmastership at Norton, Queens County, N.B., in mine of the 20th ultimo I pointed out that the commission's jurisdiction in regard to this appointment ceased after issuing the certificate in favour of Mr. Ward. But owing to another case having been referred to the Department of Justice for decision which might have a bearing upon this case I promised to let you know when such opinion was received.

The opinion referred to was in connection with the Hawkesbury postmastership, as to whether a department could legally reject a candidate for whom a certificate had been issued by the commission when more than one year had elapsed since the issue of such certificate.

The opinion just received from the Department of Justice is to the effect that section 13 may be invoked in rejecting a candidate after twelve months had elapsed from the date of certificate unless the person sought to be rejected has served in the position for a probationary period for six or twelve months, as the case may be. In the Hawkesbury case, however, I understand that your point is that the candidate for whom the commission issued its certificate of appointment is not sufficiently qualified bilingually, notwithstanding both the departmental officers and the commission decided otherwise, and if you feel justified in rejecting this candidate under section 13, apparently you can legally do so according to the decision of the Department of Justice. But in the case of the Norton postmastership you object to Mr. Ward being allowed to take advantage of the certificate issued in his favor by the reason of his activities in connection with the recent Dominion elections. I do not think this would be sufficient ground for the department to refuse to instal Mr. Ward in office, as he is not civil servant until he has been placed in a position to discharge the duties of same. Otherwise if he did not have the office tranferred to him for the next ten or fifteen years he might have his

hands tied politically notwithstanding he was earning his livelihood entirely outside the service, and this does not seem at all reasonable.

It would appear to me therefore that if it is your intention to reject Mr. Ward under section 13 some more substantial reason should be assigned than the one to which you refer. I think if you will discuss this point with the Deputy Minister of Justice he will agree with me.

You see by this correspondence between the Postmaster General and the Civil Service Commission that there was a desperate effort made to get rid of Mr. Ward, who had been appointed postmaster at Norton. On August 28, 1928, after an interval of almost two years from the date of the letter I have just read, there was a lot of correspondence between the department and the Postmaster General. I wish to refer to a letter of August 28, 1928, written by the Hon. P. J. Veniot, Postmaster General, to Mr. Gaboury:

Dismiss Allan Price and appoint William A. Reynolds acting postmaster at Norton.

This was done in face of the letter from the Civil Service Commission setting out the law in regard to this case.

On August 31 there is a letter from E. J. Underwood to the district superintendent at St. John, instructing him to put into the office Mr. W. A. Reynolds as acting postmaster.

On September 7, 1928, I find a letter from H. W. Woods to the superintendent of postal service saying that Mr. Reynolds had been installed on September 15.

On September 14 there is a letter from Mr. B. E. Thomas, Service Bureau of the Canadian Legion of British Empire Service League, to the Hon. Mr. Veniot, asking him why Mr. Ward had not been called upon to fill the post office at Norton. I desire to read the letter in reply from the Postmaster General. It is dated September 19, 1928:

Dear Sir,—

I am in receipt of yours of the 14th instant in connection with the postmastership at Norton, N.B., and in reply beg to give you the following information:

It appears that in 1924, two years before I assumed the position of Postmaster General, an investigation was held into the conduct of the postmaster at Norton, N.B., and the charges made against him were investigated and proven. The office was declared vacant, but he was allowed to remain in temporary charge until the Civil Service Commission had made a permanent appointment. George Ward, a returned soldier, was one of the applicants, and he received the certificate of the Civil Service Commission for the permanent appointment. This certificate, it appears, was never accepted by the Postmaster General. The matter was left in abeyance with the old postmaster still acting when I took charge of this department.

[Mr. Jones.]

Now, I desire hon. members to listen to this. The letter continues:

I knew nothing about this matter. About a year ago my attention was called to the situation at Norton, and after making inquiries touching the details I decided that in view of the length of time that had expired between the date of advertising the vacancy in 1924, and the time that the matter had been drawn to my attention, and in view of the fact that I learned that Ward had left Norton and was engaged in a position at St. John, and that there were other returned soldiers who had applied and who were still residing in Norton, it would be better under all the circumstances to have the vacancy advertised anew. In the meantime, so as to give no undue advantage to one returned soldier as against another, I issued instructions to have this vacancy advertised and to appoint a Mr. Reynolds in temporary charge. I had to appoint a person in temporary charge because conditions were such as Norton that it was impossible to put up any longer with the old gentleman in charge.

You will notice that in this letter the Postmaster General states that the matter has only just been drawn to his attention, whereas two years previously he had taken the matter up himself with the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. VENIOT: As Postmaster General?

Mr. JONES: Yes, as Postmaster General, in 1926. And this letter is 1928. In November and December, 1926, he had taken the matter up, and here he says he knew nothing about it. Perhaps I have taken up more time on this matter than I should otherwise have done, but it is one of the most important questions that can be directed to the attention of the house. On October 4, 1928, there was addressed, from J. G. Herwig, of the British Empire Service League, a letter to the Hon. Mr. Veniot, calling his attention again to the matter of Mr. Ward's not receiving the appointment. And then we have another letter, October 5, 1928, from L. D. Theriault, secretary, to Mr. Herwig.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's time is up.

Mr. CLARK: I want to ask the Postmaster General for the section of the Civil Service Act or of the Post Office Act which enables him to appoint a postmaster either permanently or temporarily.

Mr. VENIOT: Where the salary does not exceed $200, based upon a revenue of $400, the Postmaster General has the right to make a temporary appointment.

Mr. CLARK: I am referring to those post offices which—

Mr. VENIOT: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will possess his soul in patience.

Mr. CLARK: I thought the minister had misunderstood my question. It is not a question of preserving my patience; I want the Postmaster General to be clear.

Mr. VENIOT: I will be clear. When a vacancy occurs we consider that under the act we have the right to make a temporary appointment, and that continues until the Civil Service Commission makes it permanent.

Mr. CLARK: Will the minister refer to the section of any statute in existence which authorizes him or his deputy or anyone else to make such appointments?

Mr. VENIOT: I am not in a position now to refer to such a statute.

Mr. CLARK: The minister has his deputy before him and his deputy knows that in dozens of cases this assumed power has been exercised by the minister. The Post Office Department must know offhand whether or not such a statutory power exists, and I ask for an answer. If the Postmaster General does not know then the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) is in his place, the Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon) is in his place, and there is no question in the world but an answer can be given at a moment's notice.

Mr. VENIOT: I will not undertake to satisfy the hon. gentleman by discussing legal issues, because I am not qualified to do so; I am not a lawyer. I did not take the trouble to inquire whether legally it can be done. I certainly followed the practice that has obtained since 1919 under the Civil Service Act where temporary appointments have been made right along to fill vacancies until such time as the appointments are made permanent. I do know that under the decision of the Civil Service Commission, in the case of several appointments in the department, it has been the practice since 1919 to make temporary appointments; where there is not a waiting list we are authorized or we do make such appointments. When the Civil Service Commission advertise for applications they obtain what is called a waiting list, comprising the applicants who have successfully passed, and so long as that waiting list is in existence no temporary appointment can be made, but appointments must be made from that waiting list, according to merit. They are made from the list provided the department by the commission. This has been the practice since 1919. Otherwise how could you get along? You must have authority to make temporary appointments when vacancies occur in the post offices; otherwise how could you carry on the business?

Mr. CLARK: According to the act.

Mr. VENIOT: I think I have followed it as closely as anyone.

Mr. CLARK: The minister has made no attempt to answer a very plain question. He asserted the other evening, when I was speaking, that there was lawful authority in the minister to make appointments—I will assume he meant temporary appointments. Now once more I appeal to the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General, if such power does exist, to point out to the committee the nature of that power on the part of the minister to make temporary appointments to post offices when post offices come under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have not considered the question but I am quite willing to do so. I must however point out that under the law the Department of Justice is adviser to the departments of government; it acts for the departments of government and gives rulings asked for by those departments and even by parliament. But it has never been the practice of the Minister of Justice or of the Solicitor General to give to members of the house legal advice such as my hon. friend would like to obtain while the committee is sitting this afternoon. However, just to please my hon. friend I am willing to give consideration to his question.

Mr. CLARK: I think this is a new principle.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is not; ask the hon. gentleman just in front of you.

Mr. CLARK: In any case the Minister of Justice has undertaken to consider this question and I trust he will give parliament a statement. I submit that it has been the duty of the Minister of Justice, of the Solicitor General and of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to take notice of such a situation as has been brought before parliament during the last few weeks. This side of the house has repeatedly challenged the legal right of the Postmaster General to make appointments to post offices which come under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission, and the Postmaster General has often asserted his right to make such appointments.

Mr. VENIOT: Will my hon. friend allow me a question?

Mr. CLARK: If it is a statement, no; if it is a question, yes.

Mr. VENIOT: It is a question.

Mr. CLARK: Certainly.

Mr. VENIOT: Does that law you are now quoting—

Mr. CLARK: I have not quoted it yet.

Mr. VENIOT: Does it apply to all departments—all appointments?

Mr. CLARK: I will quote the law and the minister can study it.

Mr. VENIOT: That is not answering my question.

Mr. CLARK: I will answer the question after I have quoted the law.

Mr. VENIOT: You are attacking the Post Office Department.

Mr. CLARK: Yes; the post office estimates are before the house at the moment. But as I have pointed out, I am not attacking the Postmaster General at this moment any more than I am attacking the Prime Minister and his government. I am attacking the Prime Minister and his government at this moment for permitting any department to defy the law as it is laid down in the statute books, which is the will of this parliament.

Now I wish to draw to the attention of the committee certain sections of the Civil Service Act. I refer first to section 19, which is as follows:

> Save as otherwise provided in this act or in any regulation made hereunder, neither the governor in council nor any minister, officer of the crown, board or commission, shall have power to appoint or promote any employee to a position in the civil service.

That certainly excludes the right of any minister of any department in this regard. Does that answer the Postmaster General?

Mr. THORSON: That does not apply to temporary positions.

Mr. CLARK: I will come to that.

Mr. ROBB: If that is true what is the use of electing members of parliament? Why not let the Civil Service Commission run the country?

Mr. CLARK: I am surprised to hear the Minister of Finance assert to this committee and suggest to parliament that the chief duty of the government is the appointment of employees. That is a delightful doctrine. Now let us go on to section 21:

> Every deputy head shall notify the commission of every vacancy in any position in his department immediately after the vacancy occurs, and whenever such vacancy is to be filled, the deputy head shall request the commission to make an appointment.

We have had brought before us in the last few weeks many instances where the Postmaster General has delayed for months in notifying the Civil Service Commission and where he has made temporary appointments on his own responsibility without notifying the commission at all. I think it is time the government took some action instead of stand-up almost daily and by their votes endorsing the actions of the Postmaster General. Subsection 2 of section 21 deals with temporary appointments, as follows:

> The commission shall thereupon appoint the person whose name stands highest upon the commission's list of eligible persons for the class in which the position is found and who is willing to accept the appointment; in case there is no such list for the class, the commission shall forthwith hold an examination and, if necessary to prevent any serious interference with the public business, but not otherwise, may fill the position at once by making a temporary appointment as prescribed herein.

That is the Civil Service Commission, not the Postmaster General, or any other minister of the crown.

Mr. VENIOT: Will the hon. gentleman permit me to direct his attention to one point? Does not that section refer only to what is known as the temporary waiting list?

Mr. CLARK: Most decidedly not, or it would say so.

Mr. VENIOT: They have to establish a temporary waiting list.

Mr. CLARK: This is the statute dealing with the question of appointments. There is only one section of the act which gives any power to any department to take on temporary employees, and I particularly direct the attention of the Minister of Justice to this section. I refer to section 39; while section 38 also refers to temporary appointments it only covers the case of a temporary pressure of work requiring extra employees. Section 39 states:

> When employees are required on short notice for emergency work outside the city of Ottawa, the responsible agent or officer of the department requiring such extra assistance may engage the necessary employees, and the said agent or

officer in each case shall forthwith report to the commission through the deputy head of his department the names of the persons so employed.

2. No such employment shall extend beyond thirty days unless approved by the commission. . .

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any time specified within which the commission must make an appointment or selection?

Mr. CLARK: No, I cannot find any such provision except that the commissioners are charged by oath to deal with such cases forthwith. There is no specified time, but they are charged to deal with the matter immediately they are notified of the vacancy. Certain steps are prescribed and they are bound by their oaths to make the appointment forthwith.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the hon. gentleman aware that in making appointments to the outside service in the Post Office Department the Civil Service Commission must depend upon the officials of the department, the postal inspectors and so on, to secure the necessary information, and sometimes two or three months elapse before appointments are made? Who is to act in the meantime?

Mr. CLARK: The thing is perfectly simple; in practically all these dismissals the postmaster who was carrying on could have continued in office until the advertisement was issued and the district superintendent reported to the Postmaster General.

Mr. VENIOT: What would you suggest where a postmaster died?

Mr. CLARK: That is also quite simple; the district superintendent is the man who must deal with the situation. I have read the section of the act which provides for cases where employees are required on short notice, and I should think that would take care of vacancies occurring through death:

When employees are required on short notice for emergency work outside the city of Ottawa, the responsible agent or officer of the department requiring such extra assistance may engage the necessary employees, and the said agent or officer in each case shall forthwith report to the commission through the deputy head of his department the names of the persons so employed.

2. No such employment shall extend beyond thirty days unless approved by the commission. . . .

That is perfectly clear; whoever is in charge of the district makes the appointment immediately and reports to his chief. If it is not possible to have the appointment confirmed within thirty days the chief, in this case the Postmaster General or his deputy, will simply write a letter to the Civil Service Commission explaining the circumstances and request the approval of the commission in the meantime until the office can be advertised and the vacancy filled in accordance with the Civil Service Act.

Mr. VENIOT: That refers only to waiting lists.

Mr. CLARK: Waiting lists nothing; there is nothing here about waiting lists.

Mr. POULIOT: So the minister will be the subordinate of his officer.

Mr. VENIOT: Let the hon. gentleman consult the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CLARK: I do not need to consult them, I am consulting the will of parliament. At the moment I am not concerned with how the Civil Service Commission administers the act; as a matter of fact I am going to ask this government to investigate how the commission is administering this act, because I believe a file which I brought to the attention of the house the other evening clearly indicates that a civil service commissioner has disregarded his oath of office and, to speak quite frankly, I believe he has conspired with the Post Office Department to hold up these appointments.

Mr. ROBB: If the minister is wrong and the Civil Service Commission is wrong, who is to carry on the business of the country?

Mr. CLARK: Follow the statute. If this government continues this policy of ignoring this act, which is the will of parliament; if it continues to back these illegal appointments and this defiance of the act by a minister of the crown the people of this country will deal with this government and will put in office a government which will administer the act. If the act is deficient in any way it can be changed. The Minister of Finance may laugh; he apparently considers it a great joke when he thinks of the way the Postmaster General has been carrying on, but I should have thought that the Minister would have voted yesterday with a shamed face—if the shame was not in his face, it must have been in his heart—when condoning the offences of the Postmaster General. I would also direct the attention of the house to the fact that the Postmaster General came in and cast a vote as a juryman in his own favour—most remarkable conduct.

There are two other features in connection with this matter. The postmasters who have been illegally appointed by the Postmaster General are being illegally paid by this country. I would draw the attention of the government, and particularly the attention of

the Minister of Finance to the fact that the Auditor General is passing payments to these employees who are unlawfully employed and who are retaining their positions contrary to the express provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. ROBB: Then the Auditor General is wrong also?

Mr. CLARK: Certainly he is wrong, absolutely. I suggest right now to the Minister of Finance that he bring the Auditor General before the public accounts committee and sak him to explain why he is doing this.

An hon. MEMBER: Another man gone wrong.

Mr. CLARK: I am going to give the various ministers who treat this matter with such levity one more test and see if their levity will extend that far.

The file in a particular case was sent to the Civil Service Commission on June 29, 1928, for action by that body. The appointment in question happened to be the post office at Sutton, but I am not going to deal with that particular office but endeavour to make my remarks general because there are many other similar cases. I venture to say that if an investigation were carried out it would be found that there are many other cases in which the Civil Service Commission is involved in the same way as one commissioner is involved in this case. On June 29 the appointment was referred to the Civil Service Commission. On July 9 the examination branch of the commission certified that a returned soldier was entitled to the appointment over the appointee of the Postmaster General who held office contrary to the provisions of subsection 4 of section 29 of the Civil Service Act, and despite the fact that the superintendent in Montreal had certified as to the fitness of the returned soldier. The examination was completed and the appointment could have been made but for some reason or other the file remained dormant in the office of the Civil Service Commission until October 25, when it was brought before Doctor Roche with a request from the Postmaster General that this appointment be allowed to stand still further. It had already been standing much longer than there was any legal right for it to stand, but Doctor Roche made an endorsement on the file—I wonder if the Minister of Finance will consider this as big a joke as he has considered the other breaches of the law?—as follows:

> I do not know why this file has been held for the last three months without being passed on by the commissioners. It has only been placed before me this morning, October 25, and in the meantime the department has placed the office in charge of the least competent applicant of the two.

That is signed "W. J. R." and is initialled by the other commissioners. As I stated a careful investigation took place to ascertain why that file had been held in the office for three months without being brought to the attention of the chief commissioner. The report of J. L. Bouchard established beyond peradventure that no employee of the Civil Service Commission had had the file. It is on this report that I base my assertion of conspiracy and collusion between the Civil Service Commissioner and the minister. The following statement appears in the report:

> I can only, therefore, conclude that whoever had the file held it until the looked for communication of the department to suspend action arrived.

On October 10, 1928, a request came to suspend action still further. Apparently this file had been held for the express purpose of making it impossible for the commission to function and administer the act which they were sworn to administer, and yet one of the commissioners endorses on the file:

> I accept responsibility for holding this file in my office.
>
> J.E.T.

Mr. POULIOT: Was the post office closed in the meantime?

Mr. CLARK: If the hon. member would exercise just a little discretion—

Mr. POULIOT: It is just for my information.

Mr. QUINN: Read the statute.

Mr. CLARK: I do not mind for one moment any member of this house asking me a question, and I would be the first speaker to sit down, but I do protest against such asinine interruptions.

I assume the "J. E. T." is J. E. Tremblay. As I pointed out the other night, that breach of duty is not consistent with the oath of office which appears in schedule A of the act. This oath is as follows:—

> I,..... solemnly and sincerely swear that I will faithfully and honestly fulfill the duties which devolve upon me as..... So help me God.

I assume the word to be added there would be "Commissioner".

These matters have been brought to the attention of the government repeatedly during the last few weeks. I no longer appeal to the Postmaster General because not only has he flaunted the provisions of these statutes but he has laughed at the breaches of the

statutes and has proceeded to make further breaches, and the government has stood calmly by and endorsed his actions by voting with him. I understand that they are going to send him to France, I believe—

Mr. MANION: To England.

Mr. CLARK: —to England to represent this country. They intend to send as our representative a man who deliberately breaks the statutes and laughs at it as he is doing right now.

Mr. VENIOT: I am not laughing at that.

Mr. CLARK: A representative endorsed by the members of this government. I would plead with the Minister of Finance under whose supervision there comes at least one official, the Auditor General; I would plead with the Prime Minister under whom possibly the Civil Service Commission would come in a case like this: I would plead with the Minister of Justice to take these serious matters under consideration, advise the ministers of the various departments as to their lawful powers under the act and have it made clear to the house what those powers are. If that is done and if the ministers of the crown will take these matters seriously under consideration, it will do a great deal towards satisfying the members of the house and the country at large.

Mr. BOYS: I do not know that one need apalogize for taking part in this discussion. It involves a very important act and one that has been under consideration for some time in the house. If I wanted any further excuse for rising to say a few words, it would be the attitude of the Postmaster General when the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Clark) put a perfectly clear question to him, asking him to quote from the statute the section which gave him authority to make the appointment in the Sutton case, namely, that of Crowell. The Postmaster General excuses himself, stating that he is not a lawyer.

Mr. VENIOT: Did he not give another reason also?

Mr. BOYS: If he did, I missed it.

Mr. VENIOT: I said that I was following the practice since 1919 under all governments.

Mr. BOYS: With due respect to the minister, I do not think he has any excuse and I will pass on to discuss that matter in a moment or two. I am a lawyer and I have been a lawyer for a few years.

Mr. VENIOT: I am glad I am not.

Mr. BOYS: I have been a lawyer long enough to learn that the lawyer who always thinks he knows the law, is more or less of a fool. I admit at once I am anything but infallible, but I will go so far as to say that I have endeavoured to understand the provisions of this act by carefully reading the sections, not once but twice or three times, and to ascertain, if I can the authority that is given to ministers of the crown in connection with the act. Having done so, I make this statement with great confidence. When the Postmaster General said that he is not a lawyer and he dose not know where he gets his authority, one would imagine that before he presumed to make an appointment of a temporary character, or any other appointment, he would satisfy himself from the officers in his department that he had that authority and, if he or they were doubtful, he would, as the Minister of Justice suggests, take advice from the Justice department. I agree with the Minister of Justice that I do not think it would be fair to expect him to stand up in the house and, speaking for the government, give an opinion on the spur of the moment, without having an opportunity to consider the matter. I do not know that it has ever been expected of him, but I think it is the duty of a minister in charge of a department to acquaint himself with the provisions of the act and to see where or not the act gives him authority. Having read the act carefully, I state now in my opinion the minister had no authority of any kind, sort or description, to appoint Crowell to the temporary postmastership at Sutton. The sections of the act are quite clear. The Minister of Finance has come to the rescue and I would like to remind him that he was in the house with the Minister of Justice when the Civil Service Act was passed and he supported its provisions. The Minister of Finance rises and says: If a man dies, who is to carry on the business of the office? Is everything to be at a standstill? I can only say to the minister that before he makes such a proposition, he should read the provisions of the act. Let me say to the Minister of Finance and to the Postmaster General that the act provides most amply for the situation that is mentioned. As the Minister of Justice has been kind enough to say that he will take this matter under consideration, and let the house have his opinion, it is just as well that we should spend a few minutes in looking into the features of the act so that not only the ministers, but we members of parliament will know where we stand. We are sometimes asked by returned soldiers as to their rights

under the act. Apparently the Postmaster General has one view of their rights under the act, while others have a different view. At the moment I am not going to raise any question as to dismissals; I am not going to suggest that the Postmaster General is doing anything for ulterior purposes. I am going to deal with the provisions of the act, and I think it is high time that members of parliament as well as departmental officials should understand what the act means. If my interpretation of it is wrong, I shall be only too glad to have any sections I have overlooked pointed out to me, and to be put right in the matter, so that in future I shall be able to give advice to anyone who may desire it of me.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not like to interrupt the hon. member, but I think I should point out that a discussion on the interpretation of certain sections of the Civil Service Act cannot properly come on the item which is now before the committee.

Mr. BOYS: I am quite sure that when I point out the purpose of my observations, the Chairman will no longer suggest that I am out of order. I am endeavouring to discuss the provisions of the act as applicable to the action of the Postmaster General in making an appointment which he had no right to make. Let us take these sections up one by one. I think the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) was a member of the committee when the act was revised; I know I was, and I think I had the pleasure of sitting with him under the chairmanship of the Hon. A. K. Maclean when the act was passed. Section 19, to which the Minister of Finance pledged his assent as a member of the house when the act was passed, reads as follows:

> Save as otherwise provided in this act or in any regulation made hereunder, neither the governor in council nor any minister, officer of the crown, board or commission, shall have power to appoint or promote any employee to a position in the civil service.

Does the Minister of Finance say that that does not cover all positions?

Mr. ROBB: Read the exceptions.

Mr. BOYS: I am going to do so. That is one section he supported and I think that covers all appointments to post offices with the exception of post offices with a revenue under $400. I have in mind the Sutton case where the officer enjoys a salary of over $2,000. But apart from that the act applies to every department of government. That provision states that neither a minister nor the governor in council may make the appointment. Section 20 reads:

> Except where otherwise expressly provided, all appointments to the civil service shall be upon competitive examination under and pursuant to the provisions of this act, and shall be during pleasure.

Is it suggested that that section does not apply to every solitary civil servant to be appointed to any department of government with the exception of some of the cases the Postmaster General has excepted where in his department the offices are under $400? What happens when there is a vacancy? I particularly direct the attention of the Minister of Finance to section 21 and I was surprised to find him, with his experience, and as a supporter of the act, rise and say: What is to happen to the country if a man dies? Is the business of the country to be at a standstill? Does he think his colleague, the Hon. A. K. Maclean, chairman of the committee, was so remiss, careless and inefficient in his work that he never thought out the situation or that the members of the committee did not? Section 21 reads:

> Every deputy head—

My hon. friend, the Postmaster General's deputy head.

> —shall notify the commission of every vacancy in any position in his department immediately after the vacancy occurs, and whenever such vacancy is to be filled, the deputy head shall request the commission to make an appointment.

Does any member suggest that that is not definite? I do not care what the vacancy is for, whether it is on account of death or promotion or resignation or dismissal; that is the section which governs. The deputy makes the request. Then subsection 2 reads:

> The commission shall thereupon appoint the person whose name stands highest upon the commission's list of eligible persons.

The Postmaster General wants to make a distinction. He spoke, I am sure, without consideration and without reading the provisions of the act which govern. Does he suggest there is not a list for every position? I have already eliminated the offices under $400.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not catch the hon. member's point.

Mr. BOYS: Whenever there is a vacancy, it is the deputy head who notifies the commission. Why did my hon. friend say, when the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard was discussing this, that that applied only to eligible lists? There is an eligible list for every single appointment if there is a veteran who

applied and asked to be on that list. If my hon. friend the Postmaster General wants to ask me a question, I shall be delighted. It is information I want.

Mr. VENIOT: I merely wish to say this. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman—

Mr. BOYS: I do not mind in the least.

Mr. VENIOT: My hon. friend has asked me a question. In reply I say that there are not always eligible lists in existence.

Mr. BOYS: I did not say there were.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman said that there was an eligible list for every appointment.

Mr. BOYS: My hon. friend did not listen to what I said. I said that providing there was a qualified person who wanted to be on that list, and I say it again.

Mr. VENIOT: There may be many qualified people wanting to be on an eligible list, but they are not on because the eligible lists are cancelled every twelve months.

Mr. BOYS: My hon. friend knows perfectly well that if a man has a right to be on an eligible list and applies to be put on, he is put on, and that eligible list has to be considered by the commission.

Mr. VENIOT: Only for one year.

Mr. BOYS: It is renewed.

Mr. VENIOT: No, it is not renewed except by examination.

Mr. BOYS: There is one sure thing, and that is that there was an eligible list in the Sutton case, which my hon. friend knew all about and disregarded. In case there is no such list for the class, what is to happen under the act? It states:

> The commission shall forthwith hold an examination and, if necessary to prevent any serious interference with the public business—

I would like my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) to get this:

> —and, if necessary to prevent any serious interference with the public business, but not otherwise, may fill the position at once by making a temporary appointment as prescribed herein.

The minister would suggest: Who is to carry on the business of the country? The act provides for that very case and states that if there is any urgency, not the Postmaster General, not his deputy head, but the Civil Service Commission, and the Civil Service Commission alone, shall make the appointment, and the business of the country goes on.

Subsection 3 of section 21 reads:

> Except as to appointments to positions in the head-quarters of the several departments and other portions of the civil service at Ottawa, the appointments to any local positions in any province shall, so far as practicable, be made from bona fide residents of such locality.

I almost think my friend the Postmaster General would agree with that provision. I took the view when acting as a member of the committee which considered the act in 1919 that in the event of a vacancy occurring let us say in the county of Simcoe, in a post office, in any of the towns or villages, a man should not be brought in from Toronto or Ottawa or some other place and take that position, and I had the honour of moving that subsection myself, and since then the appointments have been given to residents of the locality.

I pass on to the lists of applicants. I know the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) cannot follow all this at the moment, but when he comes to consider it, I trust he will do me the honour to think over what I am about to say. I again say that I may be wrong, but I have made an honest effort to get at the actual effect of these provisions and the conclusion that I have reached is this:

In connection with these appointments, there are three lists. They are provided for by section 29 of the Civil Service Act. I had better read subsection 2, so that there may be no room for doubt:

> The commission shall prepare and maintain a special list of persons in receipt of pensions by reason of their services in the war who
> (a) have from causes attributable to such service lost capacity for physical exertion to an extent which makes them unfit efficiently to pursue the avocations which they were pursuing before the war;
> (b) have not been successfully reestablished in some other avocation; and
> (c) desire to be placed on such list.

That is what I was referring to when I addressed myself to the Postmaster General, that they would be put on if they had expressed the desire to be placed on such list.

Mr. VENIOT: That applies to returned soldiers.

Mr. BOYS: I quite agree that it does.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman was talking a little while ago about applicants generally.

Mr. BOYS: No, I am talking about these special lists. Whether you call them two lists, or whether you want to regard the first two

lists as really one list, and put them in a special class, I care not. Then there is another list, and rightly or wrongly the commission have adopted this construction of the act, and if they are wrong it is high time they were put right. If my hon. friend the Postmaster General or any other member of the house does not agree with the provisions of this act, the proper course to pursue is to amend the portions which are objectionable, and make them conform to what we want but so long as those provisions are in the act, they are the law of the land and they must be obeyed.

I come to the next class, and this is perhaps where the Postmaster General and some of us may be at issue in connection with the Sutton case and other cases.

The next is a list of returned men who have served and have the qualifications mentioned in the act, regardless of disability and regardless of reestablishment; in other words, if they have no disability and regardless of the fact that they have been fully reestablished, so long as they come within the class mentioned in the act namely, veterans, they are put on the third list, which has precedence over all civilians. I do not know whether the Postmaster General agrees with that, but I make that assertion. The Postmaster General shakes his head.

Mr. VENIOT: I say we do not disagree.

Mr. BOYS: We do not disagree. If my hon. friend says that seriously, then how in the name of goodness he failed to appoint Hill, a returned man, to the Sutton post office, and a man from that locality, I cannot understand. A letter of the Postmaster General was read in this house asking whether this man Hill had been fully reestablished. The Postmaster General now agrees with me, that whether or not he had been reestablished it does not make a bit of difference.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not say that as regards reestablishment.

Mr. BOYS: Let us understand each other.

Mr. VENIOT: I still hold to the reestablishment.

Mr. BOYS: I have made it plain that the first list, or a double list if you choose to call it that, comprises the two classes, the disabled class and the class that are not fully reestablished. I have then said, and to this the minister gives his assent—if this is a misunderstanding, let us put it right—that there was another eligible list of veterans who were fully reestablished and who had no disability, and who were given preference over any civilians if they were qualified. I have quoted the sections of the act on that point. I do not want to be rude at all, but I would ask the Postmaster General now that I have re-stated my position whether he agrees with that position or not.

Mr. VENIOT: I think the best answer I can give would be to allow the hon. gentleman to go on and make his statement, because when he asks a question and I answer it, he turns my answer the other way. I am satisfied to allow him to go on.

Mr. BOYS: If I wanted to discuss the turning question, I would know where to go for instruction.

Mr. VENIOT: And you would be an apt scholar.

Mr. BOYS: We will leave that sort of thing out of this discussion. I want to say to my hon. friend that I am not doing this vindictively at all. I wish to know for my own information, and further I think it is desirable that the house should know just what the effect of these provisions is.

I say that that is the third list. Then comes the fourth list, which is a list of civilians, or returned men, if you will, who have no special qualifications and are not on any special list. Appointment from that list goes by merit, the one with the highest marks being selected. That being so, let me apply it to the Sutton case, because I have had the opportunity of reading that case and I know a little about it —many of the other files I have not read and I do not wish to discuss cases that I have no knowledge of. In the Sutton case you had two applicants. You had Crowell, who was not a returned man. I am not going to discuss whether his qualifications were as good as Hill's or not, because that might be a controversial question. I will admit for the purpose of this argument that he had the qualifications. I am sure that the Postmaster General will admit from the evidence on the file that the returned man, Hill, had the necessary qualifications. The only point which he raised in his correspondence was whether Hill was fully reestablished. I say now that that had nothing whatever to do with it. It did not make any difference whether he was reestablished or not, because he belonged to the third class, and being a returned man he was entitled under the act to the appointment over any civilian. I say to the Postmaster General, if my construction is right—and until we get an opinion from the Minister of Justice, I will certainly assert my opinion against that of the Postmaster General, who says that

he does not know where he gets his authority; I have quoted the sections to substantiate my contention—and with that law on the statute book the Postmaster General has put Crowell in that office and has left him there two years, though Hill had a certificate from the Civil Service Commission, they being the only ones who could make the recommendation and issue the certificate. The Postmaster General has utterly disregarded that certificate and the provisions of the act, and has left Crowell in that office now for two years without any authority whatever.

Now, that raises a further point. Where does he get the right to pay him? In the first place, if he is a temporary employee, there is not a scratch of the pen in this act from beginning to end which gives the Postmaster General or any officer of his authority to make temporary appointments. I use the word "temporary" technically. There is a difference between a temporary appointment, and an appointment to fill a vacancy. It is only right that emergency cases should be dealt with. There might be in St. John, if you will, or in Barrie, if you will, a vacancy which requires to be filled immediately, and there is no doubt that under the act—it only shows how thoroughly the matter was considered—the superintendent or inspector in charge has the power to appoint under section 39, subsection 1. It reads:

> When employees are required on short notice for emergency work outside the city of Ottawa, the responsible agent or officer of the department—

Does my hon. friend suggest that that is his deputy or anyone else in his department at Ottawa? Does he not admit at once that that has relation to the officer in charge of the department in the locality in question?

> —requiring such extra assistance may engage the necessary employees, and the said agent or officer in each case shall forthwith report to the commission through the deputy head of his department the names of the persons so employed.

That is for a period of only thirty days. Let us read subsection 2:

> No such employment shall extend beyond thirty days unless approved by the commission.

Not the Postmaster General, not his deputy either.

Mr. VENIOT: For the sake of information—

Mr. BOYS: I am glad I am interesting the Postmaster General.

Mr. VENIOT: You are wrong; that is why I am interested. Do you apply that to the Sutton post office?

Mr. BOYS: I certainly would apply it to the Sutton post office.

Mr. VENIOT: Let me continue. Do you apply that to the general run of employment at the Sutton post office?

Mr. BOYS: What is the sense of talking about the general run of employment in the Sutton post office. We are discussing not some person that sweeps the office; we are discussing the postmaster of that office, nobody else.

Mr. POULIOT: May I ask a question?

Mr. BOYS: In the capacity of a juryman or a member of this house?

Mr. POULIOT: I should like to know from my hon. friend if he submits that the Postmaster General is governed by the Civil Service Act or by the Post Office Act.

Mr. BOYS: Both of course where the provisions are applicable. But I am sure my hon. friend, as an experienced lawyer and counsel, knows that the provisions dealing with this matter in the Post Office Act, under which act we used to operate, have all been repealed and the only law now which deals with these matters is the Civil Service Act. Prior to 1919 the Post Office Act governed. I say there is no power, and I want to distinguish between temporary employees and extra assistance. There is the authority to appoint contained in the section I have quoted. I trust the officer of the Postmaster General who sits beside him to assist in the passage of his estimates will pay attention to this and perhaps before the discussion is over he will be able to show the minister where his authority is to be found. I am open to conviction, I am anxious to get from him what he considers to be the law in this regard and if he can refer me to anything to contradict what I have stated, by all means let him do so and I shall be glad to read the sections and revise my view, if necessary. We have a vacancy which requires emergency treatment. There is authority, not for the Postmaster General, not for any officer in Ottawa, but for the responsible officer in charge of the locality to appoint to the vacancy a person for a period of thirty days, and no longer.

Dealing specifically with Sutton—not because that is the only case, there are many others, but there is nothing like taking a concrete case on which to base one's argument—a man has been appointed there as temporary postmaster; that appointment has been made by the Postmaster General without any authority whatever under this act and without authority to pay him. Under section 42:

> Temporary employees shall be paid only out of moneys specially voted by parliament for the purpose.

I ask the Postmaster General—if he does not want to answer now he may do so later on—whether or not Mr. Crowell's salary appeared in the estimates last year, and whether the payment of his salary was authorized.

Mr. VENIOT: It is authorized under the general vote.

Mr. BOYS: I think of $240,000. This is a matter the public accounts committee might well be asked to deal with and have the Auditor General come before them to show how in the world, with these provisions before him, he ever passed that payment. I am most emphatic in my contention that the Postmaster General had no right to make that appointment under this act.

There is the situation. Without prolonging the matter, having dealt with these clauses, I should like before I sit down to ask the Postmaster General to kindly come to-morrow prepared to answer what I have said. If he is not a lawyer as he states and cannot tell us at once, and if he admits that although he is Postmaster General he does not understand the provisions of the act which govern him, I ask that he come to-morrow fully advised upon the matter, either by his own officers or by the Department of Justice, and tell the house where he got the authority to make the appointment he made in the Sutton case—and in many others like it—even for thirty days. He has not the right to do it for thirty days, to say nothing of two years. From my knowledge of the Postmaster General I do not think he wishes to fly in the teeth of the statute. Possibly he thinks he has this right. But if he finds he has not, let him admit it, and in future carry on the work of the department having regard to the provisions of the act under discussion.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not intend to take up the time of the committee in an attempt to interpret the act as my hon. friend has been doing. He is a lawyer I know—

Mr. BOYS: Not infallible.

Mr. VENIOT: —of good standing in his profession. I have often listened to lawyers interpreting statutes to suit their case, and I fear that is what the hon. gentleman has been trying to do. I say that notwithstanding all the confidence I have in him.

Mr. BOYS: Kindly answer the argument; that is the point.

Mr. VENIOT: I say that because if the act is applied in the way the hon. gentleman says it should be, then the whole of the public business would be held up.

Mr. BOYS: Not at all.

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

[Mr. Boys.]

Mr. VENIOT: I make the statement. It is for you to reason why.

Mr. HANSON: It is for you to prove it.

Mr. BOYS: I say this to my hon. friend. Business certainly will be held up by pursuing the course which is now being followed. If the Civil Service Commission make appointments to various offices, and the Postmaster General will not allow the appointees to take office, undoubtedly the business of this country will be held up.

Mr. VENIOT: I hope the two hon. gentlemen who have been discussing this act and interpreting it will let their memory go back to 1919.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

Mr. VENIOT: Will the hon. gentleman just be courteous enough to hold his speech. Let me go back to 1919 and follow up what has been done since that time, I can show that all those whom I came after in the Post Office Department pursued the very same practice that I am following. If the law was wrong—

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Murphy did not. In the Norton case he did not.

Mr. VENIOT: If the law as interpreted by my hon. friend was in existence at that time then all these appointments have been illegal. I am not the only one who has made illegal appointments, if such be the case. The point I wish to make is this. When I came into office, and I found it being operated as it was in 1919, I never thought for a moment that it was necessary for me to undertake to give an interpretation of the Civil Service Act in making temporary appointments, when everyone who had preceded me in the office had been carrying on in the same manner in regard to such appointments. That is why I continued as I did in regard to temporary appointments. And I still maintain that, that practice having been observed since 1919, blame should not be heaped entirely upon my shoulders for having followed it. If, however, the practice is wrong, then both hon. gentlemen have done their duty in bringing the matter to the attention of the house so that, if wrong, it can be righted.

Mr. BOYS: Will not my friend admit that the construction I place on the right of veterans who are not disabled, and so forth, is the construction placed upon the act by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. VENIOT: I will not admit that.

Mr. BOYS: My hon. friend will not say it is not?

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. gentleman will ask the Civil Service Commission they will tell him that they have rulings on the point from the Department of Justice with reference to reestablishment.

Mr. CLARK: That is only with regard to disabled men.

Mr. BOYS: I would ask the Postmaster General to be good enough to produce those rulings for the benefit of the committee.

Mr. VENIOT: Let the commission produce them.

Mr. BOYS: You can easily get them.

Mr. VENIOT: No. I do not think it is fair that I should be asked to obtain information which should be produced by another department. Let the heads of the departments concerned produce the information.

Mr. BOYS: Does not the Postmaster General himself wish to know what the ruling is with respect to the act that guides him?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I may say that I propose to find out all the rulings that have been given in connection with this matter, and I shall be glad to see that my hon. friend gets them.

Mr. CLARK: I think they are already tabled.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There may have been others.

Mr. BOYS: This is another ruling.

Mr. CLARK: What is the Postmaster General's interpretation as to the right of a returned soldier, not disabled, and possibly fully reestablished, as compared with that of the civilian?

Mr. VENIOT: I will not give any interpretation of that since the Minister of Justice has undertaken to obtain all the rulings and interpretations issued in the past by his department. When they are produced we shall get it right.

Mr. CLARK: Has the minister, in connection with some of the appointments which have been made by him, refused to give a preference to a fully reestablished soldier, not disabled over a civilian.

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot answer that offhand; I shall have to go to the record.

Mr. CLARK: Will the minister admit that he did it in the Sutton case?

Mr. VENIOT: There is no appointment yet in the Sutton case.

Mr. BOYS: Temporary?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, temporary.

Mr. CLARK: The minister has given a preference there, in his own personal appointment, over a reestablished soldier.

Mr. VENIOT: There was no returned soldier applying at the time the temporary apppointment was made.

Mr. CLARK: That is because the minister made the appointment before the applications were called for.

Mr. VENIOT: Someone had to take charge of the place and run it; it could not run itself.

Mr. POULIOT: I have a few words to say on this matter. I heard the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Clark) say this afternoon that he wished to have the will of parliament expressed; I think it is rather the wish of the opposition that he wants to see fulfilled. I do not understand how it can be said that persons who have been appointed temporarily by the Postmaster General, pending permanent appointment by the Civil Service Commission, should not be paid. In my opinion the most important thing is to have the office running continuously. Suppose a postmaster dies or is unable to fulfil his duties; surely it is the duty of the Postmaster General to prevent what I may call a break in the service rendered by that particular post office; and to this end he must appoint someone temporarily to carry out the duties of the office pending appointment by the Civil Service Commission, and the person in charge shall be paid for performing such service.

We have heard a lot this afternoon about the Civil Service Act. I have here the French text of the act, chapter 22 of the revised statutes of 1927; and there is another act also which is of utmost importance in this connection, and which has been overlooked by all hon. gentlemen on the other side ever since they began discussing the estimates of the Post Office Department. I refer to the Post Office Act. If I understood what my hon. friend from Vancouver-Burrard said this afternoon, the minister has nothing to do in his department. For example, according to the hon. gentleman, in the event of a vacancy occurring it should be filled temporarily by a district superintendent, who would report to the Postmaster General advising him accordingly, and if that temporary appointment were not satisfactory, then the Postmaster General would advise his officer of his dissatisfaction and would cancel the appointment and make another. This, it seems to me, is the very reverse of what should be done. Under the statute the power is not

given primarily to the subordinate, the employee, the officer of the department; it is vested in the minister who is at the head of all authority in the department. This is how I understand the law in this matter and I think it is but fair; it is common sense; otherwise we should have a state of insubordination.

There is another point to be considered: When there are two acts dealing with the same subject we must take those acts jointly in order to understand the intent of parliament. This is a principle which is understood not only by lawyers but even by ordinary business men in the country. Now here is a point of considerable importance in relation to this question. According to sections 19, 20 and 21 of chapter 22, the Civil Service Act, who is supposed to instruct the Civil Service Commission as to whom they are to appoint in case a vacancy occurs? Let us take the case of a postmaster in some village or town: he dies; suppose it is deemed urgent to appoint a successor immediately so that there may be no break in the continuity of the service. The question is, who will tell the Civil Service Commission what man is to replace temporarily the late postmaster?

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond West-Cape Breton): Taschereau.

Mr. POULIOT: St. Peter of Cape Breton. My hon. friend usually has very much brains in his hand.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond West-Cape Breton): I carry as much in my hands as my hon. friend does in his head.

Mr. POULIOT: If I were a teacher and the hon. member my pupil I would send him to the tail of the class. But to resume my point. Suppose the postmaster dies in such a case as I have suggested. I ask, who will give an eligible list to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond West-Cape Breton): Taschereau.

Mr. POULIOT: I see my hon. friend wants to change his leader.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond West-Cape Breton): No; we will accept Taschereau as a subordinate.

Mr. POULIOT: If I may be allowed to proceed, I will repeat the question: Who will instruct the the Civil Service Commission as to the person temporarily to replace the deceased or retired postmaster? That is a problem. I think the Postmaster General has been within his rights in making temporary appointments even in cases coming under the Civil Service Act for permanent appointment. In section 7 of chapter 161 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, I find the following:

The Postmaster General may, subject to the provisions of the act,

(a) establish and close post offices and post routes. . . . .

He has that power.

(b) remove or suspend any postmaster or other officer or servant of the post office;

(c) enter into and enforce all contracts relating to the conveyance of the mails, or other business of the post office;

There are several sections relating to postage, money orders and so on and then follows a very important section which has been overlooked by hon. gentlemen opposite:

The Postmaster General may, subject to the provisions of this act,

(x) make such regulations as he deems necessary for the due and effective working of the post office and postal business and arrangements, and for carrying this act fully into effect.

2. Every such regulation shall have force and effect as if it formed part of the provisions of this act.

That is the law. The Postmaster General is given power to do certain things according to the act and where the act is not complete, where something is missing from the act, he is empowered to make regulations to provide for such special cases. That has been done by the ministers of several governments, Tory as well as Liberal. I heard my hon. friend opposite say that the present Postmaster General is taking his lead from the Tory party; that is easy to understand, because that act was adopted under the Tory government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friends should not laugh; I am very serious. The actions of the various ministers under this law show how they all have interpreted it, and it seems very clear to me.

I will not delay the committee longer; I simply wanted to draw attention to the fact that the Postmaster General has been following the law, and no one can blame him for having done so.

Mr. BOYS: My hon. friend has the statute there; can he point to any section in the act which gives the right of appointment to the Postmaster General or his deputy? Can my hon. friend read any section of the act which is in conflict with the sections I quoted, which were very distinct?

Mr. POULIOT: I quoted the subsection which empowers the minister to make regulations.

Mr. BOYS: Does my hon. friend suggest that the act which gives the minister power to make regulations gives him power to make such regulations in violation of the provisions of the act? As a lawyer he would never say anything like that.

Mr. POULIOT: It is not in violation of the act. The minister is head of the department. . . . .

Mr. BOYS: He can make regulations for the enforcement of the act, but not in disregard of it. Read the act and see what it says.

Mr. POULIOT: I will read it again for the benefit of my hon. friend:

The Postmaster General may, subject to the provisions of this act,

(x) make such regulations as he deems necessary for the due and effective working of the post office and postal business and arrangements, and for carrying this act fully into effect.

The second subsection is very important also:

2. Every such regulation shall have force and effect as if it formed part of the provisions of this act.

Mr. BOYS: Then may I just crystallize it in this way: Supposing under that section the Postmaster General or any other minister made a regulation which is in conflict with the act itself; which would govern, the regulation or the act?

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend has not proved that the minister made a regulation of that kind.

Mr. BOYS: I am quite confident he did not do so; if he did so I say he had not the power.

Mr. POULIOT: My point is that in the Civil Service Act there is no specific provision for post offices, but such provision is contained in the Post Office Act—

Mr. BOYS: Does my hon. friend say that the appointment of a postmaster is not an appointment under the Civil Service Act, and provided for by that act? Does my hon. friend suggest that the minister can make a regulation in conflict with the provisions of the act? Knowing my hon. friend as I do I venture to say that he will not make such a statement on the floor of this house as a lawyer and on his responsibility as a member.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend knows very well that the Civil Service Act applies to all the departments in certain matters, but in the Civil Service Act there is no mention of postmasters.

Mr. BOYS: The act says "appointments"; the filling of a vacancy in a post office is an appointment and therefore comes under the act.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, but there is a great distinction to make between permanent and temporary appointments; they are not the same at all. If the minister takes it upon himself to appoint a man to a permanent position which is not under his jurisdiction I believe that is contrary to the provisions of the act; but he has the right to appoint acting postmasters—

Mr. BOYS: Who?

Mr. POULIOT: The Postmaster General.

Mr. BOYS: Will my hon. friend read any section of the act to support that statement? I have read the sections which show that the Civil Service Commission must make such an appointment. I ask my hon. friend to help me and to help the house by reading any section of that act which says the Postmaster General or any minister can make such an appointment.

Mr. POULIOT: Then I will ask my hon. friend to read the section forbidding the minister to do so.

Mr. BOYS: I have read the section, which says that all these appointments whether temporary or otherwise must be made by the Civil Service Commission. My hon. friend has asked me to read it again, and I will do so. My hon. friend has the statute there, and he might follow me to make sure I do not leave out any words, as has happened before:

19. Save as otherwise provided in this act or in any regulation made hereunder, neither the governor in council nor any minister, officer of the crown, board or commission, shall have power to appoint or promote any employee to a position in the civil service.

Does my hon. friend think there is any doubt about that?

Mr. POULIOT: My contention is that it is the spirit and the letter of the law that no "permanent" appointment under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission may be made by the minister.

Mr. BOYS: While the hon. member admits that a permanent appointment cannot be made, does he suggest that a temporary appointment can be made by the minister or his deputy?

Mr. POULIOT: Surely.

Mr. BOYS: Where is the section?

Mr. POULIOT: I have read it twice but I will read it again so that the hon. member for North Simcoe can go to school with the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard. Section 7 of the Postal Service Act reads as follows:

The Postmaster General may, subject to the provisions of this act,

(x) make such regulations as he deems necessary for the due and effective working of the post office and postal business and arrangements, and for carrying this act fully into effect.

Mr. CLARK: Where does that say anything about making appointments?

Mr. POULIOT: I will illustrate my viewpoint for the children. Suppose a postmaster dies, who is notified?

An hon. MEMBER: The undertaker.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, it is not in the act; it is perhaps an appendix to the act. When a postmaster dies the assistant is supposed at once to notify the superintendent of the postal district—I think that is the way it goes—and then the district superintendent writes to the department and the minister is notified. In some cases the assistant may act as the acting postmaster or postmistress, but sometimes the assistant has no knowledge of the post office. In other cases the assistant has carried on the work of the post office while the postmaster did nothing. The department is the first to be notified of the vacancy. There is no provision in the act which says that the district superintendent should notify the Civil Service Commission of the death of a person in charge of a post office. In these cases the minister has to exercise a certain amount of discretion to see that the work of the post office is not disturbed through the death of the person in charge, and that is why the Postmaster General has to appoint someone as acting postmaster before the Civil Service Commission makes the final appointment. This may take some time and my friends on the other side of the house seemed to be very much surprised and scandalized because a file was left for some time in a drawer of the desk of one of the civil service commissioners. I have a letter which I keep as a curiosity writen to me by a gentleman, whom I shall not name, in answer to a letter of mine written ten years before. It is possible for a file to be left in a drawer without any intention of causing trouble to anyone, and I think it is unfair to use such strong language against the Civil Service Commission for a mere trifle.

Personally I am not in favour of the Civil Service Commission appointing public servants, but I do think that they will always be very helpful in holding examinations to see that people are qualified for certain positions. I believe the commissioners are competent men and are doing as well as could be expected when we consider the large amount of work which has to be done by them. The only reflection which has been cast upon the present commissioners is in respect to the Sutton case, and this matter has been fully discussed in the house.

Mr. BOYS: I would like to refer my hon. friend to a certain section of the act. I did not read this section myself, because I did not think that anyone would take the position that while the Civil Service Commission had the sole right to make permanent appointments the minister or his deputy might make temporary appointments. I gather that my hon. friend takes that position, and I think that it would be advisable to have the record complete by including this section. Section 38 of the Civil Service Act reads as follows:—

When, from a temporary pressure of work, extra assistance is required in any branch of the civil service, the commission may, on the written report of the deputy head that such extra assistance is required, authorize the employment of such number of temporary employees as are required to carry on the work.

2. The commission shall establish lists of persons eligible for such temporary employment.

3. Temporary employment in the civil service shall be authorized only for such time, not exceeding six months, as the commission deems necessary.

There is the law. Does the hon. member suggest that the minister can take any action which would be in conflict with the provisions of the statute?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): That does not apply to the position of postmaster.

Mr. VENIOT: That applies to assistance required in large offices.

Mr. BOYS: That is not the point which has been raised. If my hon. friend had been listening he would have heard me deal with that section. I was dealing with the argument of the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), that there was authority vested in the minister to make temporary appointments. There is not one word in this act from beginning to end which says that the minister has the right to make an appointment of any kind, nor has he the right to employ extra assistance. The officers of his department in the locality may do that, but the minister has not that right.

Mr. POULIOT: I would like to ask my hon. friend another question, because I am very much interested in discussing this matter. The people who are appointed as acting postmasters do not come under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BOYS: They are temporary employees.

Mr. POULIOT: When a man asks for an appointment to a position which comes under the provisions of the Civil Service Act he does so at his own risk. When the decision of the minister—

Mr. BOYS: They cannot appoint him.

Mr. POULIOT: —is confirmed by the Civil Service Commission then he comes within the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BOYS: Under the act he can neither appoint him nor pay him.

Mr. POULIOT: That is the contention of my hon. friend.

Mr. BOYS: It is not simply my opinion; it is so provided by the act, the terms of which are very plain; and I know when my hon. friend, who is a lawyer, reads them, he will agree with me. Is there any doubt about this?—

Temporary employees shall be paid only out of moneys specially voted by parliament for the purpose.

Mr. POULIOT: I have not the English text of the statute. I have the French text.

Mr. BOYS: I would take a chance of my hon. friend's knowledge of English.

Mr. POULIOT: The word "auxiliaire," meaning extra assistance, is used. It does not mean in the sense of acting in another man's place because an acting officer is one who replaces temporarily the person for whom he is acting. When we speak of "auxiliaires" we speak of people who come to assist in his work the officer in charge. That makes all the difference in the world.

Mr. BOYS: Section 39 governs that. Let my hon. friend read it and take whichever view he likes. We should both content our souls for the present and wait for the pronouncement of the Minister of Justice. When we were promised that, I made up my mind that I would say no more at present, but I like a little dialogue with my hon. friend and I was tempted to continue.

Mr. POULIOT: I like it myself, but I stick to my contention. To sum up, the last sections referred to by my hon. friend from Simcoe apply to extra assistance, auxiliairies, people who come to assist the man who is in charge and not to acting officers. When a man is appointed temporarily as acting postmaster, he does not come under the Civil Service Act, but is appointed by the minister for a special purpose and for a particular length of time, and when he is so appointed by the minister he cannot say he is there for good, because another appointment can be made by the Civil Service Commission. I have endeavoured to make myself as clear as possible, and while our views may differ, I like to discuss matters on such a high plane with my hon. friend from Simcoe.

Mr. BOYS: It is entirely mutual.

Mr. JONES: When my time expired earlier this afternoon, I was discussing a letter from Mr. Herwig to the Postmaster General, dated October 4, 1928. It reads:

We appreciate the fact that this case has been pending a very long time. We are convinced, however, that he should be regarded as eligible and given the appointment in accordance with the spirit of the Civil Service Act.

That is the opinion of Mr. Herwig, of the Service Bureau, Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League.

In reply to this the secretary—and I presume it must be the secretary of the Postmaster General as the letter is from his office—writes as follows:

Mr. J. C. G. Herwig,
Service Bureau, Canadian Legion of the B.E.S.L.,
P.O. Box No. 384, Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,

Your favour of the 4th instant re the Norton postmastership, reached here during the absence of the Postmaster General.

Same will be submitted to him immediately on his return to the office and will receive the most serious consideration.

L. D. Theriault,
Secretary.

Then we have a memorandum dated October 20, 1928, from the Postmaster General to his deputy, as follows:

If not already rejected, notify commission of rejection of certificate in favour of Ward.

That is the whole of that memorandum. The next letter following this is dated October 25, 1928, to the Secreraty of the Civil Service Commission, Ottawa, as follows:

Re Norton:

Dear Sir:

The Postmaster General has given attention to the above-mentioned postmastership, in regard to which a certificate was issued by the Civil Service Commission on the 30th July, 1924, on behalf of Mr. George Ward, returned soldier.

In this connection, I beg to inform you that Mr. Ward is hereby rejected as unsuitable under section 24 of the Civil Service Act, and to state that with a view to making another selection, the vacancy will be advertised in the very near future.

This is as far as I intend to carry this case along at the present time. The vacancy was again advertised, and Mr. Ward, the same returned soldier, and Mr. William E. Harmer,

another returned soldier, made application, but still the office at Norton is being occupied by acting postmaster W. E. Reynolds. I wish to close this matter of the Norton post office by saying that the Postmaster General has disregarded the provisions of the law of this country and, in particular, the Civil Service Act.

The minister stated earlier this afternoon that he has carried on in the same way as his predecessors. The Hon. Charles Murphy, who was Postmaster General for Canada in a former Liberal government, let this matter stand, and recognized the application of Mr. Ward from 1922 to 1925. The present Postmaster General is always making statements of this kind. There are in the file statements and letters under his own signature which are absolutely untrue and the Postmaster General knows that himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. JONES: Yesterday the Postmaster General made a statement in regard to the returning officers. I did not intend to mention this, but it does not do to let the hon. gentleman away with all these wild statements. One would think he was in some back district in the province of New Brunswick addressing an audience when he spoke in the House of Commons yesterday afternoon. He said that the Tory party had dismissed every returning officer in the last election. I want to point out to the Postmaster General that that statement is absolutely false, because three, if not four or five in the province from which he comes, New Brunswick, were returning officers under his own government in the previous election. I leave the matter as it is at present before the committee, and I think it has been proven absolutely by many cases that the Postmaster General is not fitted for the position he occupies at the present time.

Mr. STIRLING: I want to direct the attention of the committee to the incidents connected with the appointment of the postmaster at Oliver, British Columbia, to which passing allusion was made by the Postmaster General yesterday afternoon. The late postmaster at that place desired to resign last fall, on being appointed customs officer at the neighbouring port of Osoyoos. The vacancy was therefore advertised by the Civil Service Commission and there were three applicants, all of them being returned soldiers. The post office inspector at Vancouver interviewed these three applicants and reported on them to the Postmaster General. He placed them in a certain order of merit. The first name that appears we can set aside, because, as the inspector points out, his military discharge papers were not in order. The second applicant is a man called Anderson, a Conservative, a storekeeper in Oliver since its inception and a responsible man. He intimated to the inspector that if appointed it was his intention to dispose of his stock, and alter his premises to make them more suitable for a post office. From 1912 to 1915 he had been postmaster at a place called Tow Hill, Graham Island, in British Columbia. The third name on the list was that of a man called Ede, a Liberal, a carpenter who had worked in Oliver in its early days, had moved away, and had recently returned to live in Oliver. In due course, in fact on the 8th of January of this year, the Civil Service Commission issued a certificate of appointment to Anderson. The form has frenquently been referred to here. It refers to Anderson as the appointee and draws his attention to section 13 of the Civil Service Act, but like others which have been drawn to the attention of the committee, it does not draw Anderson's attention to the ruling of the Department of Justice.

Mr. VENIOT: Is the hon. member reading from the certificate that was found on the file?

Mr. STIRLING: Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: The certificate found on the file is not the same class of certificate that is sent to the appointee. All the certificates sent to the appointees have that ruling printed on them and do not go to the Department.

Mr. STIRLING: So that the file which has been brought down is not an actual copy of the original papers?

Mr. VENIOT: What you are reading is only notice to the department of his appointment, not a notice to the appointee. The latter is different.

Mr. STIRLING: But surely these papers that are brought down for the use of the house purport to be exact copies of the original papers.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but there is an error there.

Mr. STIRLING: Does my hon. friend say there is an error here?

Mr. VENIOT: No, no. The hon. gentleman is reading from a certificate which he says went to the appointee. That certificate never went to the appointee. The Civil Service Commission sends to the appointee a certificate

which is somewhat different from the one which it sends to us notifying us that an appointment has been made. On the certificate sent by the Civil Service Commission to the appointee is printed the ruling of the Justice department, but it is not on the one sent to us.

Mr. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, in this file which was brought down with reference to the Oliver matter, this certificate appears which purports to be a copy of what was sent to Anderson.

Mr. VENIOT: It does not. The hon. gentleman is wrong. He is making an unfair statement; he is not stating the case right.

Mr. STIRLING: Then I would ask the Postmaster General to state it. Where is the mistake?

Mr. VENIOT: There are two forms of certificate. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart) has a copy of the certificate which is sent to the appointee, I believe, judging by the colour; it is a purple certificate. I think that is the one that is sent to the appointee.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): This is a notice of appointment to the postmaster. It is not a certificate.

Mr. VENIOT: It contains the ruling of the Justice department.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It does not contain it all, but only part of it as has been pointed out several times.

Mr. VENIOT: It contains what the commission thought was sufficient to guide the appointee.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I do not know about that.

Mr. VENIOT: What is the use of making statements that are not according to the facts?

Mr. STIRLING: I received these papers which set out what has happened with regard to this matter, and I certainly took it that this paper, which is called a certificate of appointment, was a copy of what was sent to the man.

Mr. VENIOT: It is not.

Mr. STIRLING: If the Postmaster General says that that is not the case, we will drop that point and pass on, but it seems a most extraordinary thing to hand us a file which purports to be the file connected with the case, but which does not contain the papers which were used in this matter.

Mr. VENIOT: You have everything from the department there.

Mr. STIRLING: Anderson, at all events, receives notice of his selection: I suppose the Postmaster General will agree to that. It is intimated to him that he has been selected. There is a suggestion at least that he will be appointed on probation, and he is told that he will receive instructions as to the date upon which he shall begin his work. I maintain that when a man receives a statement to that effect, his reaction to it is that he has been successful in the examination held by the Civil Service Commission, that he will be appointed on probation and will have to start work on a certain day. That at any rate is what entered Anderson's head. He disposed of his stock, altered his premises, bought certain fixtures, and retained the services of an assistant.

Just a month later, early in February, there is a letter from the Postmaster General to his deputy which refers to the fact that the Postmaster General is in receipt of certain information which shows that Anderson has become the agent or local manager of a telephone company in that place. There is nothing on this file to show what is the source of the Postmaster General's information. It is scarcely likely that the details of the postmastership in a little place like Oliver, three thousand miles from here, would have been told by word of mouth to the Postmaster General, and I cannot help thinking that some communication must have been received by the Postmaster General which does not appear on this file. The deputy head accordingly writes to the superintendent of the postal service at Vancouver, and suggests that some guarded inquiries should be made to ascertain when Anderson took charge of the telephone company. Eventually the Postmaster General receives that information in the form of a communication signed by Mr. Murray of the superintendent's department in Vancouver, confirming the fact that Mr. Anderson has been made agent for the local telephone company, and that he started operations on the 1st of February. I would draw the attention of the committee to the fact that ever since Oliver has had a post office the holder of that postmastership has also been agent of the local telephone company. To urge that connection as a good reason for rejecting the selection of the Civil Service Commission is not a reason but a flimsy excuse. It takes six days for a letter to pass betwen Oliver and Ottawa, and a little more than a week after the Postmaster General communicated with his deputy asking him to ascertain details with regard to this telephone position, two letters are written from Oliver to the Postmaster General, which

I shall put on record as they are very short. The first one is dated Oliver, February 18, and reads:

The Hon. the Postmaster General,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Honourable Sir:

In behalf of myself and others doing business at Oliver I take the liberty of respectfully requesting you that the post office be not put in with the telephone service, and also desiring that you would favourably consider the application for the postmastership sent in by Mr. H. A. Ede as we believe he is a suitable and competent person for the position.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) A. L. Rhynd.

Then follows a letter dated at Oliver, dated February 19, 1929, to the hon. Postmaster General:

Dear Sir,—

It has always been a bone of contention here, the post office and telephone office in together, the service has been very poor. They are unable to give good service in either line. We understand Mr. Anderson, who has the telephone office, has an application for the post office as well, to which 90 per cent of the pepole here object, I am sure. There is another qualified applicant who we are sure would give good service, a Mr. Ede, who is qualified in every respect. I am sure this will voice the sentiment of a very large majority of the people of this district.

Thanking you for any consideration of this letter, I am,

Yours very truly,
William Foster,
Oliver Confectionery and Tonsorial.

There is no evidence whatever, Mr. Chairman, that the Postmaster General made any attempt to get confirmation of these statements. It would appear therefore that all that is necessary, when the desire for the rejection of a Civil Service Commission appointee is in the mind of the Postmaster General is that he should receive a letter, or perhaps his limit is two, containing any statement the author cares to make, and then the Postmaster General will accept those statements as a reason for the action he takes. Had he taken the trouble to get confirmation of the statements to which I have referred, I think these facts would have been revealed to him: that William Foster is the man who sold a vacant lot next his barber shop to Mr. Ede, and that the writer of the other letter has leased his ten-foot frontage to Mr. Ede, to be used for the new post office. Both of them, one would consider, rather biased witnesses, and I think further inquiry in the locality would have proved to him that these two men, Foster and Rhynd, were about the only two supporters in the whole district that Mr. Ede had.

[Mr. Stirling.]

I suggest that the Postmaster General has set at naught the appointment of Anderson, who was acceptable in the eyes of the minister's own superintendent, and who has appointed by the Civil Service Commission. I do not understand why the Postmaster General should adopt this course. I do not understand why the government should set at naught the provisions of the Civil Service Act. I will say this much for the government, speaking as I do of four or five years' representation of that piece of southern British Columbia: I should be inclined to state that in the matter of these appointments the various departments of this government have been reasonnably fair, have reasonably left partisanship out of their appointments until now, and it has remained for the Postmaster General to spray this poison into that district of British Columbia. I do not know what effect the Postmaster General desires to obtain, but I think I know what the effect of his action will be. He has certainly made it far more difficult for the next Liberal candidate in the riding of Yale to get elected. He has certainly made it more difficult in the whole of souther British Columbia to instil into the minds of the people that this government is desirous of upholding the Civil Service Act. And I can assure him that the people of British Columbia desire to uphold it; they do not wish to see it flouted. And he has set this government at variance with the Canadian Legion. I would draw the attention of the committee to the two closing paragraphs of a letter adressed to the Postmaster General by J. C. G. Herwig, Service Bureau, Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League. The letter is dated April 5, 1929. These are the paragraphs to which I refer:

May we ask whether favourable consideration can be given to a claim by Mr. Anderson for reimbursement of expenses? We are sure that anyone applying for a position in the federal service should not suffer loss on that account, particularly after obtaining success in an open competition.

The views of the Canadian Legion in regard to the spirit in which rejections are carried out has already been made known to you. We regret that another case should have arisen where an ex-service man, after considerable delay, has been rejected on the grounds of "unsuitability" without a trial in the position.

That, I think, fairly reflects the opinion of the returned men in Canada, and also I think of the great body of civil servants from the Atlantic to the Pacific; they feel rather more nervous than they did as to the retention of their positions because of the conduct of the Postmaster General.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Chairman, I desire to get some more information from the Postmaster General regarding the deficit about which he spoke last night.

Mr. VENIOT: Perhaps the best way to furnish this information will be for me to read this prepared memorandum which I have received from the office:

Reference by Mr. Stewart (Leeds) on the 1st instant, to the statement contained in the Postmaster General's report of revenue and expenditure and deficit or surplus as the case may be in post office revenue from the year 1868 down to the present, particularly recent years.

Re fiscal year 1921-22

The operations for that year showed a deficit of over $1,500,000 following a surplus of over $1,600,000 the preceding year. This deficit is due entirely to the greatly increased rates of payment to railways for the conveyance of mails which added to the expenditure of that year by over $3,700,000. Had it not been for this extra outlay the operations of the department for the year would have shown a very material surplus.

Those rates were fixed by the railway commission as the result of an application by the railways for increased rates at so much per foot for the use of mail cars.

1922-23

The revenue for this year showed an increase of $2,700,000 over the preceding year. At the same time there was a decrease in expenditure of over $325,000 due largely to downward revisions in rates of payment to railways for conveyance of mails,—

That is in some cases where those downward revisions took place.

—the estimated savings on this account being at the rate of $400,000 per annum.

1923-24

The discontinuance of the use of postage stamps in the payment of war tax on cheques, etc., effective from 1st October, 1923, resulted in a decrease in revenue while the expenditure on account of salaries of postal employees and supplies generally accounted for the reduction in surplus of approximately $600,000.

For the years 1916 to 1924 the figures giving the revenue of the department, included postage stamps used in payment of war tax. Had it not been for this source of income the operations of the department during those years would have shown a decided deficit each year.

1924-25

The revenue during this year was adversely affected by the disruptions of business through the postal strike while the expenditure was correspondingly increased through the employment of additional temporary assistance. During the same year the expenditure was increased on account of payments consequent upon salary revision amounting to over $1,700,000. The surplus in the preceding year of approximately $800,000 being thereby changed to a deficit of over $1,200,000.

1925-26

There was an increase in revenue over the preceding year of more than $2,400,000 due to increases in practically all phases of postal business including adjustments in favour of Canada of postage on parcels from other countries amounting to approximately $300,000 more than in the preceding year. Against this however, must be placed, under the head of salaries and allowances, an item of nearly $500,000 through the post office vote being charged with the expenditure for flat increase which superseded cost of living bonus following salary revision. The bonus had formerly been paid out of a general vote. The salary vote was also augmented by statutory increases of nearly $125,000. Increases in certain other items are practically offset by decreases in the remaining items. The items above enumerated, however, account for the spread of approximately $1,800,000 between the deficit for 1924-25 and the surplus of nearly $525,000 for the fiscal year 1925-26.

1926-27

As stated by the Postmaster General in the house on the 1st instant the letter rate to all places in the North American continent was reduced from three to two cents effective 1st July, 1926, and consequently affected the revenue for nine months of the fiscal year the actual net decrease being about $1,645,000. The decrease would have been much greater had it not been for increased returns from other classes of mail matter and from other postal facilities. On the other hand expenditure was $500,000 higher than the preceding year, consisting largely of statutory increases and additional positions totalling nearly $400,000, also of added expense for mail service and equipment. These items account for the spread of approximately $2,150,000 between the surplus of the preceding year and the deficit in 1926-27.

1927-28

Compared with the preceding year the increase in revenue was slightly more than offset by the additional expenditure. The increase in expenditure was due mainly to the following items—$600,000 through the flat increase in salary of $120 granted by parliament effective 1st April, 1927; $200,000 for statutory increases, and $109,000 for rural mail boxes (which are paid for as purchased by patrons of rural mail delivery) the balance being due to cost of handling the increased volume of mail and of improved postal facilities generally.

The introduction of two cent postage would have affected the remuneration of postmasters who are paid by a percentage on revenue had it not been for the decision of the government that the salaries of these officers should not be reduced. Otherwise the net revenue would have been improved to the extent of approximately $500,000.

That is to say, an order in council was passed providing that the salaries should remain the same after as before the reduction from three to two cents.

1928-29

In addition to the information given by the Postmaster General in the house relative to increased expenditures during the fiscal year which ended on the 31st March last, it might be stated that increases in expenditure have

occurred under practically every heading due to the general expansion of the service. It is to be understood, of course, that final figures for the year are not yet available and that any amounts quoted are more or less approximate until the accounts can be finally balanced.

That is all the information I have.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose we were considering the first item in vote 314. Shall the item carry? Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The CHAIRMAN: The item was called and no one rose to speak, so I declared it carried.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): We were only half through the explanation I was asking from the Postmaster General with regard to the financial end of his department. I was referring to the revenues of the department, and the Postmaster General laid a statement on the table. I observe that during recent years the revenue has been steadily increasing, but the Postmaster General spoke about the reduction in postage rates and gave that as a reason for the falling off in the revenue. However, in his report for the year 1928 I find the following statement:

> The net revenue for the year amounted to $30,529,154.76 and the expenditure to $32,379,195.65. This is an increase in the net revenue of $1,150,458.21, instead of the expected decrease due to two cent postage having been in operation for twelve months as compared with nine months of the previous year; and it indicates a marked increase in the volume of all classes of mail matter.

So I take it that after all there was no loss in net revenue through the reduction in the postage rate. As I have said, the statement shows an increase in revenue so I submit that the decrease in postage rate cannot account for the deficit; the larger volume of business seems to have made up for the reduction in rates. Now I would like to ask the Postmaster General in what year the reduction became effective.

Mr. VENIOT: I think it was October 1, 1926.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yet we find the revenue for 1926 $31,024,464.22, as compared with $28,581,992.87 in 1925, so that no loss was sustained through the lowering of the postage rate.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. VENIOT: It became effective only on October 1, 1926. Let me correct that statement; it came into effect on July 1, 1926.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Then we find that in 1927 there was a loss in revenue of only $2,000,000 instead of the $6,000,000 stated by the Postmaster General.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not say there was a loss of revenue of $6,000,000; I said if there had been no increase in the volume of business, by one fell stroke of the pen the reduction would have been $6,000,000, but there was a large increase in the volume of business.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): So it is quite clear there was no loss of $6,000,000 in revenue.

Mr. VENIOT: No one said there was.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I want that clear, because that was my understanding. Then in 1928 the net revenue was up to $30,529,154.76 and it is estimated that the revenue for the current year will be higher still, so that I submit there has been no loss in revenue sustained through the reduction in the postage rate. What items other than the revenue from the sale of postage stamps produced that total? Is there any revenue from money orders and postal notes?

Mr. VENIOT: There is just the revenue from that source and from the stamps.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Perhaps the Postmaster General can tell us under what headings the net revenue is made up?

Mr. VENIOT: I have here a statement which shows the revenue and expenditure in recent years.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I am asking for the different sources of revenue; it is all bulked here.

Mr. VENIOT: Our revenue is derived from the sale of stamps, from the commission on post office orders and postal notes, the postage on newspapers, the parcel post, the postage on circular advertising matter and so on and the sale of postal cards. I think that is about all.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): All these items, except the commission on postal notes and money orders, would come under the heading of postage, I suppose?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Then I suppose there would be really only two headings?

Mr. VENIOT: On page 11 of the report the revenue is given in greater detail:

Postage stamps, postcards, etc., sold	$ 26,200,775	97
Postage paid in cash on newspapers	1,483,317	75
Postage paid in cash on third class (printed) matter	1,158,518	59
Postage paid in cash on metered mail matter	1,103,339	88
Postage paid in cash on parcels	3,722,434	57
Rents of letter boxes and drawers	319,432	09
Commission received on money orders	1,575,248	20
Commission received on postal notes	179,486	69
Profit in exchange on money order business with other countries	18,403	81
Profit in exchange on British postal order business	2,277	93
Commission received from the United Kingdom on postal order business	740	29
Postage on parcels from other countries	635,339	60
Transit charges on correspondence from other countries	124,361	01
Void money orders, that is, money orders issued between January 1, 1926, and December 31, 1926, payment of which had not been claimed up to December 31, 1927	7,079	33
Lapsed postal notes	6,855	88
Collections from sale of rural mail boxes	21,548	00
Miscellaneous revenue	18,499	97
	$36,577,659	56
Deductions	6,048,504	80
	$30,529,154	76

Mr. HEAPS: I would like to refer to the matter of salaries paid in the postal department. Could the Postmaster General give the committee the amount of increase he recommended to the Civil Service Commission should be granted to the postal workers?

Mr. VENIOT: Last year I recommended that the minimum and maximum salary should be increased. Speaking from memory, I recommended this year an increase without fixing the amount; I requested the commission to readjust the salaries of the postal workers, postal clerks, and postal porters. I read the reply from the commission the other day in which they said that they did not consider an increase justifiable. I replied to that letter in March, and so far as I know nothing has been done since.

Mr. HEAPS: The increase recommended last year was only $60 per year.

Mr. VENIOT: If my memory serves me rightly I think the amount we recommended would have meant a vote in the estimates amounting to about $260,000.

Mr. HEAPS: But the individual increase would not have been more than $60 per year?

Mr. VENIOT: It would likely be around that figure.

Mr. HEAPS: I believe there was some correspondence tabled this year in relation to that particular question, but I have not had the time to look it up. The minister was good enough to inform the house the other night that he has exerted his very best efforts to obtain an increase for these postal employees, and he also went so far as to say that he had persuaded the government to side with his particular view. When I spoke on this question the other night I expressed some astonishment that the Civil Service Commission had not taken the proper action when the government were so unanimous in their views. It is quite possible that the Civil Service Commission turned it down because the recommendation of the Postmaster General would have meant so little to the men employed in the postal service. I am a very firm believer in the Civil Service Commission, and I would not like to see anything done which would impair the usefulness of that organization. However, the men in the postal department are becoming so disgusted with the actions of the government that they are beginning to ask that the question of salaries be taken out of the jurisdiction of the commission. But we should realize that once we begin to tamper with one of the main functions of that organization it will not be long before the commission will be wiped out of existence.

The Postmaster General has offered these men an increase of $5 per month. Had his recommendation been carried out it would mean they would receive a minimum of $90 per month. I do not think the Postmaster General or any member of this house will say that $90 per month is a decent living wage. Yesterday the Postmaster General, when making a defence of his department, paid a very eloquent tribute to the men and women employed in the department. He said that they were mostly responsible for the efficiency of the department, and I think the men who give such good service to the government and to the people of this country are deserving of at least a decent living wage. The government has not as yet recognized that fact, except for the recommendation of a $5 per month increase.

I would like to read a letter which is characteristic of a number I have received from

different parts of this country. This is a letter from an ex-service man in the city of Toronto:

I receive as salary $85 per month. Started to work on the city staff in September 1928; received my appointment latter part of February 1929,—

He then goes on to say that out of the salary of $85 per month a deduction of $8.50 is made, leaving a salary of $76.50, which he receives for his services.

Mr. STEVENS: What is the deduction for?

Mr. HEAPS: He does not say, but I imagine that part of it is for superannuation. The letter continues:

I have a wife and eight children to support on my salary, which as you will see is really only $76.50 per month. Would be indebted to you if you would place these facts before the house as I feel sure that were they aware of the small pittance paid to postal helpers, and the hardships caused through same, a large number of whom are returned men like myself, I have confidence to believe that there is not a member in the house who would not be in favour of granting us a living wage.

Mr. MANION: What is his occupation?

Mr. HEAPS: He is a postal helper.

Mr. ROBB: What is his name?

Mr. HEAPS: I do not think it would be fair to the man to give his name; I will let my hon. friend see the letter.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They would dismiss him.

Mr. HEAPS: This man, the father of eight children, has served overseas and a grateful country now rewards him with wages of less than $85 per month. I want to read from another communication which deals more particularly with the Civil Service Commission and its attitude toward the postal employees. This comes from a very high official of the organization and in his communication to me he represents what I believe to be the overwhelming sentiment of those employed in the Post Office Department. He writes:

We despair of ever getting any measure of justice or equity at the hands of the Civil Service Commission. Letter carriers and other postal employees are becoming disgusted waiting for something that does not materialize, and as nothing has been received under the Civil Service Commission since the act was amended in 1919, but a reduction of $156 in their salaries.

Then he goes on:

When we go to the commission with our grievances they never tell us the same story twice. Four years ago they told us if any increase was given us it would have to be given to all the civil service; that the amount would be so large the House of Commons would not vote it. The following year they told us if the government would give them the money they would try and distribute it. What they told us in 1928 you will find on page 2 of our circular letter to members of parliament, dated February 18, 1929. This year they advised our committee not to expect any increase as there were lots of men to be got for what they were receiving now.

In other words, when these men went to the Civil Service Commission this year to ask for an adjustment of their salaries, the reply they received was: "If you are not satisfied with your present condition, there are plenty of men to be obtained for the salaries that you are working for." If that is the way in which the Civil Service Commission handles the employees of the government, it seems to me a change should be made in the personnel of the commission.

The Postmaster General, as I said a moment ago, spoke yesterday in the house of the efficiency of the staff under his control. Nothing is more likely to impair the efficiency of that department than underpaying the men. I do not think any hon. member can expect a man who is working for $85, $90 or even $100 a month to be able to continue to give efficient service. We expect a great deal from those in the employ of the Post Office department. We expect the postmen to be courteous, honest, able to meet the public; we require that they shall be men of good character and physique. They have to go out in all sorts and conditions of weather; yet when the postman comes to our house we can almost tell the time by his knock. It is a sign of ingratitude that in the face of all this talk in parliament of our prosperity and our huge surpluses of revenue over expenditure, we refuse to increase the salaries of hundreds and possibly thousands of men in our employ who find it impossible to live on the wages they receive. I believe I am not doing the Postmaster General an injustice when I say that he recommended an increase of $5 per month to these men, but I want to see him and the government go a little further than that. The least the government can do is to pay to its able-bodied employees a minimum salary of $100 per month as requested by the postal workers in a memorandum to members of the house. I feel rather disappointed at the action of the government and even of parliament, that we can find no means of overcoming the obstacle of the Civil Service Commission to giving the postal workers what they are entitled to. If the government were to insert in the estimates a sum that would allow these men an in-

crease of approximately $120 to $150 a year, parliament, I feel satisfied, would vote it without a dissenting vote. It appears to me that on the present occasion the reason these men are not getting the increase is that parliament is unanimous in its view. When we all agree on a thing, the men apparently cannot get it. If there were a little disagreement on the question, it is possible that the postal employees would get the increase. Will the Postmaster General hold out any hope whatever to the lower paid men in the postal service of receiving a proper reward for the services they render to the people of the Dominion?

Mr. MANION: I wish to say just a few words along the same lines as the observations of my hon. friend. The hon. member for South Wellington in a few very eloquent remarks dealt with this question. He took up the matter with the minister and, after asking certain questions, found out that there were some 10,000 of the lower paid employees. The wages of many of those men would be under $100 a month. One's sympathy goes out to men of that type, who are trying to play the game, trying to be honest and to be worthy of the confidence of the people of the country in classes of service which demand the greatest amount of confidence and honesty. In my own city, for instance, there is no finer group of men than those employed in the Post Office Department, the letter carriers and other postal employees are a very high type of men. Many of them are, of course, reasonably well paid, but the postal helpers and letter carriers certainly deserve the sympathy of the house. I submit to the minister, in view of what has been pointed out by the last speaker as to the unanimous support which this question usually gets in the house—at least the unanimity of views which prevails with respect to it on this side, whether on the part of the group in the other corner or this group here—that the government will have no difficulty in passing such a resolution. They will receive no opposition from our side, and I am sure, if they bring in any such resolution, they will get no opposition over there. Parliament is the high court of the land. The Civil Service Commission, with all due respect—and I am one of those who support it—is not in control of a question like this. This question can be decided by the high court of parliament, by hon. members sitting in this house, and without taking up further time, I think the minister might well consider carrying out the suggestions of the hon. member for South Wellington and the hon. member for North Winnipeg in regard to increasing the salaries of the lower paid men. It might be said to me—and I will say it so that somebody else will not—that I was at one time in a position to have dealt with the matter. I doubt if the minister would have said this, but he knows I was not in office long enough to deal with a question of this sort. I could not have dealt with it during an election without being accused of having ulterior motives and he knows what it is to be accused of that. I appeal to the minister's sense of generosity, and to the government generally, to deal with this question from a generous standpoint. I can bespeak the support of all the members on this side, and I know the minister need not worry about his own.

Mr. VENIOT: It must not be understood that the salary of a postal helper who is receiving $1,020 a year is fixed at that; it ranges from that figure to the maximum, which is $1,440.

Mr. MANION: It takes some years to attain the maximum.

Mr. VENIOT: It increases at the rate of $60 a year. That is the way the Civil Service Commission regulates the matter The salary of a letter carrier begins at a minimum of $1,080 and increases to $1,440, and the salary of a postal clerk goes from $1,080 to $1,740. When they enter the service they enter at a minimum and after a number of years they reach a maximum which is a fairly good wage. My endeavour at the beginning was to increase the minimum and also to increase the maximum. I am not quite sure, but speaking from memory I think I asked that the minimum salary of the postal helper, which is $1,020, be increased by $100, and of course the maximum would also receive that $100 increase. I am speaking from memory, but I think that is about right. I give that information so that the committee will see how the thing works out. The other evening I think I gave the number of employees, namely, letter carriers, 2,710; postal clerks, 3,009; postal helpers, 2,922.

Mr. MANION: Is it not a fact that if the minister or the government brought in an estimate to increase these salaries, irrespective of anything in the Civil Service Act, parliament is supreme and could carry the matter through?

Mr. VENIOT: I think that parliament could, but I cannot lay down a policy for the government in this matter. I would have to have the government state its policy before I could commit myself.

Mr. STEVENS: While on this point, may I draw the minister's attention to the fact that in 1919 parliament voted a bonus for the letter carriers of $480, which, with the standard salary of $720, gave them a total of $1,200 as a minimum. Later on there was supposed to be a stabilization of salary to do away with the bonus, and it was understood that this stabilization would not lower the minimum to this class of workers, as to others, but when parliament did stabilize salaries, the result was that instead of receiving a bonus and salary which amounted to $1,200, the letter carriers received a salary of only $1,020.

Mr. VENIOT: Going back to the old minimum.

Mr. STEVENS: The old minimum was $720.

Mr. VENIOT: That is right.

Mr. STEVENS: The government did away with the $480 bonus and fixed the minimum salary at $1,020, with no bonus, making a loss of $180 per annum. The point I am making is that the letter carriers actually suffered a loss of $180 a year in the so-called stabilization.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Only as respects the minimum.

Mr. STEVENS: It is the minimum we are speaking of, and this is the class that is suffering. It is all very well to say that there has been an increase of $60 a year, but with that increase it would take the letter carrier three years before he would reach the $1,200 which he was receiving before the stabilization.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It affected very few in the service.

Mr. STEVENS: I would not think so; there is quite a number. The suggestion has been made to fix the minimum at $1,200 a year, it strikes me as a reasonable request.

Mr. McMILLAN: I am sure that the sentiment expressed by the hon. member for Fort William a few months ago, that he had every sympathy with the employees of the Post Office Department and stood solidly behind the Civil Service Commission at all times, except when he was a member of the shadow government—

Mr. MANION: I deny absolutely that I ever interfered at any time with the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McMILLAN: You deny it absolutely?

Mr. MANION: Absolutely.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. McMILLAN: You deny that you ever sent telegrams which secured the dismissal of post office officials in any part of Canada?

Mr. MANION: I deny absolutely that I ever interfered with anybody who was under the Civil Service Commission and that I ever appointed anybody who should have been appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McMILLAN: So far as the expressions of sympathy which we have just heard for the poorly paid class of public officials are concerned, more particularly postal-workers, I have every sympathy with the condition of those who are receiving salaries which do not enable them to sustain themselves and their families in that degree of comfort which we as citizens of this country would all like to see. But, sir, it has been a surprise to me during the four sessions I have sat in this house to observe the silence which has been kept respecting the returns of those who are the real wealth producers of this country. What is the situation? The real wealth producers of this country, in the first place, are the agriculturists, the artisans, mechanics, those who are engaged in the leading industries of this country, and the workingmen of Canada. If you take the year of our highest agricultural production—

Mr. GOTT: Order. The hon. gentleman is getting away from the question.

Mr. McMILLAN: Am I to be called to order, when these post office estimates are up for discussion and hon. members time after time talk about the poorly paid employees in this and other departments, if I endeavour to make a comparison with other poorly paid workers in this country? I was going to say that in the year 1927, which is the last year for which we have the full figures, and the year of our greatest agricultural production, the total agricultural production in this country amounted to $1,780,000,000. In that estimate is counted twice all the agricultural products which are consumed upon the farm in the production of our live stock and live stock products of every kind. When you subtract that amount from the sum total and divide the remainder among 711,090 farmers, which is the number in this country according to the last census—and that does not take in all the small farmers owning one acre or less—you will find that the gross earnings of each individual farmer and his family were less than $2,200 per annum. When you take into account the annual requirements, the necessary farm expenses, interest on investment, et cetera, I invite anyone in this house or out

of it to show where the average farmer in Canada is earning to-day over $1,100. When we come to the forty leading industries of this country and divide the total wage and salary bill of their employees amongst their number, according to the returns of 1924, we find that the average wage for the individual worker—not for himself, his wife and family—is $1,104.41. The earnings of the hired male servant and the maid servant on the farm together total $1,103 per annum, so that the average farmer of Canada with his wife and family are only able to earn to-day what his man servant and maid servant are receiving on the average throughout Canada. So when we consider the question of the salaries of our public officials, should not the whole economic system in this country be taken into consideration? Because after all is said and done, the real wealth producers of this country constitute the class upon whom the whole burden in the end must fall. If those who do produce the wealth of the country, are able to retain such a small portion to themselves how under heaven can they afford to pay other people any more?

Mr. VENIOT: I think in reading from my notes I made a mistake, in fact I am sure I did in giving the figures for the postal helpers. I gave the maximum as $1,440; it should be $1,320. For letter carriers I gave the maximum as $1,440; it should be $1,500. The other figures are correct.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): Are not those figures even in revised form subject to a diminution of so much per cent by way of compulsory contribution to a superannuation fund?

Mr. VENIOT: All employees of the government who come under the Pension Act contribute 5 per cent.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): So the net is not the figure the Postmaster General has given.

Mr. VENIOT: I have given the minimum and the maximum. Of course it is understood that 5 per cent is deducted for superannuation.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): The minimum is that much less.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I think some of us will agree that there is altogether too much truth in what the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) has stated. The agricultural people are receiving far less than they should receive, and the employees in industry are also receiving far less than they should receive. I am one of those who believe that we are not going to get very much improvement until we have a pretty complete reformation of the system. I would go further than I fancy my hon. friend from South Huron would go, though I do not think this is the time to discuss these other questions. I would rather emphasize the relation between the low paid employees of the government and the higher paid. We very easily secure additions in salary, for instance, in the case of the deputy ministers—perhaps their salaries are not too great; I am not discussing that, but I do say there is a very wide discrepancy between the higher paid and the lower paid officials. Whatever may be true of agriculturists or those engaged in industry generally, we are dealing now with one particular class of government employees and I think we would do well to consider, not this class in relation to some other group outside, but rather the actual requirements of this class having regard to living conditions as they are to-day.

In that connection I would refer to a document which I think has been quoted before in this discussion. It is a memorandum issued by the Amalgamated Civil Servants. I will quote two or three brief paragraphs.

First of all the question is put as to the cost of living to-day, and some figures are cited that were given before the industrial relations committee of this house. The memorandum then proceeds:

> For our purpose we have taken the figures from The Labour Gazette, which supplies the cost of a weekly budget of staple foods, fuel, light and rent only. It is stated in the Gazette that to estimate the cost of other necessities it is necessary to increase the cost of this budget by 50 per cent. We do not even go as high as this, merely adding 33-1/3 per cent.

Surely, that is a very, very moderate basis on which to go. The argument is concise:

> In 1919 the average cost of living was $22.18 per week, which, plus one-third, amounted to $1,557.81 for the year. Compare this with the $1,312.05 actually received by thousands of civil servants considered to be in the $1,500 maximum class of to-day. Again, in 1920, living costs for the year were $1,794.50, whilst these civil servants received only $1,593.

That is, taking the very lowest minimum figures as put forth in our own Labour Gazette we find that the maximum figure of the postal workers falls far short of the minimum requirement for decent living.

Now, if we in Canada were living in a period of trade depression there might possibly be some reason for this state of affairs, but we are assured by the Minister of Finance that we are living in a period of very great prosperity, and his budget shows a surplus. I would say that under these condi-

tions there is no excuse for permitting such a situation to continue. Let me read another paragraph from this memorandum:

> The average weekly budget over the period 1918-1927 was $21.79, amounting, plus one-third, to $1,510.77, while the average amount actually received by the class of civil servants mentioned was $1,396.11. Thus, these employees have, for ten years, been receiving an average salary less by $114.66, than the average cost of a budget, much less than the cost of a minimum health and decency budget.

So much for the higher paid of the postal helpers. Then comes a very strong plea for the lowest paid employees in the service.

> The main point, however, which we desire to stress most strongly is, that there are many civil servants in receipt of an average salary far below even $1,200 per annum.
>
> With an average cost of living existing over a period of ten years amounting to $1,510.77 per annum, surely our request for a $1,200 minimum salary errs only on the side of modesty, and justifies us in once again appealing for and urging your support.

I repeat, this seems to be an eminently modest and reasonable request. Our own statistics show that the very minimum required is over $1,500; all that the civil servants here ask is that no one should be paid less than $1,200.

According to some statistics recently brought down at the request of the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer), there are at the present time civil servants of the male sex getting less than $100 per month, full time, 2,089, and temporary, 1,672. To bring all these people up to the $1,200 a year minimum it would take $64,629. Surely not a tremendous amount when we consider the alleged prosperity of this country and the manner in which we can throw away money for certain purposes. In this same return I find that in the post office there are 624 full time employees, and 686 temporary employees receiving less than $100 a month. It would require only $18,534 to bring these people up to the $1,200 class. This is such a small amount I hardly like to put it forward as a reform in government policy, and yet the government seems determined to refuse to take any action about it.

As I said the other day, it seems to me that the Postmaster General is simply hiding behind the Civil Service Commission. He has asked them for very little—some $5 a month—hardly enough to justify the commission in considering seriously any change. If he had asked for $100 or $200 or $300 a year extra he might be justified and the house would be justified in insisting upon its being granted. But the Postmaster General's request is so small that one hardly can blame the Civil Service Commission for not acceding to it.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

An hon. gentleman behind me laughs; apparently he is astonished at this argument. But I repeat that the amount asked for is so very small that it seems to me the Postmaster General is merely seeking an excuse and is not very serious about the matter. If he were at all serious he would force it to an issue.

Again, as I said, it seems to me that the Postmaster General is hiding behind the government; for again to-night he says, "I am not the government, I cannot take action". The other night he refused to come out definitely and say that he would recommend such action to the government. Until we have a statement from the Postmaster General that he is prepared to recommend substantial increases to the government and that the government is prepared to stand by such recommendation, then we shall have to throw the blame for the lack of these increases upon the Postmaster General himself.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I had not intended taking part in this debate, but I have had correspondence with letter carriers and have asked them confidentially to state their opinion on the matter. I asked them plainly: "Do you think the Postmaster General is making a screen of the Civil Service Commission? Do you think that the Civil Service Commission ought to be disbanded, and would you rather go back to the patronage system? If not, what is your opinion regarding this question?" The answer I got was this: We do not know and we are not prepared to say that the Postmaster General is hiding behind the Civil Service Commission, making a smoke screen of it. Nor am I prepared to make that charge either, because I have no evidence touching the matter. The Postmaster General on April 5 did make a statement at the instance of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Thorson) and we all agreed with the conclusions of hon. gentlemen who had spoken before him. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) and members of the opposition agreed with the Postmaster General that there should be a substantial increase in the salaries of these employees. The Postmaster General himself said so. Now the question that presents itself to me is this: Can we formulate some sort of proposal which will solve the problem for this year? It seems to me that the Civil Service Commission themselves cannot be such iron clad people as to be impervious to public opinion and to the opinion expressed on either side of this house. They cannot be individuals of that description unless there is something behind it of which

we do not know. Well, I put this proposition to the Postmaster General—and I am not throwing any insinuations at him. We have all expressed the view that these men deserve an increase in salary, and they themselves have stated their position. They say, "The Postmaster General has admitted that we deserve an increase, but what with the commission not taking action and the Postmaster General, although recommending it not being able to enforce it, we are the sufferers". This is the proposition I put to the Postmaster General: Supposing that he himself nominated a committee from both sides of the house and waited upon the Civil Service Commission and asked for a conference, placing the matter before them in a reasonable light. If they were reasonable men they would comply with the request.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Let us go down on our knees when we do it.

Mr. ADSHEAD: No; we do not need to go down on our knees. If they have the power which it is said they have, and if the Postmaster General, as he says, cannot help himself, it is not an unreasonable proposal that such a committee as I suggest should meet with the Civil Service Commission and talk the matter over. Then, if they remained unreasonable, further action could be taken. Let me make another suggestion to the Postmaster General: If the Civil Service Commission do accede to the request—or if they do not—will the Postmaster General, shall I say, show his sincerity in this matter by calculating what the total increase would amount to and including it in the supplementary estimates, so that it may be available when the Civil Service Commission do comply with the request of the house?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I am glad to be able to say a few words on behalf of the postal workers of the Dominion. I wish to say frankly that I am in favour of an increase to the lower paid postal workers in Canada. I do not think there is any room for argument in that regard. I am very much pleased also to observe to-night such unanimity of opinion in the house touching the question. During the last few days we have listened to a very lengthy discussion from the other side of the house with referrence to the action of the Postmaster General. And what has been the whole weight of the argument, if you can call it an argument, emanating from that side? It has been this: that if, for example, a postmaster died in this country it would be a crime for the Postmaster General to endeavour in any way to keep the service going by appointing a man temporarily. That is about the substance of the argument we have had from the other side. And what do we find to-night? We have heard the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), an hon. gentleman for whom I have the highest regard. I am always sorry to see him on the other side because he never looks at home; still, I have a very high regard for him. I was therefore glad to hear him; and I was glad to hear the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) also making a plea. But what did it indicate? The Civil Service Commission, which we have been led to believe was a paragon of perfection, for some unaccountable reason now comprises such scoundrels that they will not do full justice to the postal employees. In other words, when hon. gentlemen opposite for their own purpose wish to use the Civil Service Commission, the commission are the finest type of people in the country; but when it does not suit the purpose of hon. gentlemen opposite to represent the commission in this light then they ignore them. Now I want to ask this question: Who at the present time is running the affairs of this country?

Mr. GOTT: No one.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Is it the Civil Service Commission or the government? When I find the Postmaster General saying that there was a wish to pay the lower paid postal workers more money but that the commission refused to meet this wish, then I ask myself and this house seriously the question I have just put: Who is running this country at the present time?

An hon. MEMBER: Veniot.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Well, let me say to my hon. friends opposite that if they could show anyone as capable of administration as the Postmaster General they would be very well off. What position do we find ourselves in when, all parties being unanimous in the desire to pay more money to the lower salaried employees, we discover that we are impotent in the matter?

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. BOYS: Let the government introduce legislation; that is all that is necessary.

Mr. ROBB: You would block it.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): But what I want to bring out is this: How is it that so suddenly hon. gentlemen opposite change their opinion regarding the Civil Service Commission? At one time they wish the Civil Service Commission to be in absolute control—

Mr. ERNST: Not the Civil Service Commission, but the law.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): My hon. friend is talking too fast; he will learn more when he is here longer. At another time hon. gentlemen opposite, when it suits their purpose, desire to override the authority given that same Civil Service Commission under the law. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite they cannot have it both ways; either they must stick to the law at all times or they must not do so, and if they are going to stick to it in one case why not stick to it all the time? I want to say emphatically that so far as I am personally concerned, if this government wishes to pay these postal workers or the employees of any other department larger salaries but cannot do so under the existing law, that law should be changed immediately.

Mr. GEARY: That is what has been suggested.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): No, hon. gentlemen opposite are not saying that; at one time they say the Civil Service Commission are paragons of perfection and the next moment they say the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission is not worth considering. I have never heard greater inconsistencies in argument in my life, and I am sure the people of this great country will be thoroughly disgusted with such arguments coming from hon. gentlemen opposite.

About ten years ago I remember when certain postal employees in my city were on strike. We had a public meeting, which I attended and where I did a little speaking, and I said very boldly that I condemned the action of postal workers in going on strike. I also said, however, that since they were paid such very small salaries, and since they were striking for larger salaries, I was with them 100 per cent. I took that position ten years ago and I am of the same opinion to-night.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I must thank my hon. friend from Saskatoon for the compliments he has just paid me; I regret that at the outset I must say I am afraid I cannot congratulate him on his understanding of the situation which confronts us at this moment. He does not really understand the situation.

My hon. friend asserts that we on this side of the house have been charging the Postmaster General with breaking the letter and the spirit of the Civil Service Act. That is so; we have done so for several days, and we have brought up many glaring examples. As I tried to tell the house about a week ago in discussing this very question, we expect the Postmaster General to be absolutely bound by the letter and the spirit of that act, just as we expect the government to be bound by it. However, that does not bind this parliament, which is above the Civil Service Act and the Civil Service Commission, and if in this house we have the unanimity of opinion which my hon. friend says exists with regard to increased wages for the lower paid officials of the Post Office Department, parliament can meet that situation in five minutes. We passed through this House of Commons yesterday in five minutes, by unanimous consent a supply bill which involved millions of dollars. All that is necessary is for the Postmaster General to secure the support of his own government to a proposal to pay these men what is fair and reasonable, and to do it now.

It is idle for hon. members opposite to get up and say how greatly they sympathize with these postal workers if they do not carry their sympathy into practice. I will congratulate the hon. member for Saskatoon on being the only member on the Liberal side of the house who has said a word in favour of these men. A week ago to-night I urged that some hon. members opposite should support this proposal, but up to the present time my hon. friend from Saskatoon is the only member on that side who has done so. The Postmaster General says he is in favour of the proposal and has recommended it; can he not convince the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister that it is right? If it is right, with the government in command of the house as it undoubtedly is at present, why not bring in the necessary measure and pass it?

I was criticized when I made that proposal a week ago; I think it was the Postmaster General or the Minister of Finance who interjected that it could not be done, that the Auditor General would not pay these amounts. My friend the Minister of Finance knows better than that. We will have supplementary estimates this session; put in an item fixing the amount to be paid the postal workers of Canada notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, with the names and amounts set out. That could be done on one sheet of paper, and if the house is unanimous in the view that such action should be taken, the bill could be passed in five minutes. Then it could be sent to the senate as part of the supply bill and the senate could not change it. The whole matter is in our hands; are we willing to take this action?

I submit that the present salaries paid the lower grade officials in the postal service is a disgrace to Canada and to the public service, and should not be tolerated in this great

country. My hon. friend the Postmaster General will agree with me; he says these officials are underpaid. Why continue this disgraceful situation; why not change it now? We have considerable time remaining in this session during which we might consider the matter. I ask the Minister of Finance to take it up with his colleagues; I ask the Postmaster General earnestly to press it upon the Minister of Finance; I ask the government to bring in a supplementary estimate fixing the amount involved. I presume that all the 10,500 postal workers will not be affected; I do not know the percentage, but we might assume that those concerned will comprise perhaps 25 or 30 per cent of the total. I would not suggest giving them a niggardly $60 increase as recommended by the Postmaster General; I would give them something more substantial than that. I would see that a minimum was established of at least $100 a month. Surely that is necessary when our own Department of Labour informs us that a family of five cannot live in this country and supply itself with the necessities of life on $1,200 a year. That amount is sufficient to provide only for food, fuel and rent; people must be clothed, and a family of that size cannot live decently on $1,200 a year. Surely we can establish that as a minimum and agree to it this session.

I believe there is an inclination on the part of the Postmaster General, and perhaps on the part of the government, to postpone this matter, I suspect until next session, but I urge the Postmaster General to have it attended to this year; the government will get all the credit. If there is a wrong under the present system there must be a remedy; there is no wrong in this country which parliament cannot right. Are we agreed that it is wrong to pay these men at the present scale? If so, let us right that wrong now. There is nothing in the law to stop us; we can override the Civil Service Act and the Civil Service Commission. I will grant you that the Postmaster General should not override the law, but he does so.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Has the Civil Service Commission, under the present Civil Service Act, the power to increase these salaries?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, in my judgment it has the power to do so, but I understood the minister to say the commission will not grant his recommendation.

Mr. VENIOT: The commission say it is not justified.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If they are wrong in that opinion are they to bind this parliament? The idea is absurd. That commission is our creature, and we cannot permit to exist a wrong which has been brought to our attention. If there is no division of opinion on the question I should like a good many more hon. members on the other side of the house to get up and support this request for action, then I think we might get somewhere; they would force the government to do what is right by these employees and do it this session. Let it not be postponed any longer; let it be done now.

Mr. ROBB: The debate this week has been as varied as the weather.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The weather has been pretty steady—rain.

Mr. ROBB: During the early part of the week we had hon. gentlemen opposite attacking my colleague the Postmaster General; they alleged that he had not always acted as the Civil Service Commission had recommended. Now we have them urging that the government—

Mr. GUTHRIE: That parliament, not the government.

Mr. ROBB: —override the decision of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Parliament can do it

Mr. ROBB: It is only fair to say of the Civil Service Commission that in their report they claim that the salaries paid in the postal service are comparable with the salaries paid in other departments of the government service. I submit to the hon. gentlemen that if they are going to consider an increase in the salaries of the civil service of Canada they should not pick out only the postal workers. I venture to say that if the postal employees of Canada or the civil service of Canada were asked how they were being treated to-day as compared with the salaries and retirement allowances they received under the administration of which my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) was a minister, that they would reply that they are being fairly well treated. This government has improved to a marked degree the position of the civil service of Canada; not only have salaries been increased but we have provided retirement allowances for members of the service, and in many cases for their families.

As pointed out a moment ago by an hon. gentleman who represents a rural constituency, in considering the salaries of the civil service it is only fair to take into consideration the salaries of those who provide the

revenue for the carrying on of the affairs of this country. I think every member in the house will admit that our primary industries, those of the farm, forest, mine and fisheries, provide the traffic for the railways.

Miss MACPHAIL: And the tariff too.

Mr. ROBB: They provide a great part of the revenue of the railway workers, and, with the railway workers and those who are employed in industry, provide the revenue to carry on the affairs of the government.

I am one of those who have great respect for the Civil Service Commission as a means of determining the qualifications for entering the service. I do not say that they are always right but I think they do fairly well under the act parliament has given them to administer. In some places that act limits the scope of the commission in determining who shall get the position, but until parliament has the courage to amend the act—bring it a little nearer if you wish to the British act, and I think that would be much better for Canada—we must put up with the act as it is. The Civil Service Commission in considering the salaries to be paid in one department of the service must take into consideration the salaries paid in other government services.

Mr. HEAPS: If the minister has so much confidence in the commission why does he appoint another commission to investigate them?

Mr. ROBB: In the particular service which the hon. gentleman have been discussing there is a surplus of applications for the positions, notwithstanding the salaries paid. The people who accept those positions know before they enter the service what the salary is going to be; they know what the minimum and the maximum are; they know of the pensions provided for their families. In this particular service there is a large waiting list all the time, but in the technical classes the experience has been that men are being drawn away from the service. Industry is offering them more than the government offers, and that is why this commission of advisers was appointed. I am glad to say that the personnel of the commission has been well received by the country as a whole. Their duty is to look into the relativity of certain salaries paid in the public service of Canada to the remuneration for similar services in the different industries of the country.

It is all very well for my hon. friend, the acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Guthrie) to say that we can put an amount in the estimates to take care of the postal workers, but how is that to be allocated?

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: According to the lowest paid.

Mr. ROBB: Are we to override the Civil Service Commission, which has been formed purposely to determine how much is to be given to each class in the service? These questions must all be worked out. If we put in an amount for the postal workers what will my hon. friend say about the other workers employed in the public service? Are we to throw them to the wolves? Have they not some right to consideration as to the salary they should get?

Mr. GUTHRIE: If they are down as low as the others.

Mr. ROBB: Take the rural postmaster who has to wait up late at nights for the different trains; has he no rights?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The rural mail carrier too?

Mr. ROBB: If there is any class that is not properly treated it is the rural postmaster.

Mr. COOTE: You should treat them better.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend has referred to the rural mail carrier. That position is advertised and any person can tender for the work; that business is carried on the same as the other business of Canada. If we are going to establish a fixed remuneration for the rural mail carriers—

Mr. GUTHRIE: On a mileage basis.

Mr. ROBB: —then we must be prepared to go a step further and give all contracts on that basis and abandon the tender system.

When you take into consideration the salaries paid to the civil service as compared with those paid on the farm, in the mines, in the forests; as compared with those paid to teachers in the public schools, to professors in the colleges, to those working in the department stores and different commercial houses throughout the country; as compared with the salaries paid in the services of the different provincial governments, it will be found that the employees of the Dominion of Canada are much better off to-day than they were when this government assumed the responsibilities of office in 1922.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I assume from what the minister says that it would be inadvisable to bring up the question of postal workers' salaries without considering the salaries paid in the rest of the service.

Mr. ROBB: I think it would be fairer.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Does my hon. friend condemn the Postmaster General for making his recommendation on April 5 that the salaries of postal workers should be increased?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. MALONEY: The minister has mentioned the superannuation scheme under which the civil servants come. Does he contend that that is a gift from the government to the civil service? Is it not a fact that the civil service, because of their monthly contributions, are entitled to that superannuation?

Mr. ROBB: Yes; the government pays part and they pay part.

Mr. MALONEY: But the government is making money on the superannuation scheme every day. The government is making more out of the superannuation scheme than any insurance company in the country is making out of insurance, because many civil servants may die before they retire and all that money remains with the government. The superannuation is certainly no gift. I am not finding fault with the minister for stating he believes many civil servants are well paid. I believe that to be the fact, but on the other hand there are innumerable civil servants who are much underpaid and as soon as the government realizes that fact the better it will be for the public service of Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am rather interested in this discussion for two or three reasons, the first being that on several occasions when ministers found it necessary to ask parliament to increase salaries notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act, they got very little support from hon. gentlemen opposite. I have vivid recollections of several such occasions. Another objection I take to the suggestions of some hon. gentlemen opposite is this: they suggest that because the postal workers are now under review, they should be given an increase, notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not deny that they have all, in season and out of season, been the advocates of control by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MANION: Control of appointments.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Control of appointments and control of salaries.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If we think they do wrong, we can correct them.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Hon. gentlemen opposite have argued that the Civil Service Commission should rule over the civil service of this country. Notwithstanding any opinion we may have had about the matter, the act has remained without change. Along with all the other members of the government who were present when the proposition of the Postmaster General was made to increase these salaries, I was agreeable to it, and we asked the Civil Service Commission to consider such an increase. But hon. gentlemen opposite will bear in mind that since this government came into office there have been one or two increases granted to the civil service. In what manner were the Civil Service Commission asked to revise the salaries of the civil service? They were asked to ascertain the wages paid in similar vocations in industrial and commercial life in this country and to fix the salaries of the civil servants on that basis. I am not going to argue that that was done in its entirety, but I do say that those were the instructions given to the Civil Service Commission when the increases were proposed. The commission did their work and parliament accepted that. The salaries were fixed on that basis and it is assumed, rightly or wrongly, that the civil service are on a parity with similar services in other lines of endeavour throughout the country. That is the basis on which we presume those conclusions were reached.

I for one am in favour of an increase to the postal workers. But this is the surprising thing to me: the acting leader of the opposition stands up in his place to-night and states that all the government has to do is to insert an item in the estimates to provide for this increase. That would be absolutely unfair. As a reason for not recommending an increase at this time, the Civil Service Commission say that it would make the salaries of the postal employees out of line with those of other classes of civil servants. Every individual employed in the civil service who is drawing a salary similar to that of the postal worker has a right to be considered. Nevertheless hon. gentlemen opposite will ignore all these considerations. It seems to me that if the Civil Service Commission are instructed that the minimum salaries paid in those classes are too low, and to readjust them, that is their business; but in all sincerity I do not think parliament is equipped on every occasion to do work of this character at the request of someone in some particular line. I am not quarrelling with the suggestion of the acting leader of the opposition that perhaps the rural mail carriers or the rural postmasters do not receive enough money. But, parliament in its wisdom having set up a civil service commission for this purpose, having given it all the equipment for making investigation, ascertain-

ing wherein there is inequality, and trying to place the civil service upon a parity from one end of the country to the other, that commission is the proper body to arrive at a conclusion whether or not an increase should be granted. If the salaries are not in line with what people in similar occupations in commercial and industrial life are receiving, then let the commission recommend that increase, and let us pay it. When the Postmaster General suggested to the government that the postal employees were underpaid, I believed him; but I realized that if they were to receive an increase, then a very large body of the civil service was also entitled to an increase. I am not opposing that, but it seems rather a strange procedure to ask parliament to deal with a single case without taking into consideration the whole service. I will agree with my hon. friend if he will ask the Civil Service Commission to consider the salaries of all those in similar classes and vocations, but I am not prepared to consider one class only.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Let us take all the lower grades.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, but let the Civil Service Commission handle the question. I think they are the body best equipped to do it, and not the House of Commons.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Has no other member of the government made a similar request or recommendation in connection with his department?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We are making requests repeatedly. In my department I have as many requests for increase turned down as are granted. The Civil Service Commission have a man who goes through the Department of the Interior making reports whether the recommendations made by the minister—because they have to be signed by him—are to be granted or not, and the Civil Service Commission take action on those reports.

Mr. STEVENS: The Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Interior have both laid emphasis upon the fact that we have criticized the Postmaster General for departing from the terms of the Civil Service Act in connection with certain features of his department, and on the other hand they claim that we are now—

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I did not suggest anything of the kind.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend did.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No; I confined my remarks to the particular question at issue. I was not in the chamber when the other question was under discussion.

Mr. STEVENS: We are told that we are now advocating a violation of the Civil Service Act. I think the hon. member for Saskatoon was the one who said this.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I did not say you were advocating a violation of the act.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, an overriding of the commission. We will put it in that way.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): What I was pointing out was that for the last few days this commission was being held up as one which was doing no wrong.

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Now my hon. friends want parliament to act in place of the commission.

Mr. STEVENS: We have not held up the commission as doing no wrong. We have stood behind the Civil Service Act as the governing act over the civil service of this country, and we still stand behind it.

Here is the situation that has arisen in regard to the rate of salary paid to the lower paid classes of the service. The Postmaster General told us last year, and I think he told us again this year, that he had made a recommendation to the Civil Service Commission and that the Civil Service Commission—he will correct me if I am wrong—turned down his request on the ground, at least this was one of the grounds, that if they increased the salaries of the lower paid members of the Post Office Department it would necessarily follow that they would have to increase the salaries paid in connection with similar lines of work in other departments.

Mr. VENIOT: That would rather be the inference.

Mr. STEVENS: Frankly, that has no terrors for me. The point at issue is this: Are these men whose position we are now discussing—I would remind the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) that we are now discussing the post office estimates, by the way—paid a sufficient salary? There is unanimity of opinion, or there was until the Minister of Finance spoke, that they are not paid a sufficient salary. If there are other civil servants doing a similar class of work in other departments the same reasoning naturally will apply to their case. We have said—my hon. friend from South Wellington so stated a moment ago—that it was within

the power of parliament to adjust this matter, and I suggest to the minister and to the government a way in which it could be done, supplementing what my hon. friend from South Wellington said a moment ago. We could take into consideration the question of a minimum salary—a minimum wage, we will put it that way. The suggestion has been made—I made it myself a few weeks ago—that we should fix $100 a month as the minimum wage for an adult civil servant; that, of course, would not apply to youngsters just entering the service as messengers or something of that sort. Let adult civil servants, doing the normal work of an adult, be paid a minimum salary of $100 per month. Some classes might properly be exempted; there would not be very many, and they could be specified. That is a reasonable proposition, and if parliament would so declare the Civil Service Commission would undoubtedly immediately comply. It is within the competence of parliament so to declare.

I pointed out to the minister a few moments ago—I did it a week ago, and I am going to do it now, and draw it to the attention of the Minister of the Interior as well—that as a matter of fact certain members of the Post Office Department are to-day receiving less salary than they were in 1919. The facts are clear; there is no escape from them. In 1919 there was a minimum wage to a letter carrier of $720, and there was a bonus paid of $480, making a total of $1,200. The civil service properly asked that the salary be stabilized at that rate as a minimum, and that certain increases then be given. Parliament accordingly fixed the minimum salary for a letter carrier at $1,200, overriding, if you please, the Civil Service Commission, or disregarding it, in so far as the Civil Service Act is concerned. Parliament did that as a matter of fairness to the underpaid civil servants. They had asked that that rate be stabilized as a minimum salary, and it was virtually agreed that it should be so stabilized. But when action had been taken, this is what resulted: The minimum salary was fixed at $1,020, with no bonus, so that the letter carrier who in 1919 was drawing $720 in salary and $480 as a bonus, or a total of $1,200, finds himself $180 a year or $15 a month, poorer, because he is receiving $1,020 instead of $1,200. There is no excuse for that.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Will my hon. friend explain how that comes about? He says that some of these men are drawing less money than they did in 1919, although it was stipulated that no man should draw less than his salary and bonus after the stabilization.

Mr. STEVENS: The action of parliament had, as a matter of fact, that result. I am not at the moment criticizing the action of the government.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): What I am asking my hon. friend is, how does it come about that any individual in the service at that time could now be drawing less money? I could understand it as applying to those entering the service since then.

Mr. STEVENS: I can tell my hon. friend that it is a fact, nevertheless. I will give another case. The maximum salary of a post office letter carrier in 1919 was $1,260, plus $396 bonus, or a total of $1,656. He now receives a maximum salary of $1,500, or a reduction of $156. There is a legitimate grievance which these men have. They find themselves poorer owing to the action of this house in 1924 than they were in 1919. The Postmaster General disclaims responsibility because he says that he cannot act in this matter alone. Very good; then I submit to the government that the situation is such that it ought to engage their attention and be righted this session; it should not be allowed to continue as at present. I brought this matter to the attention of the house last year, as did my hon. friends from Winnipeg; we have it up again this year; there is a general feeling in the house that some action should be taken, yet we simply drift along. It will not do for the government to answer that the Civil Service Commission—

Mr. VENIOT: Does my hon. friend suggest that the minimum salary on entrance to the service be $100 per month?

Mr. STEVENS: I suggest a minimum salary of $100 to an adult for the normal work of an adult.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That means young stenographers.

Mr. STEVENS: No, youngsters of that character might be termed apprentices and should be exempted.

Mr. VENIOT: None under eighteen receive the minimum for an adult.

Mr. STEVENS: That virtually would do away with the objection. In some cases the objection might hold; I think there are a few messengers, for instance, who carry special delivery letters and so forth. No one is suggesting that they should be included.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): A number of married men act in the same capacity as messengers. We have all those difficulties.

Mr. STEVENS: A man doing a man's job is entitled to a minimum wage of $100 a month, and I think that ought to be accepted and established by parliament. I suggest to the government that they take this question into consideration and let us this session declare such a principle, fixing the minimum salary, and then the commission with all their machinery could very readily adjust the various salaries.

Mr. VENIOT: May I ask my hon. friend when that minimum to which he referred was fixed?

Mr. STEVENS: In 1924.

Mr. VENIOT: By law?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, by the action of parliament, and it was intended—there is no question of this—to stabilize the rate at the original figure of $720 per year plus the bonus of $480, as the minimum salary.

Mr. VENIOT: But it did not work out that way.

Mr. STEVENS: No, it did not. I frankly confess that I do not understand what peculiar twist of phraseology in the law brought about that result, but that is the result.

Mr. VENIOT: I see that that is the result but I cannot understand how it could be brought about.

Mr. STEVENS: No, and that is why I invite the government to reconsider this whole question. I have under my hand a reference to the report of a committee of parliament which recommended what I am now suggesting. A committee of parliament sat in 1924, and if I recollect rightly, they made a unanimous report in regard to the matter.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Quite right; the bonus was to be added in every case.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, the bonus was to be added in every case and stabilized at that rate. I think the committee will take my word for it—

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is quite correct.

Mr. STEVENS: —that the parliamentary committee—it was under Mr. Raymond as chairman, if I recall rightly—recommended unanimously that this should be done. The grievance of some of these employees is that they not only failed to get that accomplished, but they are actually under a lower rate today than they were at that time. So there is a very strong case for these workers. And when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance brings forward the suggestion that the increase would run into other departments, the answer is a simple one: If in other departments employees doing a similar class of work are receiving these lower rates of pay, then by all means bring them up to the level we are now advocating for the letter carriers and postal workers.

Mr. J. FERNAND FAFARD (L'Islet) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words on behalf of the rural counties. We, who represent the farming classes, have broad enough views to understand that letter-carriers are entitled to a reasonable remuneration, in order that they may give to their children a decent education. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre stated that he was in favour of a minimum salary of $100 per month for civil servants. If he is sincere, he also desires that this minimum salary be applicable not only to civil servants but also to those employed in basic industries. Evidently, being the champion of large interests, he did not wish to mention this minimum salary for those employed in industries which help in the development of our natural resources.

I recall reading in newspapers that when the house is in session, it entails an expenditure of $30,000 per day to the country. Well, sir, it is unfortunate to note that during the present week we have already spent $200,000. Why? To find out what everybody knows, that the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) is the best Postmaster General that we have had for many years past. His dealings were thoroughly investigated and absolutely nothing illegal was found.

Sir, as a representative of a rural riding, I must point out that a great deal of time is devoted, in this House, to the cause of civil servants and very little thought is given to the farming classes. We have farmers who own lands worth seven or eight thousand dollars and are far from earning the minimum salary the hon. member for Vancouver Centre mentioned a short while ago.

If we, on this side of the House, representatives of rural ridings, are in favour of an equitable salary for the civil servants; if we want them to live decently and give a good education to their families, we equally want the hon. members of the opposition to cast their eyes now and then on the farming classes. When we lowered the duties on farm implements, a few years ago, that was rendering a minimum service to the farmers, yet we met opposition which was not to the credit of these same gentlemen who sit opposite to us.

Once more, I do not wish to further waste the time of the House, however, I want to ask the hon. members sitting on your left, sir, to take a greater interest in the farming classes of this country.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I think sometimes, Mr. Chairman, we speak rather prematurely in regard to these matters; the unanimity which was apparent earlier in the evening does not now exist. We understood at the outset that every member was agreed on this subject, and that the government were absolutely behind the proposal to increase the rate of pay and bring it up to a fair standard. To-night we find that one or two members on the government side are in favour of this increase, "but"—and there they pause and begin to give some reason why the proposal should not be adopted. Finally the Minister of Finance, upon whom will depend in the main the settlement of this question, tells us that the civil service is well paid. Consequently I do not believe that any suggestions we may offer or any pressure we can put upon the Postmaster General will avail in bringing about a settlement of this question.

An hon. MEMBER: Until the next general election.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Perhaps. The Minister of Finance said that the civil servants have a splendid system of superannuation. But as the member for South Renfrew pointed out, that is not at all to the credit of the government. We have heard of cases of civil servants paying into the superannuation fund without receiving a cent in return. It is the best kind of industrial insurance that I know of for the benefit of the company—in this case the government. The Minister of Finance also said that in the end the public pays for these increases. Well, I would point out that the postal helpers are employed in distributing the mail in our cities, and it is from these urban centres that most of the profit from the postal service is derived. Therefore if the public pays for increases of this kind I think the request of the postal helpers should receive special consideration at the hands of the government. Besides, the government has not sought to reduce the war tax collected in the cities. Therefore the cities may rightly claim that the postal service should receive fair consideration from the Postmaster General.

It has been said that the government increased the salaries of these men. This is disputed, and it has been pointed out by one member that some of the salaries instead of being increased have been reduced under the settlement which the government claim benefited the postal workers. If this contention of these men as would appear, is well-founded, then I think the government should reconsider the case and see to it that they are given the substantial increase which we all understood they were to receive. I do not think the Postmaster General will deny after what has been pointed out by several hon. members to-night that some of these postal workers are not as well off to-day as they were in 1919. In my opinion this has been demonstrated in the course of the discussion, but it appears as if the Postmaster General now perceives it for the first time. Undoubtedly a grievance exists among the lower paid members of the postal service, and the Postmaster General should accede to our request that these men be placed on an equality with the other postal helpers in regard to increased pay. I have pleasure in supporting the proposal, but after listening to the Minister of Finance I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion that our efforts will fail unless they are more strongly supported on the other side of the house than they have been up to the present time.

Mr. EVANS: I wish to add my voice to the demand that has been made for a living wage for the postal workers of this country. It has been a surprise to me for many years now that somehow or other the government expects certain civil servants to exist on a wage which must be far below the living line, while the men who get seven, eight and nine thousand dollars are continually being further considered. This is not as it should be. We like to think that we are living under a democratic form of government. Regarding the words of the Minister of Finance that many of the primary producers are not in any better position, after all, the rate of remuneration at which a man's services may be obtained does not matter; the government should not expect him to work for a wage on which he cannot live decently. Regarding those whom the Minister of Finance also mentioned, those who furnish the revenue of the nation, the new wealth which is added each year, it is quite true that we are guaranteeing the profits of all other classes except those who really create this new wealth. One way in

which the government can help those who are getting only a poor living wage is for them to lower the cost of living. While we are guaranteeing the profits of one class, we are making it impossible for the wages that are paid to meet the cost of living which every other class has to face. Some means must be found to give these people a living wage. Lately I was told that some of the temporary workers in Ottawa are receiving as low as $68 a month. This is far below what a family can live on these days.

The Minister of Finance also mentioned the rural mail carriers as perhaps the most poorly paid in the whole service, and he said the government do not fix the salaries of these carriers. I think they do worse than fix the salaries; they grind them down to the very lowest cent they can do the work for. There is one rural mail route established in my constituency and the tenders have been twice issued for rural mail carriers; but the price has been too high in each case; yet in each case only a very moderate wage is asked for the day's work. Moreover, we expect in the rural mail service men who will comply with all the regulations, men who have to be out in all sorts of weather, travelling over all kinds of roads. And we also exact from the rural mail carrier a bond which is not asked for in the case of the city worker. A good deal of consideration is therefore due the rural mail carrier and I should like to see him receive better treatment than he has been getting in the past. Very few of these people get anything like a wage commensurate with the expenses involved in their calling.

Mr. HEAPS: I feel constrained to say a word or two in reply to the remarks made this evening by the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman asked why we were discussing only postal employees. I am quite prepared to deal with the whole question of wages of all civil servants when the proper time comes; but we are now dealing with post office estimates, hence the discussion of the salaries of postal employees.

As has been already pointed out, in previous years there has been a fairly unanimous feeling in this house in favour of an increase in salary for these men, but so far it has been denied them, let us say, by the Civil Service Commission. Another reason why we should deal with the postal department is that it is one of the revenue producing branches of government; it is the service for which the people pay. I am satisfied, therefore, that the majority of the people do not want to see the postal employees poorly paid; I believe that the people who come into contact with the postal service are anxious to see that these employees get a reasonably fair wage for the services they perform.

When the Minister of Finance discussed the question of technical employees and the salaries paid them, he came out with what is to me a most remarkable statement. He said that as there was a shortage of technical employees it was necessary to consider the question of giving to these people an increase in salary. But what did the Minister of Finance actually do? When the Civil Service Commission recomended a fairly large increase in the salaries of these technical employees the minister evidently was dissatisfied with that recomendation and therefore appointed a commission to look into the matter. There is the anomaly, I might say the absurdity of the position in which the Minister of Finance finds himself. He went further and made the statement that, so far as these other workers are concerned, these lower paid men, there are too many of this class and consequently we can keep wages down to the absolute minimum. As a labour representative in this house I strongly resent, and I wish to say that the labour movement throughout the Dominion will equally resent the idea that because there is a waiting list, a large number of men out of work, that is any excuse for the government to reduce wages. And that is the only conclusion one can come to from the remarks of the Minister of Finance to-night. He also asked with what particular class of employees the postal workers could be classified. Well, suppose we classify postal employees with the labourers, let us say, of Toronto. The labourers there are paid by the municipal council, I believe, 60 cents per hour, which is probably more than is paid to the postal workers of Toronto. If I were asked with what class of workers I should classify postal employees I should say that the postal worker, in view of the many qualifications which a man must possess in order to become a postman in Canada, and in view of the strict examination he must passs before he enters the public service, ought to be classified at least with policemen and firemen. I have seen the examination test which postal workers are expected to pass before they are accepted, and I venture to say that if the same examination were submitted to members of parliament more than one half of them would not be able to pass it.

An hon. MEMBER: Speak for yourself.

Mr. HEAPS: I am speaking for myself. I could not answer half the questions which these people are asked by the Civil Service

Commission to answer. As I say, I would classify the postal workers with at least policemen and firemen, who are receiving more than $85 a month to begin with. I do not know what the salaries of these employees are in different parts of the Dominion, but I know that in Winnipeg they start with $120 a month. The minimum of that class in Winnipeg to-day is equal to if not greater than the maximum of the postal employees. And, as I have pointed out, the postal employee is expected to pass a very difficult examination.

I resent the implication of the Minister of Finance that wages are to be determined by this government on the principle of supply and demand, that is, that if there are a great number of applicants for positions as postal workers, the salaries of these men must be kept down to the utmost minimum. The minister will not contend that the salary of $85 a month being paid to-day is anything like a reasonable salary for the services these men perform; all he can say is that the salary is commensurate with that paid other workers, and because there are large numbers on the waiting list he says these men are not entitled to any increases. That is something we strongly resent, and personally I think that in his more calm and reflective moments the Minister of Finance would not have made such an assertion.

Mr. FORKE: I had no intention of taking part in this discussion, but I do not think the hon. member is drawing a fair conclusion from the remarks of the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance compared these wages with the amounts paid in other lines of work, and said that apparently people were more anxious to enter the employment of the government than to work for private firms. He did not say that because of the large number on the waiting list the wages were being kept down.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the acting leader of the opposition to-night, and I quite agree that in the lower classes of the government services the salaries are too small. If a general increase for the lower classes of employees were suggested I should be only too glad to support such a measure. I know of one woman who is attempting to support her mother and keep a small apartment on $60 a month, and I know she has a very hard time of it. I should like to see the salaries of the lower classes in all departments increased.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have no doubt that the postal workers of Canada will be very glad and thankful for the sympathy of the minister, but they would be more thankful if he would carry his sympathy to a practical point and induce his colleagues in the government to do something this session. I think my friend the minister will realize what I mean if, when he goes home to-night, he will read the second chapter of the Epistle of St. James.

Now I would like to direct a question to the Postmaster General. Has anything been done recently in connection with an examination called a sortation test in city post offices. Information has come to me in the shape of a telegram to the effect that men who have reached their maximum in the postal service, who have been in the department a long time and who are entitled to full pay, are now being subjected to an annual sortation test under the threat made by public notice, I understand given by the postmaster of Montreal, that unless these men are able to pass this sortation test their salaries will be decreased and they will be degraded in rank. Perhaps I had better read the notice, which was posted in the Montreal office and which is contained in a telegram sent me by the United Postal Workers of Canada, Montreal branch:

Sortation Test

The department has called our attention to the fact that a number of postal clerks at Montreal who have reached the maximum rate of pay failed in their case examinations. We are in consequence directed to remind all concerned that clerks must take the test successfully every year, firstly to qualify for the annual increase up to a maximum and then to retain this maximum rate after they have reached it. The official communication adds that unless all these who are drawing maximum pay take the tests successfully in the near future and continue to do so from year to year thereafter the question of reducing their salaries to the next lower grade will be seriously considered. It is up to these concerned to take the warning and to make a serious effort to pass the case examinations successfully if they would save themselves the serious consequences of a reduction of salary.

V. Gaudet,
Postmaster.

I want to ask the Postmaster General if there is any authority for posting a notice of that kind in the Montreal office.

Mr. VENIOT: I think that was done all over Canada. When these men reach their maximum they continue to take their case examination, which is a major examination, and if they fail they are given another year in which to study and practise in order to bring themselves to the point of efficiency required of an official or mail sorter who has reached his maximum and wishes to retain his position. This is done more as a disciplinary measure than anything else, in or-

der to try to maintain the efficiency of the service; because if sortation efficiency is allowed to go down the whole organization in that branch is disrupted. I think that practice has been followed in the larger offices all over Canada for years; it is nothing new.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am glad to have this explanation from the minister. Perhaps he will explain another matter which I desire to bring to his attention. This question is contained in a letter from a prominent citizen of Montreal, written on April 19:

> We certainly have a grievance here in Montreal, as I am sure no city in the world of its size and importance has such poor service. Some time ago an English merchant who had spent twenty years in China said of the post office service here that no city in China of half the size would stand it. I spent the month of July last year in Lee, which is a suburb of London, England, twelve miles from Charing Cross but in London. There we had four deliveries in the day, at 7 a.m., 11 a.m., 4 p.m., and 9 p.m. Here in Montreal, just west of Westmount, we have two, one at from 10.30 to 12 a.m. and another between 4 and 5, one delivery on Saturday and none on holidays. If a letter is mailed in any part of Montreal to any other part, no matter how early in the day it is mailed, it will be cause for rejoicing if it gets to its destination the next day, but the chances will be against it. I mailed a letter in London at ten o'clock at night and the recipient called me on the 'phone before 8 a.m. the next morning.

Mr. POWER: You can do that in Montreal also.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am bringing this matter to the attention not of the hon. member for Quebec South but of the Postmaster General, in the hope that in some way he may be able to remedy conditions, because from this letter it is evident that a grievance exists in that city.

Mr. GEARY: The question has been raised by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre as to the effect of the stabilization act of 1924. What happened in that connection was that the $480 cost of living bonus had been gradually in part absorbed in increases in salary, and the complaint of the postal men is that when salaries were finally stabilized at least one class was left worse off to the extent of $156 per annum as compared with what they received before the stabilization took place.

Mr. VENIOT: Would that be the class going in?

Mr. GEARY: That may not have been the class going in, although they undoubtedly suffer to the extent of at least $180, the difference between the old total of $1,200 and the amount of $1,020 received after stabilization. If I might make a suggestion to the Postmaster General, he might acquaint the house with the particulars of the distribution of that bonus and the result in the end. I am sure he can readily find that information in his office and I believe the house would like to obtain it. The complaint seems thoroughly justified. I have had the opportunity of going into the figures and I find that men are receiving $156 a year less than they received before the stabilization took place. It may be said that the cost of living bonus was not required in 1924 so much as in 1919, but I am not at all sure of that. I do not think the budgets issued by the Minister of Labour will show that the cost of living has decreased to such an extent as to justify the lower pay which the postal men now receive. They require very special qualifications. As the hon. member for North Winnipeg has just said, their duties are extremely onerous; they carry registered mail, collect money, sell stamps, and have other responsibilities which the postal carrier of old did not have to assume. The ordinary labourer working for the corporation of the city of Toronto—I hope the committee will forgive me for referring to this, but it is something I happen to know something about—the man who works in the ditches for the city of Toronto gets $1,497 per year for a forty-eight hour week, and he also gets a fortnight's annual holidays.

An hon. MEMBER: How much per hour?

Mr. GEARY: He gets $28.80 per week.

Mr. POWER: Is he a permanent employee?

Mr. GEARY: He is a permanent employee. Every employee who is taken on by the city of Toronto receives sixty cents for every hour he works, and is generally taken on for two, three or four months. His pay for a week amounts to $28.80, or $1,497 per year, with Saturday afternons off and a holiday of two weeks in each year. The men in the postal service deserve at least equal treatment.

As I ventured to say the other night, the government of Canada should make of itself a model employer. I do not mean to say that it should pay exorbitant wages, but it should see that any adult in its employ, possibly a married man with a family, should not be paid less than is required to keep himself and his family. Hon. members on the opposite side of the house must realize that the present minimum rate will not keep a man, let alone a man with a family.

I understand that the Minister of Finance agreed with the Postmaster General in for-

warding the recommendation of the government to the Civil Service Commission for an increase in the salary of the postal workers. I can hardly understand the minister's action after hearing him speak to-night, because one can only gather from his remarks that he is opposed to this increase. The Minister of the Interior is also opposed to the increase and takes refuge behind the Civil Service Act. As the hon. member for North Winnipeg has said, the Civil Service Commission recommended an increase in technical salaries which was much higher than the government wished to pay. The Minister of Finance then instituted a commission to inquire into and report on the matter. What is to become of that commission's report if it is to the effect that the government is right in refusing the scale of wages adopted by the Civil Service Commission? I suppose nothing will be done. What is the government going to do if the report is that the scale suggested by the Civil Service Commission is right? After appointing a commission at considerable expense and wasting a lot of time, is the government simply going to treat the report as waste paper unless it happens to meet with its own view? No government should send a commission out on an inquiry having determined ahead of time that if its report be at variance with the government's wishes it will be treated as a nullity. The result logically will be the overriding of the Civil Service Commission, should the report agree with the government's views, and there is no difference in principle between overriding it in that way and increasing the salaries or providing the money with which the increases could be paid.

From the statements of the Postmaster General, the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Finance it is hard to tell just what is the government's position. Does it intend to and does it wish to increase the wages of these men, or does it intend to leave them as they are? After listening to the hon. member for South Wellington the Postmaster General will surely regard him as an ally. I believe the Postmaster General wants to take this action, and the hon. member for South Wellington has pointed out a way in which it can be done. Parliament stands supreme over any creature of its own, and it can bring legislation down during this session to enable a higher salary to be paid to these employees. If that legislation includes an increase of salary to employees in other departments who are underpaid, then I say that this house will welcome the opportunity to remedy any injustice which may exist in other departments as well as that which does exist in this particular branch of the service.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I have been rather surprised to-night at the remarks of the various ministers who have spoken upon this question. I think we must all agree that there is something behind this thing which does not appear on the surface. If we trace the whole matter back to the beginning we will find that the government has not been at all fair with the civil servants of Canada. As far as I can see they have been put off from time to time with promises made at election times, and have been more or less deceived by promises made after elections which have not been carried out. The Minister of the Interior said to-night that recommendations had been made for increases in other departments. That statement was made in reply to a question which I asked him. My question was: Did any of the other ministers of the government make similar recommendations to that made by the Postmaster General? I gathered from what he said that such had been the case, that other ministers had made similar recommendations. The Minister of the Interior spoke for all the ministers who were present at the time he was speaking, and he said that they had all been in favour of the increases recommended by the Postmaster General. I think I am safe in saying that would mean that the majority of the council were in favour of that recommendation. Following up the line taken by the Minister of the Interior, I presume the whole council were in favour of the recommendations which had been made by other ministers of the crown for increases in their departments.

I have been brought into fairly close touch with employees of the government through the New Westminster branch of the Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada, and I have met a great many of the employees of the various departments. So far as I can see these men are very reasonable in their demands. From time to time they have placed their case before the government, and I think they have done it in an intelligent and reasonable manner, but their representations have not received proper consideration. I agree with the Minister of Finance when he says that there are other departments in which the employees are not being paid enough. I have been informed of complaints of employees of the Public Works department, of penitentiary guards, who are connected with the department of the Minister of Justice; of employees of the departments of National Revenue and Marine and Fisheries, of employees of other departments of the government. I think I could easily demonstrate to-night that in all those departments there are

employees who are much underpaid. I do not think it is fair to say to them, as has been said by the government in many cases: If you do not like the job, then you can resign and let somebody else have it; there are many men looking for your jobs. I do not think that is a fair way of looking at the matter, more particularly in view of the provisions of the Superannuation Act and the conditions attached to the retirement allowance of which the Minister of Finance seems to be so proud. As a matter of fact, under the law as it now stands, if a civil servant who has not been in the employ of the government for at least ten years retires, he gets back none of the money that has been taken monthly from his wages during the time of his employment. I understand that 5 per cent is taken off their wages, and if they leave voluntarily before the ten years expire, they get back not one cent of that money. That is nothing short of brigandage, because it is their money which has been retained, and when they leave the service they are entitled to receive it. The government says: Yes, you can quit. But what will the government do? It will confiscate the money of those employees and add it to the enormous balance, running into millions of dollars, which stands to the credit of the government in the retirement fund. That is certainly not fair, reasonable or just. The hon. member for Saskatoon will, I think, agree with me in regard to that. He knows something of the Saskatchewan act, and I think if the government compares the Saskatchewan act with the Dominion act, it will find that the Dominion act is not as fair to employees as the Saskatchewan act. Under the latter act a man has to pay in 4 per cent, not 5 per cent, of his wages, and he can get back the amount standing to his credit whether he retires within ten years or after a longer period. Moreover, he is allowed a better rate of interest than is allowed under the Dominion act.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Saskatchewan is a model for most of the other provinces.

Mr. McQUARRIE: In this connection I would hold it out to the government as an example which might be followed, and I am sure the civil servants in my constituency would be very much pleased if the Saskatchewan act were adopted by the Dominion government. What I am contending is that it is very unfair to say to these men: If you are not satisfied with the wages you are receiving, then you can retire. They are entitled to more reasonable treatment than that. It is very strange and unfair for the Postmaster General and the other ministers to try to put the blame on the Civil Service Commission, because they know perfectly well that the blame should not be attached to the commission at all. The government is responsible. If the government carried out one-half of the promises which were made by the ministers during the election, then the civil servants would have no cause to complain.

I have spoken about the penitentiaries, and I would point out in that connection that the employees in the penitentiaries are under another disadvantage; that is that they are not allowed to organize. They do not now belong to the amalgamated civil servants' association, and they are not permitted to belong to it, because a ruling has been handed down by the Minister of Justice to the effect that they must not join such an organization. As a matter of fact they did at one time belong to it, but later on they were compelled to withdraw and now they are kept out of the organization notwithstanding the statement which has been made recently by the Minister of Labour that the government allows all civil servants to belong to associations and to organize if they so desire.

I believe, as I have stated before, that the civil servants have been unfairly treated by the government. I have seen the requests made by the Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada, and I say without hesitation that I would support those requests almost in their entirety. The government must be either deceptive or very weak-kneed. There is something wrong somewhere, and I do not believe this matter will ever be remedied until we get into office a government which will take hold of the matter in a fair and reasonable way, and settle it to the satisfaction not only of the employees themselves, but of the country at large; because I do not believe that the people are anxious that their employees should be asked to work for anything less than a reasonable living wage.

In reference to the particular department which is under review at the present time, it is admitted by the Postmaster General that certain employees are not getting enough and he has recommended an increase. What defence can there be for this flimsy excuse which has been put up by various ministers that under the Civil Service Act it is not within the power of the government to take action? We have seen it demonstrated time after time that the Postmaster General or some other minister could and did override the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Does the hon. member approve that?

Mr. McQUARRIE: I can prove it in many cases.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I thought the hon. member asked if I could prove it.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): No, I asked whether the hon. member approved it.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I say that the government is playing with the Civil Service Commission. There is not one minister who will from his place in the house say honestly and sincerely that he believes in the Civil Service Commission, and there are very few members on that side of the house who will support it. They want to get back to the old patronage system. I have no doubt they will tell you that privately; indeed, they will say it publicly, and they have declared so publicly many times in the house. Why has the government not the courage of its convictions? Why does it not attempt to do away with the Civil Service Commission? The answer is obvious: It is afraid to do so. It is afraid of what the people of the country will say to it at the next election if it adopts a course of that kind. If the hon. member for Saskatoon wants to know, I am and always have been in favour of the Civil Service Commission. I never had patronage and I do not want it. I think that the patronage can be and is much better administered by the Civil Service Commission than it would be if members on the other side of the house were administering it themselves. I do not believe in this policy of blaming the Civil Service Commission. If the Postmaster General is actually in favour of increasing the wages of these employees, let him stand up and say: I ask for no quarter and I give no quarter to my colleagues in the cabinet. That is what he should do. He is a man of great courage; he has shown that here, and I think it is really disgraceful for him to remain a minister of the crown when his recommendations are not accepted by the government. He can never make me believe, no minister of the crown can make me believe, that the cabinet as a whole is desirous of increasing the wages of these men at this time. I never will believe it, because if they felt that way about it they would see that the wages were raised in very short order. I suggest to the Postmaster General that he show in the cabinet some of that courage which he has displayed throughout the course of this debate and that he insist on his recommendations being carried out so that these men may be given a fair deal; and I suggest also that his colleagues take up the question of wages in their respective departments and see that their recommendations for increases are carried out.

Mr. EVANS: I would like to direct a question to the Postmaster General regarding the design of the new postage stamp. We have often commemorated certain events by a new stamp. Lately I see that the Canadian emblem, the maple leaf, and the crown, are missing from the new design. There did not seem to be any reason for a change of that kind just now. Perhaps the minister would explain it.

Mr. VENIOT: I did not catch all that the hon. gentleman said, but if I understood him aright, he wished to know why the crown was left off the postage stamp.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, and the maple leaf, the Canadian emblem.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not know that I can explain it. Our experts have advised us, perhaps not in connection with this particular matter, but in connection with other matters, that under the system of heraldry the head of the reigning sovereign was a sufficient indication of our connection with the British crown. That is the only reason I can see at the moment. I know that the stamp used to contain a portrait of the sovereign, with the crown.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is not the crown on the head to which my hon. friend refers, but the two small crowns in the upper corner of the stamp.

Mr. VENIOT: I could not say positively, but I do not remember any change in that respect having been made since my time.

Mr. HEAPS: I wonder if the Postmaster General will tell the house what the position of the postal workers is at the present time, and if there is any hope of their getting any increase in salary.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman is certainly putting a difficult question to me, asking me to reply on behalf of the whole house. Surely he is not sincere when he asks me to state what this house is going to do or what it might do. I have stated my own position in connection with this matter. I have made an honest statement, and I have been sincere in what I have done. The government was also sincere in accepting my recommendation. I sent it on to the Civil Service Commission, but the commission refused to consider it, and their reply has been placed before the house. They stated that it was unjustifiable. That is the only definite reason they gave in their

reply. I know that suggestions have been made on the floor of this house as to how that situation might be met. I am not going into the details of the argument, because I think we have argued it long enough, but I say that it becomes now a matter of policy as to what shall be done and, of course, it is for the government to decide what that policy shall be. It is not my place to speak on behalf of the government until they have decided upon a policy.

Mr. HEAPS: May I ask when we may expect the government to give to the house the method by which they are going to meet the situation?

Mr. VENIOT: I am not supposed to expect anything. I am only supposed to work on definite propositions.

Mr. STEVENS: Surely the minister does not correctly interpret his duties and his responsibilities. We are bound to put our questions to the minister who is in charge of the estimates for a given department.

Mr. VENIOT: I do the best I can, but there are questions that I cannot answer—such as new policies.

Mr. STEVENS: We do not expect an answer to any unreasonable question, but what we do expect is this. After accepting the minister's statement of last year as a truthful statement, as he says, of his position, and we give him credit for that, the house at large has discussed this question very fully since, and has indicated to the minister, and through him to his colleagues in the government, that the house is not satisfied with that position. We say that the finding of the commission—which, by the way, is not precisely what it is represented to be by the government, but we will wave aside technicalities—is not satisfactory. We still believe that there is a justifiable grievance on the part of a large body of the civil servants in this country, and we feel that it is our duty to bring this question to the attention of the government. I think the minister himself will admit that the facts which I brought to his attention half an hour or so ago indicate that there is an obvious difficulty or grievance or injustice which ought to be remedied. The minister can scarcely claim to have discharged his duty fully by simply saying: I am only one minister; I cannot do this thing. The attitude of the Minister of Finance was not by any means what the Postmaster General suggests. The Postmaster General says: I put my case before my colleagues, my colleagues endorsed it, and we sent our united recommendation to the Civil Service Commission, and they rejected it. The Minister of Finance, however, speaking from his place to-night, spoke rather strongly against this matter.

Mr. VENIOT: I think the hon. member is misinterpreting his statement.

Mr. STEVENS: I give the Minister of Finance credit that he spoke very frankly. He made a rather elaborate argument that this particular class of civil servants were paid more than persons engaged in private work of a similar character. That was his position, in a few words. We are not satisfied with that position. We think the government ought to give some attention to the representations made by parliament. I am a little disappointed by the attitude taken by two or three hon. gentlemen to-night, but in the main the expressions of view have been entirely in support of what the minister says his own position is. It ought to be a more comfortable position than he has been occupying during the last week or two, because he has been subject to rather bitter criticism.

Mr. VENIOT: I am always comfortable.

Mr. STEVENS: We are now saying to the minister: we are behind you, we want to help you give expression to your view in this particular case.

Mr. VENIOT: Beware of the Greeks bearing gifts.

Mr. STEVENS: No, I am bringing no gifts. If I could I would bring this little gift of justice to these workers. I would give back to them at least what was taken away from them when the salary was stabilized. I think it is a horrible injustice to these people. The suggestion is that they were "gold-bricked"—a little bit unparliamentary, perhaps, but it is very expressive of what took place. These workers trusted the government, they thought they were going to get an adjustment that was favourable, and they now find in one case they are getting $180 a year less, in another case $156 a year less, and so on in varying amounts. It is not fair, it is not just. They have placed their case before us repeatedly. I myself and others brought it here last year; nothing was done and it went over to this year; we are coming towards the end of the session again, and nothing has been done. We can get nothing from the minister. My hon. friend's question was a fair one. What can the government do? Will the Minister of Finance, will the Minister of Justice, will some other minister tell us? The Minister of

Finance is leading the house; will he say this much, that the ministers will collectively consider this whole question and make some statement to the house next week or within a few days? Surely we might have that assurance. I think parliament is entitled, after going into this question so earnestly as we have, to have these views reconsidered by the minister. I can assure the minister—and I think I am speaking for everybody on this side of the house—that we will give the government loyal support in every reasonable effort they may make to remedy these grievances. In the light of that, surely the minister will say that the government will review the question and vouchsafe an answer, say, next Monday or Tuesday. That is a reasonable question, and I am sorry the Postmaster General—whose attitude on this one thing has been fair, according to his own statement—I am sorry to-night that he sort of throws up the sponge.

Mr. VENIOT: Oh, no.

Mr. STEVENS: My friend is rather fond of posing as a man of ultra courage. As was suggested to me a moment ago, if he would just pour out in the council chamber in the east block some of the vim and energy he has exemplified here in one or two of his speeches recently, I rather think his colleagues would be quickly scurrying for cover. Let him crack that whip of his around them and waken them up. My genial friend the Minister of Finance could not possibly resist his overwhelming eloquence and his dominating personality. I am certain the Prime Minister could not.

Mr. VENIOT: You must have kissed the Blarney stone recently.

Mr. STEVENS: Not at all. I have a great admiration for courage, but I do like to see that courage directed in a useful cause. Now, here is a chance for the Postmaster General to do something of a very useful character. Let the Minister of Finance vouchsafe to this house, after all the pleading and urging of this case, an assurance that the government will in the sacred precincts of the east block, between now, we will say, and Monday or Tuesday, spend an hour considering the welfare of these people. I ask him at least to give us that assurance to-night, and then we will wait with patience and gratitude and hope for what we trust will be a favourable answer. I make that appeal to the Minister of Finance now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. STEVENS: Not a move! I am surprised. I really thought the Minister of Finance could not resist an appeal of that character. I turn in sorrow to the Minister of Justice, who has not been very much occupied this session. We were sorry at the early part of the session that he was away; we are glad he is back.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You will be surprised at the amount of work I have had to do.

Mr. STEVENS: I am sure. Will he now with his splendid record of interest in the welfare of the poor—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEVENS: Do not laugh, please.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEVENS: This is not a laughing matter. Will the Minister of Justice say that he will support the Postmaster General in council and see that half an hour's consideration is given to this question?

Mr. LAPOINTE: When it comes to the expenditure of money I am no good at all; I leave it to others.

Mr. STEVENS: I see very little comfort for some thousands of civil servants in that quarter.

Mr. POWER: What about the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. STEVENS: The Minister of Agriculture a moment ago said: come to Saskatchewan and we will show you a model for action throughout this country. Will the Minister of Agriculture go to the council chamber with his colleague the Postmaster General who is anxious to have a little support?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think I do well if I look after my own staff.

Mr. STEVENS: There you are! What about the Minister of Health?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am always interested in the people.

Mr. STEVENS: The Minister of Health, whose gentleness and kindness of heart are noted, will he undertake this task? He is silent. What about the Solicitor General? The Minister of Marine? The Secretary of State? I think I have called them all. Not one of them answered.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): The Minister of Immigration is up at the back.

Mr. STEVENS: The Minister of Immigration exhausted himself a moment ago when he expressed his sympathy. His heart bled with sympathy. I am sorry it has bled so much that he has had to go and sit away at the back.

Mr. POWER: Do you expect anything more from the Scotch?

Mr. STEVENS: The Minister of Immigration will have a leaky heart; his sympathy has oozed out so vigorously. What about the Secretary of State? Let me appeal to the Secretary of State to bring this to the attention of the cabinet.

Mr. RINFRET: Does my hon. friend require the help of the Secretary of State against a finding of the commission?

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. RINFRET: That would be a great change in my hon. friend's mind.

Mr. STEVENS: We have stimulated the interest of one of the ministers, the Secretary of State, who by virtue of his custody of the great seal, and so on, perhaps is the right minister to bring this forward. We ask him if he will support the Postmaster General in seeing that the salaries of the underpaid civil servants of the Postmaster General's department and other departments shall be brought up to the level of a living wage. That is all we are asking. Will he see that that is taken into consideration by the cabinet and an answer given us next week?

Now, we have failed, I am sorry to say, in getting answers from the ministers. But we have placed the case, I think, fairly before the house. We have urged the government to take action; we have assured the government of our support; but we have failed up to the present to get any encouragement from them.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Chairman, I think this would be a very appropriate stage of the discussion—

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is early in the proceedings.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): —to refer to paragraph nine of the Postmaster General's report and to read this paragraph. It says:

> The expenditure shows an increase of $1,371,497.61. Of this increase, about $600,000 is due to the general flat increase in salary of $120 granted by parliament from April 1, 1927; another $200,000 is due to statutory increases approved by the Civil Service Commission; $109,000 is due to the purchase of rural mail boxes; and the remainder is due to the increase in volume of mail handled and to improved postal facilities, including air mail service, given the public.

Will the Postmaster General give us a statement of the total salaries for the year preceding the one covered by this report, and the salaries to which he refers in this paragraph for this year covered by this report. Then we shall see where the difference comes in.

Mr. VENIOT: It states there, if I mistake not, that of the increase about $600,000 is due to the general flat increase in salaries of $120 per annum granted by parliament.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): But I am asking for the total salaries—the total amount paid in each year.

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot give that offhand. It will take some time to get the information but I shall endeavour to get it.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): That information ought to be available; will the minister have it for us to-morrow?

Mr. VENIOT: We will get it.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Then we will pass that item and go on to rural mail boxes. How are they purchased—by tender?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes. I think it was in 1927 that we called for tenders for rural mail boxes and the contract was awarded that year.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): How many boxes were purchased on that occasion?

Mr. VENIOT: I am speaking from memory, but I think it was in the vicinity of 45,000.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): How many tenders were put in for them?

Mr. VENIOT: Fifty-two models were submitted and there were fifteen or twenty tenders.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Can you give us the particulars of those tenders?

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot right off the bat; I do not carry that in my mind. I did submit the whole thing to the house in 1928 and it was discussed.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I do not recall it; it was not discussed by myself, I know that. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): And where were the boxes made?

Mr. VENIOT: Montreal.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Made in Canada?

Mr. VENIOT: Of course, Montreal.

Mr. POULIOT: How many mail boxes have been bought by the department since confederation?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): On what terms are these boxes supplied?

Mr. VENIOT: They are delivered at $4.25 each. That is the actual cost, including manufacture, freight and so forth. We have distributing points in Winnipeg, Montreal, and Moncton.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Would the Postmaster General care to discuss for a few minutes the statutory increases and tell us how they work out? Every year, as I understand it, there are certain statutory increases, but is it not a fact that in other directions there are decreases due to the fact that juniors come in and take the places of others? There must be some change therefore in the total of the salaries.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not catch the purport of the question.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Are there not some employees coming in at minimum salaries and replacing higher salaried employees?

Mr. VENIOT: There are always employees coming in at minimum salaries and taking the places of others who are promoted.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Or who drop out.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, that is the case every year.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Then the total amount paid for salaries is not automatically increased by the total amount of the statutory increases?

Mr. VENIOT: The difference in the other direction would be so small as to be hardly worth talking about. It will be found in the estimates that we allow so much one way or the other to meet these conditions, but the amount is not large.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Could we not have the particulars of that?

Mr. VENIOT: I am afraid I have nothing further at the moment.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The Postmaster General seems to have much less information than other ministers who are able to answer similar questions very fully. In the typewritten statement which the minister has furnised for the year ended March 31, 1929, I find the following:

> Deductions from net revenue are mostly made up by payments of salary to revenue postmasters. The increase of $566,700 is due to increase of salaries to these postmasters.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Eleven o'clock.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I will continue to-morrow.

Progress reported.

IMPERIAL CABLE MERGER

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): I beg to lay on the table the report asked for by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) with regard to the Pacific cable transaction. I am laying on the table such correspondence as we are permitted to bring down, and which is not of a secret character, between the contracting parties, the British government, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The Under Secretary of State informs me that this is the only information which we are at liberty at the present time to lay on the table.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, May 3, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Eleventh report of the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines. —Mr. Cahill.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is moved by Mr. Matthews, seconded by Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park) that Bills Nos. 177, 178, 179—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I thought it was understood that these bills were not to be put through the house en bloc.

Mr. SPEAKER: We will take each one separately.

Bill No. 178, for the relief of Adele Cawthra Rogers.—Mr. Matthews.

Bill No. 180, for the relief of Edgar Charles Buchanan.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Mr. SPENCE: Mr. Speaker, on account of the illness of the hon. member for Toronto Northwest (Mr. Church), who is at present in the hospital at Toronto, would it not be fair to him to allow the bills which stand in his name to be read the first time? I move for him that the bills which stand in his name be now read the first time.

Bill No. 182, for the relief of Maud Parker. —Mr. Spence (for Mr. Church).

Bill No. 183, for the relief of Eleanor Vair. —Mr. Spence (for Mr. Church).

Bill No. 184, for the relief of Edna Maud James.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 185, for the relief of Helen Jane Sim Pittendreich.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 186, for the relief of Isabel Honor Gilderoy.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 187, for the relief of Alfred Roy Edwards.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 189, for the relief of Molly Vaughan.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 190, for the relief of Lillian Augusta Dunn.—Mr. Tummon.

Bill No. 191, for the relief of Myrtle Mary Jane McLean.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 192, for the relief of Catherine Goring.—Mr. Spence for Mr. Church.

Bill No. 194, for the relief of Harvey Baden Powell Haney.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 196, for the relief of Ivy Georgina Lloyd.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 197, for the relief of Helen Steele. —Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 198, for the relief of John Campbell.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 200, for the relief of Annie Forbes Sangster.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 202, for the relief of Joseph Nicholl.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 203, for the relief of Charles Stanley Cuneo.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 204, for the relief of William Allan Griffith.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 205, for the relief of Sydney Bishop. —Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 206, for the relief of Walter Henry Lyne Dixson.—Mr. Tummon.

Bill No. 207, for the relief of Ida Rosenberg. —Mr. Spence.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Bill No. 208, for the relief of Marjory Lavinia Bradford.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 209, for the relief of Patrizio Nardini.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

NOVA SCOTIA FISHERIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. W. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton North-Victoria): I would like to ask the government if they have any idea when I shall receive an answer to the questions that I asked on the orders of the day last Monday?

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I will call the attention of the minister of the department concerned to the question.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Salaries and allowances, $17,295,464.40.

Mail service, including mail service by air, $16,305,000.

Miscellaneous, including Lucien Pacaud, secretary of the High Commissioner's office, as the representative of the Canadian government on the Pacific Cable Board, at $1,500; and $5,000 for the payment of compassionate allowances to employees injured while in the performance of their duties, or to dependents of employees killed while on duty, such payments to be made only on the specific authority of the governor in council, $1,176,175.

Yukon territory, $150,000—Total, $34,926,639.40.

Mr. CLARK: On the evening of April 30, I made some remarks in regard to the post office at Sutton, Quebec, and a member of the Civil Service Commission. Yesterday evening I received from the secretary of the commission a letter which I should like to read to the committee as it involves a certain correction. It reads:

In the course of your remarks in the House of Commons on Tuesday evening on the appointment of a postmaster at Sutton, P.Q., you stated that the file had been held in the office of the Civil Service Commission by Commissioner Tremblay for a period of seven months. Your statement reads as follows:

"I must accept the statement which has been made by the hon. Postmaster General, but I would ask him to search his records and search his mind because I believe when he has done so he will find that he personally is the man who is responsible for this file having been lost in Mr. Tremblay's office for seven months." Commissioner Tremblay has asked me to point out to you that while the file was held for a little over two months in his office, a delay for which he assumes full responsibility, it was not held for seven months, as stated in your

remarks, and he would be glad if you could see your way to taking an early opportunity of making this correction in Hansard.

What I did say was "for several months," and I had actually made the correction in the unrevised Hansard when this letter arrived. Furthermore, I gave the exact dates on two or three occasions, both on May 1 and yesterday, fixing the time during which this file was held in Mr. Tremblay's office, and those dates show that it was a little over two months, as he states. I am therefore very glad to make the correction in the house.

I am also glad to note that Commissioner Tremblay agrees with me that the file was held in his office for several months, and I would like very much to know why that or any other file was held in Commissioner Tremblay's office for several months, when it was the duty of the commission to deal with it and to make the appointment under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. VENIOT: I think the letter mentioned the name of the Postmaster General, that he might give some information.

Mr. CLARK: The letter is simply confirming what I said on the evening of the first, and I simply read what already appears in Hansard.

Mr. VENIOT: While I may be responsible for the file having been held in the department, I certainly am in no way responsible for the delay in holding the file in the office of the Civil Service Commission. It was sent to the Civil Service Commission, and after that I had absolutely no connection with it.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The Postmaster General made considerable progress in the consideration of his estimates yesterday, but there are two or three other matters which I think we ought to get cleared up at this stage. According to report, there has been a number of extensions of rural mail routes in the past year, many applications for extensions or new routes, and many refusals of these applications. Could the Postmaster General inform the committee as to the number of extensions or new routes established in each province, with the mileage involved, and the cost of these extensions or new routes as the case may be?

Mr. VENIOT: I have here a very long list which includes all the applications, I think, from every constituency in Canada for rural mail delivery routes, giving the mileage, the time tenders were invited, the number of routes authorized, and the number now in operation. I have not got the cost of each route, but I would have been glad to supply that information if I had known that it would be requested. This list comprises about twenty-five or thirty sheets, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will be satisfied if I lay it on the table instead of taking up the time of the house by reading it.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It will be quite satisfactory if the minister lays it on the table.

Mr. VENIOT: I will do so. For the benefit of the committee I might state that the number of routes in operation at the present time throughout Canada, in the different provinces, is as follows:

Prince Edward Island	177
Nova Scotia	172
New Brunswick	305
Quebec	922
Ontario	2,006
Manitoba	112
Saskatchewan	91
Alberta	151
British Columbia	79
Total	4,015

I will also lay that on the table.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Has the minister the cost in each case?

Mr. VENIOT: Not the cost of each one.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The total cost?

Mr. VENIOT: I think I can get the total cost.

Mr. BRADY: I would ask the Postmaster General from what source he receives these applications for rural mail routes.

Mr. VENIOT: Generally we get them in the form of a petition from the people of the district; at other times through letters addressed to the department. We send the petition or a synopsis of it to the district superintendent with a request that he send an inspector to examine the proposed route and report on its feasibility. Generally, when he reports favourably, the route is opened. If there is any difficulty while he is making the inspection or any doubt as to the feasibility of the route, the matter is held over for further investigation. When it is decided to open the route we call for tenders, giving a description of the route.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): There is one other matter which I wish to bring up in the absence owing to illness of the hon. member who first brought it up some time ago, and that is with respect to the change in the name or monogram on the mail wagons and carts.

An hon. MEMBER: Rotten!

Mr. VENIOT: I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought the matter up.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I am bringing it up because the hon. gentleman who asked about it originally is not here, and I think there ought to be an explanation whether the change was made by order in council or upon what authority.

Mr. VENIOT: I am only too pleased to give the information and I want to thank the hon. member for bringing the matter up. This matter has been standing for some time, and it had been my intention to give an explanation to the house at an early date. Hon. gentlemen may remember that some four weeks ago I attempted to do so on the orders of the day, but the Speaker decided that I was out of order in doing so at that stage without the unanimous consent of the house. Unanimous consent was not given, and the matter was therefore held over until my estimates came up for discussion.

The first time that my attention was drawn to the dropping of the monogram or the letters G.R. from some of the mail trucks and mail appliances used in our departmental service was when I read an article in a Toronto paper, the Toronto Telegram, I believe. When the Toronto Telegram called the attention of the public to what is supposed to be the elimination of the monogram or letters G.R., it made this comment at the foot of the article: We are informed that this did not take place during the regime of the present Postmaster General. I wish to express my appreciation of the fairness of the Telegram on that occasion, but some other newspapers—I am not saying this in any critical spirit—disregarding the fairness of the telegram, gave me a roasting, so to speak. My attention having been called to this matter, I made inquiries and I found that there never had been any order in council or any departmental order isssued in regard to the so-called monogram or the letters G.R. When this matter first came up I did discover that, three or four years ago last January, the letters "G.R." on each side of the Canadian coat of arms had been left off most of the new trucks obtained for the postal service—there were not many. Investigation showed that this had happened in the cities and larger towns where the service is carried on in that way. Apparently no orders to do this had been issued, and I could only surmise that the omission had been due to neglect on the part of somebody. I immediately issued an order that the royal monogram should be placed on all trucks and other vehicles from which they had been omitted.

[Mr. H. A. Stewart.]

This is the form of contract for the carrying of the mails entered into with individuals who are not employees of the department. It will be seen that at the top appears the royal arms and on one side the letter "G" and on the other side the letter "R" and underneath the words "Royal Mail Canada." Those words, "Royal Mail Canada" are to be found on all vehicles used in the transporting of mail from post offices to trains and from trains to trains. The traps we are using to-day for transporting mail from the post offices to the trains, or in the gathering of mail by post office officials bear the words "Canadian Mail." It has been that way for years. That is the only explanation I can give. I discovered that on some of those traps the monogram was lacking. I do not think it was a case of general elimination of the monogram; but it was left off some of the vehicles used for the transportation of the mails. As I said before, the moment I got through the investigation, having received reports from Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, St. John, Halifax and other large centres, I issued an order that wherever those letters "G.R." were absent they should be placed on the vehicles. That is the fullest explanation I can give of the matter.

Mr. CLARK: I wonder if the minister would explain why the communication from the Post Office Department in this connection dated February 20, 1929, was not included in the return which was tabled on the motion of the member for Toronto Northwest (Mr. Church). I have before me the original return, and endorsed on it is the report of the Post Office Department on the date I have mentioned, addressed to the Under Secretary of State: "Enclosed is answer in so far as the Post Office Department is concerned. L. J. Gaboury, Deputy Postmaster General." But there is no answer.

Mr. VENIOT: I think that was intended for "nil." There were no orders or correspondence so far as I could find.

Mr. CLARK: The answers of all the other departments are in this return and in each case they make the definite statement that they have nothing. The Post Office Department says: "Enclosed is answer in so far as the Post Office Department is concerned." Would the minister ask his deputy, who signed this, to furnish him with the reply which was enclosed?

Mr. VENIOT: It was the one word "nil." I saw it on the report submitted to me. I do not know whether it was taken off or not, but that would have been our reply; it could not have been anything else.

Mr. CLARK: It could not have been taken off this return; all the replies are numbered.

Mr. VENIOT: I know our reply would be nil.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the explanation of the Postmaster General in regard to the disappearance of the royal monogram from certain mail carts, which has been discussed more or less in the newspapers, is quite satisfactory. It is a matter of satisfaction to know that as soon as the minister's attention was drawn to the matter he ordered the royal monogram to be replaced on the trucks from which they had been omitted or removed, and I gather from the statement made to-day that the royal monogram will continue to appear—

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, certainly.

Mr. GUTHRIE: —as heretofore upon all such trucks. There is no doubt that, while the words "Canadian mail" are now used, from time immemorial, both here and in the motherland, the mails have been referred to as "His Majesty's Mails", and the contract which the Postmaster General produced as a sample of what is in use in the Post Office Department is a contract for conveying His Majesty's Mails, not Canadian mail; and the contract is made between the contractor and His Majesty, his successors and assigns—the Postmaster General is not even represented. There seems to be a very ancient usage in this respect. What reason can there be for suggesting any change? I certainly should like to see the well-known terms "His Majesty's Mails" continued. The form of contract which I hold in my hand was printed as recently as June 1927, and having been produced here to-day by the Postmaster General I presume it is the form of contract used to-day. Under this form of contract when contractors agree with the government to carry or deliver mail it is His Majesty's mails that they agree to carry, and the contract is made directly with His Majesty the King in this respect.

I understand that in the revised statutes for some reason or other the term "Canadian Mail" has crept in. What authority there was for the change nobody seems to know. It was not in the old Post Office Act. There the term used was "His Majesty's Mail". But in the revised statutes the term "Canadian Mail" has been used. I do not suppose this house knew anything about it when the revised statutes came here to be confirmed. We passed them; nobody's attention was drawn to the change. These words appear in the revised statutes in respect of the post office to-day. But I hope the Postmaster General will not only continue the term "Royal Mail" as a matter of course, but will also continue the term as heretofore of "His Majesty's Mails".

Mr. VENIOT: Section 11 of this contract provides:

> The said contractor agrees to provide the necessary approved vehicles painted red "English vermilion" with "Royal Arms" and "G.R." and "Parcel Post", "Royal Mail", "Canada", in gold letters thereon.

That is part of the contract. It has been in that form for I don't know how long before I took charge of the department.

Mr. LAPOINTE: With regard to the the change in the revised statutes, I made some inquiries. It appears that the commissioners of the revised statutes, as was their right, and even their duty, when different expressions are used in the same act, to try to make them harmonize and use the same phraseology, communicated with the officers of the Post Office Department. In some sections of that act the words used are "Canada Mail" and in a couple of other places it is "His Majesty's Mail." The officers of the department thought that perhaps it would be better to use "Canada Mail" especially for the reason that there are mails carried in Canada which are His Majesty's Mails with out being Canadian mail. For instance, the British mails which are circulated in Canada are His Majesty's mails as well as our own, and that term really does not describe exclusively Canadian mail. The officers there fore thought fit to use the words "Canada Mail". Perhaps, if it is agreeable to all, we might compromise by saying, "His Majesty's Canadian Mail" or "His Majesty's Mails in Canada". However, I am considering this matter as to this change so that no one could take exception to what was done. The change was certainly made in good faith.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Last night I asked the Postmaster General a question in connection with the wages of letter carriers and I wish to ask now, before the item passes: Is the Postmaster General considering, or doing anything further to put into effect, the recommendations as put on Hansard on April 5?

Mr. VENIOT: The only thing I can say is that I am considering the matter, but I am not in a position now to say what other steps I shall take. I am giving the question serious consideration.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Has the Postmaster General's attention been drawn to the careless manner in which mail matter is handled in the city of Ottawa, and, it may be, in other places? I do not know what the provisions of the contract are, but I do know that during the present session I saw an open wagon or truck carying big sacks of mail, piled high, and these sacks apparently had come from the direction of these buildings. One of them dropped and fell on the street. The driver kept on going, and had it not been for someone else calling his attention to the fact that he had lost the sack it might have been missing altogether. It seems to me there should be some restrictive requirements regarding the manner in which mail matter is handled. The present mode, if what I saw was a sample of it, certainly does not tend to safety.

Mr. VENIOT: I can assure the hon. gentleman that in the last two and a half years, since I have been Postmaster General, I have spent considerable time—probably eight months of the year—in Ottawa in departmental work. I live at the Chateau and am very closely in touch with the post office, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that an instance of the kind he has cited is certainly not typical; it is not frequent. However, now that this statement has been made, I feel called upon to compliment the contractors who are handling mail in Ottawa on the efficient way in which they are doing so. The mail bags which the hon. gentleman sees piled up in these wagons are what we call tie bags and do not contain first class matter; they contain printed matter, newspapers, reports and things of that kind. While an instance of the kind my hon. friend has mentioned may occur, it should not be accepted as proof that there is any neglect in the handling of mails by the contractors in the city.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is one item in the Postmaster General's report that calls for a word of explanation. I refer to the item on page 11 with regard to indemnity paid to owners of lost insured parcels amounting to $34,123. In other words, insured parcels were lost last year for which the government paid an indemnity amounting to $34,000 odd. That seems an enormous amount and must represent the loss of a considerable number of insured parcels.

[Mr. Adshead.]

Mr. VENIOT: The amount given by the hon. member is correct—$34,123.53. We insure valuable parcels, and this is to make up the losses on such parcels.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Lost by what—theft?

Mr. VENIOT: By theft—

Mr. GUTHRIE: In the Post Office Department?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, by theft, fire or otherwise. For instance, we had a fire last year or the year before in a railway accident and considerable mail was lost. A mail car was burned and a good many packages were lost in consequence. We indemnified the owners of the parcels. The indemnity is paid after a thorough investigation.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What is the requirement in regard to the carriage of these mails from or to the post office? What kind of vehicles must the contractors have? The Postmaster General has said that the contractors here have a remarkable record. If that is so, it is only a matter of luck, because there is nothing in the world to prevent mail bags from falling off these vehicles. I want to know why Canada should be so far behind other countries in this connection. I do not think there is another country in the world where mail matter is handled as carelessly as it is here. If the Postmaster General will look up his records he will find that insurance has been paid several times on parcels sent from the parliament buildings. If the parcels are transported in these open wagons and in sacks piled so high and carelessly as the sacks I have seen, then, as I say, it is only a matter of luck if some of them are not lost. The Postmaster General has not yet answered my question: What are the provisions in the contract with respect to this matter, and how is the carriage of mail rendered safe?

Mr. VENIOT: I do not wish to take up the time of the house reading the contract, which is very lengthy.

Mr. STEVENS: Read sections 11 and 12. I will read them for the minister. Section 11 provides that the vehicles, state of repair, cleanliness and painting shall be approved by the Postmaster General; and then section 12:

> Approved vehicles with closed locked covers as per specifications, photographs, etc. to be seen at the office of the postmaster—

And so forth. In other words, the mails are supposed to be carried in locked and closed vehicles like express wagons and, I presume, with a steel screen covering that locked door.

Mr. VENIOT: That refers particularly, I am told, to first class matter and not so much to newsprint, newspapers, circulars and things of that kind which are very bulky and which would not require closed cars for their transportation. The hon. gentleman was reading paragraphs 11 and 12, which I am informed apply particularly to first class matter.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Then does the Postmaster General say that all first class matter is carried in vehicles such as those described in the contract? Will he make that statement?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, in large cities.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What do you mean by large cities?

Mr. VENIOT: In cities and towns where we have such contracts.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: If this is the proper time I would like an explanation from the minister with regard to the transactions which have taken place in respect of the Pacific cable.

Mr. MacLAREN: Coming back to the question of the designation of mails, the Minister of Justice made a suggestion in this regard, but I do not understand that his suggestion is in any definite form. I would just like to assure myself that this matter will receive the attention of the Minister of Justice, and perhaps he may give his decision to the house later on.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Will the minister say that all first class matter which is sent from these buildings is carried in closed and locked vehicles? I do not think that is the case at all.

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot answer that question offhand, but I will make inquiries and if that is not the case I will see that it is done. That is the best I can do.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): I would like to join with other hon. members who have spoken in urging the Postmaster General seriously to consider this question of increased salaries for postal workers. I happen to know all the men employed in this work in my own city and I know they are underpaid. They are entrusted with very important work, and I think we are simply putting a premium on dishonesty when we pay such people very small salaries and trust them with the handling of very large sums of money. I hope the Postmaster General will be firm in his demand that the Civil Service Commission revise these salaries upward.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the question with regard to the Pacific cable is answered I might point out that it would come more properly under the third item of this vote. The item we are now considering covers salaries and allowances.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I believe the minister would like to dispose of this question in a general way now.

Mr. VENIOT: Yesterday I laid on the table all the files we thought it proper to bring down. There are some secret communications between Great Britain and the other contracting parties concerned with this Pacific cable, including Canada, New Zealand and Australia, which it would not be in the public interest or in the interest of these contracting parties to make public to-day, because all negotiations have not been completed as yet.

Just here let me say that the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) asked for these files some time ago, but it was impossible for me to bring them down until yesterday. In a conversation which I had this morning with the hon. member he stated that he would have preferred to have this matter left over for another day, but while I thought at that time I might be able to do so I would like to go on with it now if possible, if I can do so without seriously inconveniencing the hon. member for North Winnipeg. If, when we have disposed of the question, the hon. member desires any further information I will be only too glad to bring it down.

In the meantime let me present a synopsis of what has taken place. The duplicate Pacific cable between Canada and Australia was placed in operation in November, 1926, and it was expected by the Pacific cable board that owing to the improved facilities there would be an immediate increase in the volume of business and a corresponding increase in the revenue. However, in April, 1927, a beam wireless system was placed in operation between Great Britain and Australia, the rates charged being approximately one-third less than the cable rates. As a result of the successful operation of the beam wireless about 50 per cent of the Pacific cable traffic between Great Britain and Australia has been taken away from the cable and its revenues have been reduced by approximately half a million dollars a year. Moreover, a beam wireless service has been recently inaugurated between Canada and Australia and it is expected this will substantially reduce the volume of United States traffic which is now passing over the Pacific cable and in

this way still further reduce the revenue of the cable which it is anticipated will be then operating at a deficit.

This seems to vindicate Canada's attitude in opposing the duplication of the cable. Just here, in further explanation I might say that when the contracting parties undertook to duplicate this cable Canada was either not consulted or, if she was consulted, protested. The cable was duplicated in spite of Canada's protest, which was entered at that time by the then Postmaster General, Hon. Charles Murphy. Canada especially urged that the duplication be at least deferred until the beam wireless was given a trial, but to no avail.

In the circumstances all that remained to be done was to arrive if possible at a working arrangement between the wireless and cable interests. Accordingly in November, 1927, Canada made representations to the partner governments of Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand, urging the immediate appointment of a special committee to consider the commercial policy of the cable, including its relation to the wireless system. Such a committee was endorsed by all contracting parties, but the inquiry was extended by the British government to include the eastward cable route from Great Britain to Australia and the competing wireless, so that it has not been limited to the Pacific cable and competing wireless alone. A special conference was therefore held at London composed of representatives of the governments concerned, namely Great Britain, Canada, the Irish Free State, the Commonwealth of Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa and India, and also a representative of the non-self-governing colonies and protectorates with terms of reference empowering them to examine the situation which has arisen as a result of the competition of the beam wireless with cable service, to report thereon and to make recommendations with a view to a common policy being adopted by the various governments concerned.

Canada nominated Sir Campbell Stuart as its representative at the conference and sent Mr. L. J. Gaboury, Deputy Postmaster General and Mr. C. P. Edwards, director of radio telegraphs, Department of Marine and Fisheries, as advisors. One result of the conference was a merger which was affected between the Eastern and associated telegraph companies and the Marconi Wireless Company of Great Britain. Under the proposed settlement there will be returned to Canada in cash an amount substantially equivalent to her outlay on the Pacific cable during the twenty-five years of government control. No future payments on Canada's part will be necessary as would certainly have been the case had a settlement not been reached. Control over the rates will be retained in the interests of the public, this feature having been specially safeguarded during the negotiations. A trans-Canada or all red cable route will be continued with provision for its being taken over by the government in the case of emergency.

That is a short outline of what has taken place. The correspondence which has been tabled includes some further telegrams and the complete report of that conference. The British government has passed an enabling law which has attached to it, perhaps as a schedule, a tentative agreement. I understand that that agreement has not as yet been concurred in but it will be shortly. The question now arises whether it will be necessary for Canada to pass enabling legislation as was passed in Great Britain. I am not quite definite on that point but the matter is now receiving the attention which its importance deserves.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Does the minister mean that he is making inquiry of the Department of Justice as to what the position is in that respect?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, the Department of Justice has the matter in hand.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Would the minister be good enough to tell us who first suggested that this conference should be held in regard to the cable service?

Mr. VENIOT: I think the first suggestion came from Canada, when it was seen that this competition was beginning to get keen

Mr. LAPOINTE: Only in regard to the Pacific cable.

Mr. VENIOT: I hope I am not being misunderstood; I am only referring to the Pacific cable. I think it was in 1926 when Sir Campbell Stuart was over here that my attention was first drawn to this matter. I think that was the year of the imperial conference and I was in constant communication with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) while he was in England. It was impossible for me to go over at that time, in fact I preferred to stay here because I did not know very much about the matter having only been in office a couple of months. I preferred that it be handled directly by our representative over there, Sir Campbell Stuart, in consultation with the right hon. the Prime Minister, and by means of cable consultation with the officials over here.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Who controlled the beam system at that time?

Mr. VENIOT: The beam system was just coming in at that time.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not think the hon. minister is correct in that.

Mr. HEAPS: It was long before that.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Could the minister tell us who controlled it?

Mr. VENIOT: I had nothing to do with that.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: The minister mentioned that one of the reasons for this conference was the competition from the beam system.

Mr. VENIOT: That is correct.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I see by the report that the total amount which is to be paid for the Pacific cable, over and above the liabilities, is £517,000; how much does Canada get out of that?

Mr. VENIOT: We are trying to reach an agreement, but I am informed that it will be somewhere in the vicinity of $700,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: That will be Canada's share?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Fault cannot be found with the present Postmaster General because he was not in office at the time, but it seems to me very extraordinary that the Pacific cable should have been duplicated all the way to Bamfield just at the time the beam system was coming into use. I have seen the report made by the former Postmaster General in regard to this, but I am not prepared to admit that that duplication could have been proceeded with against the wishes of Canada.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Murphy claimed that he was never consulted.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I understand Mr. Murphy claims that and the attitude he took with regard to the wisdom or otherwise of duplicating the cable was quite satisfactory, but as a matter of fact the Pacific cable board had no power of itself. Is that board still in existence?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It will be until the new law comes into effect.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: The Pacific cable board never had any real power in itself. That board represented four different governments and there were directors appointed by the four governments; I think three were appointed by Great Britain, two by Canada, two by Australia and one by New Zealand.

Mr. VENIOT: With the treasury board in Great Britain handling the whole thing.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I was a member of the board for a long time and I know something about their ways at that time.

Mr. VENIOT: I am prepared to accept the hon. member's version of it.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I am not prepared to admit that the cable board could have duplicated this cable against the wishes of the Canadian government. The British representatives on the board were appointed by and were subject to the authority of the British government. The fault I have to find in connection with this matter is that at the time it came up the Canadian government did not take it up with the British government in order to stop the duplication of the cable. I have read the papers prepared and the report made by the former Postmaster General and in the main I agree with his attitude, but I consider that this government slipped in that they attempted to deal entirely with the Pacific cable board instead of going over the head of the board to the real authority. I submit to the Postmaster General and to the members of the government who had to deal with the question, that if a representative of the Canadian government was doing something which was objectionable to the British government that government would appeal to the Canadian government and the government here would promptly hold an investigation to ascertain the facts and if the complaint were well founded they would apply the remedy. If the Canadian government had appealed to the British government, as I feel they should have done, this extraordinary thing would not have happened and we would not have had the Pacific cable duplicated in its entirety just a few months before the competition of the beam system reduced its traffic by one-half. That is where I find fault with the government. The present Postmaster General has nothing to do with this, but I say that, in effect, the government did not understand the situation and they appealed to the Pacific cable board instead of appealing to the British government when they found they could not get any satisfaction. If they had taken the matter up properly, this would not.

have happened. In effect, this large sum of money that was spent on the last long duplication of the Pacific cable was practically wasted.

There is one feature with regard to the sale of the cable that, I presume, has been given consideration by everybody, and that is the fact that this link of communication within the empire is now out of the hands of the government; it is no longer under their control. It is quite true there are in the act certain provisions whereby the different governments can bring influence to bear upon the Communications Company, but previously in the war this was a government owned cable and well I remember many meetings of the Pacific cable board during the war and particularly during the early part of it when it was demonstrated what a great asset this cable was to the British commonwealth and the allies in general. This was a cable completely controlled by the allied governments which were at war, and whatever they chose to do they could do in the way of confining the messages to those connected with the war or to those that they considered were the most important. Under the present arrangement the government are losing that control. I suppose they have considered that fact.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They saw to it that British control would be assured.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: That is British private control, which is very good, I admit, but it is not government control.

Mr. VENIOT: There are two government directors on the board.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: How many directors are there altogether?

Mr. VENIOT: I do not know.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Canada had two directors on the Pacific cable board and that did not prevent this extraordinary duplication of the cable. I suppose that feature of the case has been very carefully considered. The trouble was largely accentuated by the action of the Pacific cable board in duplicating this long cable and the inaction of the Canadian government in not preventing the duplication. I find that there is a great deal of difference of opinion in Great Britain in regard to this subject. I have under my hand the report of the proceedings in the British House of Commons of Thursday, November 22 last, when Mr. Ramsay MacDonald took strong exception to the report of the commission and to the action that the British government is taking in regard to it. He moved this motion in the British house:

> That this house declines to assent to the second reading of a bill which sacrifices public utility to private gain by disposing of valuable state undertakings to private interests, and is of opinion that the introduction by the government of such a measure in the last days of a dying parliament violates sound constitutional practice.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald is a very important man in the old country and he may be even more important yet; one does not know. But it is a pretty serious amendment for him to move on a matter of this kind which is not a public question except in regard to the use of the cable in case of necessity.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Was he not an active leader of a strong opposition when he moved that amendment?

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: That is perfectly true.

Mr. STEVENS: Have oppositions no rights?

Mr. LAPOINTE: He thought he would oppose.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Oppositions are often right.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Sometimes.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I will not go further into the debate in the British house except to say that there was a speech made by Sir Hamar Greenwood and according to the report in The Times, which is usually very accurate, he said, referring to the conference:

> It owed its existence to the competition of the post office beam system with the Pacific cable board, which was subsidized by Canada, Australia, and other parts of the empire.
>
> The post office was undercutting the imperial cable, and the position became so acute and ridiculous that the prime ministers in Canada and New Zealand insisted upon this conference being convened.

I would like to ask the minister whether Sir Hamar Greenwood spoke in any sense officially for the Canadian government?

Mr. VENIOT: My recollection is that Canada asked for the conference.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Did Sir Hamar Greenwood speak in any way officially for the Post Office Department?

Mr. VENIOT: He had no authority from me. He may have been stating what he thought was a fact or something like that.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I am quite sure he said what he thought was a fact, but I

was wondering whether it had any foundation. I asked some questions about this matter and on February 20, this reply was made by the Postmaster General:

Negotiations are in progress.

That means, as I understand it, that they had not been completed, but in the file which the minister laid on the table yesterday, I find that there was a cable last summer from the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Perhaps the Postmaster General has it under his hand.

Mr. VENIOT: I have one dated July 19, 1928. Would that be the one?

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: It said that the proposal was acceptable to the Canadian government. I have not the wording.

Mr. VENIOT: I will read it for the information of my hon. friend. It reads:

Canadian government have given careful consideration to the report of July 6 of Imperial Wireless and Cable conference. The recommendations made by the conference, which include assumption by the Communications Company of the annual service of the outstanding debt on the Pacific cable board as on the 1st April, 1928, and payment in addition of a capital sum of £517,000 for the Pacific cables, together with interest at 5 per cent as from April 1, 1928, are approved generally by us.

And then it goes on: I will try to get the conclusion.

In assuming all the liabilities of the Pacific cable board it is clearly understood that the Communications Company take over the land line leases between the board and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company together with such obligations as they entail throughout Canada. His Majesty's government in Canada assume that the Communications Company will continue to own and operate the two imperial Atlantic cables between Canada and Great Britain. The government of Canada further note that the West Indian cables are to be sold for £300,000, which relieves the Canadian government in this connection of any further liability.

That cannot be the one?

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I think so. It says earlier in the cable the terms were acceptable.

Mr. VENIOT: I will read that part again:

The recommendations made by the conference which include assumption by the Communications Company of the annual service of the outstanding debt on the Pacific cable board as on the 1st April, 1928, and payment in addition of a capital sum of £517,000 for the Pacific cables, together with interest at 5 per cent as from April 1, 1928, are approved generally by us.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Quite so, but may I say that whoever prepared this answer to me which was given on the 20th of February was not very frank, because this was not information which needed to be held back at all.

Mr. VENIOT: What does the answer say?

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: After explaining about the Imperial Telegraphs Act, which received the royal assent on February 5, 1929, providing for so and so, it says, "Negotiations are in progress." That is not a frank answer.

Mr. VENIOT: We have not accepted it yet.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: What is the date of the agreement which the minister is reading?

Mr. VENIOT: July 19, 1928. There is no hard and fast agreement, if I may use that term, which has been signed as yet.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Whoever prepared this answer that was given to me was not very frank, because there was no necessity for withholding that information. I would suggest that they might have said: The terms have been accepted by the government. The government had accepted the terms months ago.

Mr. VENIOT: No.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Your government accepted them in July of last year.

Mr. VENIOT: They were acceptable but the whole thing is not concluded yet. We do not know what the other contracting parties may do. This thing may have to be gone over somewhat further yet.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: In other words, the government is bound, but the Postmaster General does not think it is bound. The government has agreed to accept it, but the Postmaster General thinks there must be something more to be done about it.

Mr. VENIOT: Oh no, nothing of the kind.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Postmaster General is right. The bill which has passed the British house to give effect to this agreement says that the agreement will have to receive the assent of the various government-partners. so consent either by the government or by parliament is necessary on our part.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Your government gave consent last summer.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, not to the agreement.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; your government accepted the agreement. The Postmaster General has just read the despatch of last summer.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That was in the course of negotiation. My hon. friend surely knows that when the bill sets forth that there must be formal assent by Canada and all the other governments, that assent must be given after an agreement is finally reached.

Mr. VENIOT: The words are "approved generally by us."

Mr. LAPOINTE: Exactly. That was during the negotiations.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: That is one of the points I am trying to get at. I asked last session whether it was the intention of the government to introduce into parliament any legislation in connection with this matter, and the reply was, "The necessity for concurring legislation is under consideration." I take it that the despatch of the 19th of July last definitely commits this government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: It states the amount that is to be paid, and the terms, and it says that the recommendations are approved generally by us. In business that would be something that would have to be lived up to. Has this government the power to sell this cable without reference to parliament? I would like to know what the exact position is in that regard. This is a great public undertaking, and without criticizing the arrangement, which I am not doing at the moment at all, it is quite evident that everybody on the other side of the Atlantic does not agree that it is a wise thing to part with this government-owned property, which in the late war was of inestimable value to Great Britain and all the dominions, as well as to our allies. Everybody in Great Britain does not think it is wise that this government-owned cable should be operated by a private company.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The government there is a pretty safe government so far as loyalty to the empire is concerned.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Absolutely; there is no doubt about that, and I do not think that Mr. Ramsay MacDonald is disloyal to the empire either.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I agree.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: But there is a difference of opinion about this matter. Now has this government the power to agree to part with that cable without coming to parliament? I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me that it has not. It does not seem right that this great public asset could be disposed of by the government without special legislation. That is the point I want to be enlightened on to-day. It does not seem like a simple, ordinary executive act which is all that a government, I take it, is empowered to do, unless they have special authority under some statute. This is not a simple executive act at all, and I question very much whether it was fair of the government to go as far as they have done without having some discussion in the house and letting us hear something about the matter. I take it that the government is now committed, and if they bring down legislation their supporters could not oppose it without expressing non-confidence in the government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sure my hon. friend will support it.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I would first like to get a little more explanation than I have received to-day. I would ask the Minister of Justice, does he consider that the government has any power to part with this cable without the authority of parliament, and does he not think that the government has gone too far already in that direction in agreeing to the terms of this arrangement? What does the government intend to do about it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: With regard to the first part of the remarks of my hon. friend in which he stated that the government of Canada should have opposed the duplication of that part of the cable from Fiji to British Columbia a few years ago—

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: They should have prevented it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I may say to my hon. friend that the Postmaster General at that time took not only a firm stand but what I heard described as a very aggressive stand against that duplication of the cable. He pointed out—

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: To whom?

Mr. LAPOINTE: To whoever was concerned in the old country. There were communications—

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Quite so, but may I put it this way? He pointed out to the Pacific cable board and to the chairman of that board—

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know he did.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: But I say that there was an authority higher than the chairman of the Pacific cable board, and that is the place where he should have made his protest.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Speaking from memory, he spoke to a higher authority than the Pacific cable board, but they claimed that they had authority to use the profits—there were profits at the time—for the purpose of improving the property. I have here the statute of 1899, setting out the powers of the board. It says:

> The commissioners shall have full power to administer the affairs of the board and to carry on the undertaking in trust for the benefit of the said governments.

I suppose they assumed that that gave them sufficient power. I was present myself at some of the meetings which took place during the imperial conference of 1926, and I know that that was their stand, and not only that of the members of the board, because at the time we were dealing with governments; we were meeting the representatives of the British government and the representatives of the other partner governments, namely, Australia and New Zealand. The stand taken there was that the act of 1899 fully empowered them to use those profits to improve the property. We did not agree with them, and we made it certain that in the act to be introduced at the following session to embody the new arrangement it would be provided that they could have no power in future to duplicate the cable or to use the profits otherwise than with the consent of all the partner governments, and not merely at the will of a majority of the board. That was embodied in the following statute.

But events have proved that the stand taken by the Canadian Postmaster General at the time was right. The establishment of the beam wireless station had the effect of cutting down considerably the profits of the Pacific cable board. So much so that while in 1926-27 the profits were £100,000, the following year, 1927-28, they came down to £42,000, and for the current year, 1928-29, it is anticipated there will be no profit at all. I may say that from the inception of the cable board until 1916 deficits were accumulated, and Canada had to pay her share of those deficits. The profits came from 1916 until a couple of years ago, and it is those profits which were used for the purpose of duplicating the cable. We thought also at the time that part of these profits should have been used for the purpose of reimbursing what the partner governments had paid as their share of the loss. However, it is true, as my friend suggested, that Canada asked that there should be some conference for the purpose of meeting that new situation, because we were faced with other deficits and heavy losses. I believe that as a result of this conference a satisfactory arrangement has been made. My friend says that the cable will be no longer under the governments' control. That is true. But the arrangement has been made in such a way that British control will always be retained. Then there is the imperial advisory committee, which will have supervision not only of the rates but of the various matters of administration on which the governments participating are represented.

Now, as far as the financial arrangements are concerned, this new company is going to assume all the capital obligations of the Pacific cable board, and I may say that the capital had really been provided by the British government. We merely had our share, and we were paying our share of the deficits.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Loaned by the British government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, loaned by the British government. The merger is going to assume all those capital obligations and pay a sum of £717,000, which will be divided among the partners proportionately, Canada receiving $700,000. Canada has paid during the period of the deficits, namely, between 1903 and 1916, about $900,000. So we will practically get back all our losses and be relieved of future deficits.

As to the necessity of an act of this parliament, my friend may be right. The imperial act which embodies this new agreement says that it shall come into force after the consent of the partner governments shall have been given. My friend may be right that in a question of this importance it would be better to have an act of parliament rather than a mere executive act by way of order in council. However, the question has just been submitted to the Department of Justice, and it is being given consideration at this time.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Postmaster General was not in a position to give us information as to who controls the beam system.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Post Office Department in Great Britain, and the Amalgamated Wireless—I think that is the name—in Australia, the Australian government owning half of the property.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is, the competitor in this case was the government-owned and controlled system, the beam system.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Who controls the beam system now under the new arrangement?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This company.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then we have deliberately given away a publicly-owned beam system of a very superior nature to a private company, and this government has lent itself to one of the grossest scandals that has ever been before the British public.

Mr. HEAPS: I do not know where the Minister of Justice gets his figures. I have been looking up the British Hansard to find out about the question, and I hoped when the papers were tabled in connection with the merger we might have had some information avaialble for the house. These papers were not tabled until eleven o'clock last night, and except for two or three minutes this afternoon I have not had an opportunity to study their contents. It is rather unfair, Mr. Chairman, to ask the house to discuss a question of this importance when we have so little information before us. It was at the end of February when I asked for the tabling of these papers, but not until eleven o'clock last night were they available. I asked the question be laid over until Monday for discussion, but the Postmaster General preferred to proceed this afternoon.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend will admit that we are discussing the question simply because it has been raised. We could wait until the bill has been presented.

Mr. HEAPS: I asked the Postmaster General to-day to allow the matter to stand over until Monday, but he said he preferred to go on this afternoon.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman will have plenty of time to discuss it again when the bill comes up.

Mr. HEAPS: But it is only a few moments since we were told that the bill was to come before us. We should have had that bill in the house months ago, not towards the end of the session. If the matter had not been raised perhaps no bill would have been introduced at all.

Now, let me go into the figures presented by the Minister of Justice. He has told us what Canada will receive. I am trying to compare his figures with those presented to the British House of Commons, which are as follows: the first Pacific cable in 1902 cost $10,000,000; the duplicate cable of 1926 cost $13,600,000. According to the arrangement made with this new merger, the price to be paid for these two cables is $2,885,000, plus the deficit of $6,165,000, which is outstanding. Or, to put it in other words, for these two Pacific cables there is going to be paid the sum of $8,750,000—that is to say, $8,750,000 for something which cost $23,600,000. I have to reconcile the figures of the Minister of Justice with the figures given in the British House of Commons. It appears to me that the new company is paying approximately one-third of the cost of the two Pacific cables.

Another very important factor is that since 1924, when the post office in Canada protested against the duplication of the Pacific cable service, and after the other cable had been put down and was found not to be paying, the Post Office Department here gave, I understand, a license to a private company to operate a beam system between Canada and Australia, which is in direct competition with these two Pacific cables. If that is so, is there any wonder that there will be an added deficit in respect to these two Pacific cables? I cannot understand the logic of this government giving to a private utility so valuable an asset as the right of beam communication between Canada and Australia to compete with our own cables in which we are so vitally interested.

I have been trying, from the files that have been submitted, to get at the reason for the calling of this conference but I find there very little which affords me any satisfaction in regard to that particular question. What has the beam system done? When it came into operation in 1924 it completely revolutionized the whole system of communication. Just exactly in the same way as the automobile revolutionized transportation, so is the beam wireless system to-day revolutionizing the whole problem of communication. Under the old cable system, I believe, they were able to transmit messages at the rate of approximately twenty-five to forty words per minute; under this new beam wireless system they are able to transmit at the rate of 200 words per minute. And not only that; it does it at a much lower cost than under the ordinary cable system. The new system has reached such a state of perfection that it is possible to send messages with a considerable degree of secrecy.

But Canada in her communication with other parts of the world has as yet derived no advantage from this invention. As between England and Australia there has been a reduction in the cost of messages; there has been a similar reduction in practically all parts of the world except to and from Canada. I cannot understand why every other country

can get the advantage of an invention of this character except this Dominion, and I am inclined to think that one of the reasons why Canada has not had the advantage of this beam system is the fact that on the eastern coast we have the Canadian Marconi system in control, while on the western coast we have given in the past few years a license to a private concern to operate a beam system between this country and other parts of the world. I believe the beam system has cut down the cost by about one-third.

It appears further that this matter of inter-imperial communication has gone into the hands of a private corporation which is of an international character. It may be all very well for the minister or anyone else in this house to say that the matter is going to be under British control, but I venture to assert that right at this very moment, while the question is under discussion in this house, a very large percentage of the ownership and possibly the control of this communication is in the hands of interests with headquarters in the United States, possibly in France and possibly in Belgium. According to statements made in the British House of Commons, the fountainhead of this new trust that has been formed is the firm of Lazard Brothers, international bankers, with headquarters in London and Paris. They control not merely international communication, but also large hydro-electric enterprises, and they are also interested in the firm, in Quebec and other parts of Canada, which is involved in the Canadian Marconi system.

It can be shown—and when the time comes it will be shown in this house—that this huge trustification is part of a tremendous organization which has to do with the control of communication, industry, finance and commerce; and it will be shown moreover that the same organization is interested in radio, in newspapers and in various other forms of communication. I cannot for the life of me understand why Sir Campbell Stuart was appointed by the Canadian government to represent Canada at the conference held in London. I do not know what his special qualifications were except that he might have been a director of The Times newspaper, which I understand is in some way connected with some of these international organizations which are interested in intercommunication within the empire and between other countries. These things have all come out in the discussions that have taken place in Great Britain, but in this country so far nothing has been said about the matter. In Great Britain the Labour party have looked upon this as a question of supreme importance; of so serious a nature do they consider it that when the matter came up for discussion in the House of Commons they declared that, should they come into power, they would at the first opportunity repudiate the contract which had been entered into between the British government and the new company which had been formed. It seems to me that when a party which is likely to come into power in Great Britain in the very near future makes a statement of that kind that statement should be heeded by the government of this Dominion. The Canadian government should have been careful before entering into such a scheme as I have indicated. But what did they do? According to the submission which I find in the report tabled, the Canadian representative was given certain instructions dated from Ottawa the 22nd day of December, 1927. Therein there appears this rather significant paragraph:

> Owing to the inquiry having been extended to include the eastward cable route from Great Britain to Australia and the competing wireless, so that it will not be limited to the Pacific cable and competing wireless, the whole cable and wireless question will be in the melting pot. If a consolidation under either public or private auspices, of Eastern Extension, Pacific Cable and Marconi (Canadian, Australian, etc.),—in other words, a common purse on a wide scale, is proposed, this aspect of the question will require further consideration.

It is evident to me, according to the statement made in this report tabled last night, that the government at the close of 1927 had some idea that the whole question of imperial intercommunication was going to go into the melting pot and that probably out of that there would emerge something of a new character.

The minister has stated that there will be a certain amount of control on the part of the government, but he has not told us what the nature of that control will be. And that is an important question. As I understand it—and I believe I am correct in the statement—there is to be a board of thirteen persons and on this board there are to be two representatives of this government. On a board consisting of thirteen members two representatives of the government cannot exercise very much control.

It appears to me that this question became acute when the British government owned the beam system, which became perfected about 1924, and which was responsible for such competition that the privately owned cable services found it impossible to continue. Then what happened? The logical thing was for the government to take over the weaker

system, but instead of that the weaker system took over the government system and unfortunately Canada became a party to that transaction. I am very sorry the government have taken that stand; I think they should have insisted that the various governments own and control this beam system together with the cable services, so that the profits which will be made by the private company would have been obtained by the governments.

Just to illustrate how this works out I would like to quote one or two instances. Before the beam system was perfected Marconi shares in Great Britain slumped to about 13 shillings each. Immediately it became known that these systems were about to be transferred to private ownership, with the Marconi Company having a large interest in that ownership, these shares jumped from about 13 shillings to 72 shillings per share. Those are the figures according to the London stock exchange. That was not a bad bargain for the private company; the government practically gave away one of their greatest assets to a private corporation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is my hon. friend saying that the Pacific cable was at that time an asset to Canada?

Mr. HEAPS: With the beam system it would have been an asset; I do not think the contrary can be proved. This act of giving away the property of the people of this country for one-third its cost is a serious matter, involving both the question of the bargain made by the government and a question of principle. I claim that the government made a poor bargain, and I further claim that on principle the ownership of communications such as these should not have been relinquished in favour of a private corporation.

I am very glad to have the assurance of the Minister of Justice that a bill in connection with this matter will be introduced in this house; I hope when it comes before us it will be sent to one of the standing committees of the house in order that we may have an opportunity of discussing the contract entered into by this government with this private corporation which in future, if the bill goes through, will own and control these assets. I hope the minister will assure the house that when the bill is brought in it will go to one of the standing committees, where the matter may be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. GEARY: There is one matter to which I would like to direct the attention of the Postmaster General; I refer to the case of a man named Kirk, who was a letter carrier in Toronto. Some little time ago Kirk was arrested and charged with theft; he was tried and acquitted. However, the department dismissed this man, and in this connection I would like to read a paragraph from a letter dated July 27, 1928, written by the Postmaster General to Kirk's father:

> This case has been discussed by the officials of the department, and while your son was acquitted by the jury of the offences with which he was charged, there is no doubt whatever that he mistreated mail entrusted to him for delivery. In the interests of the public service, therefore, the department cannot do otherwise than remove his name from the list of employees.

There is just one other letter which I would like to read, dated March 2 of this year, also written by the Postmaster General to Kirk's father after Mr. Kirk apparently had written the Prime Minister:

> In reply I beg to say that I have gone carefully into the matter and while it is true that your son was not convicted by the court of the charge of stealing letters which was made against him, he was only discharged on a legal technicality.

I do not quite see how the Postmaster General could make that statement; after all, the man was found not guilty by the jury, and it was not a technicality in the sense of the man being charged under a wrong name or something of that sort. I gather that what the Postmaster General meant was that it was a question of the balance of doubt, or something of that kind.

I am not suggesting that the minister may not have had cause for dismissing this man; apparently Kirk had taken some letters on his second delivery in the morning and, finding himself unable to deliver them on that round, put them in another pocket on the bag he carried intending to deliver them in the afternoon. I do not know anything of the circumstances of the case; I do not know whether this man gave satisfactory or unsatisfactory service. Nothing of that kind appears in the correspondence, but the unfortunate result is that while the Postmaster General no doubt was within his rights in dismissing the man, Kirk contributed to the superannuation fund, from which he will not derive any benefit, and he is out of pocket to the extent of such contribution. The case seems a little hard; this man actually stood trial after the department elected to settle the case in court. This man was brought before a jury; no doubt he was properly prosecuted and properly defended and the jury found him not guilty. So I would submit that as far as one can see from the file, that should have been the end of the matter.

Kirk might have been kept under surveillance for a time, or something of that sort; at all events a jury of his peers said he was not guilty, and unfortunately he has lost his position, which naturally carries with it a certain amount of odium, even after his acquittal. He is out of pocket not only to the extent of his salary but also to the amount of something like $250 which he contributed to the superannuation fund. From what fund that amount could be returned to him I do not know, but his father is pressing the matter very strongly. I do not happen to know these people personally; they are at least close to my constituency, if not actually within it; perhaps I should know them but I am quite content to take the correspondence as it is without pursuing the matter further personally. However, I would suggest to the Postmaster General that on paper the rights in this case seem to be with the man, who now finds himself in a most unfortunate position. I would like to feel that the Postmaster General could make the matter right in one way or the other.

Mr. VENIOT: I remember that case quite well; I went into it quite thoroughly on the report of the superintendent at Toronto. When I stated in my letter that Kirk was not found guilty owing to a technicality I may not have used the proper term, but these are the circumstances: It was proved before the court that this man did have letters in his possession which he had no right to have.

Mr. GEARY: We admitted that.

Mr. VENIOT: He had mail matter in his possession which he had no right to have. We had been conducting a survey of certain routes in that vicinity and it was discovered that this man was not delivering his mail matter as he should have. He was taking the mail matter to his home or to some other place and not delivering it and we felt that we had a case against him and he was arrested.

Mr. GEARY: He did not take it to his home; he had it with him in another pocket of his bag.

Mr. VENIOT: He had no right to do that.

Mr. GEARY: That is quite right.

Mr. VENIOT: The officials had him arrested and he was tried. I understand that there was not sufficient evidence to prove intent and he was dismissed. There was sufficient evidence in the possession of our officials at Toronto to convince them that this man should not be continued in the service; that decision was reported to me and I approved of it. So far as the retention of the retirement fund payments is concerned, I did endeavour to see if it would be possible to have returned to him the amount which he had contributed to the fund. However, I have been advised that where an individual is dismissed from the service for cause, the payments cannot be returned. That seems to me to be rather harsh and severe but I cannot do anything else than abide by the law.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is there any discretion on the part of the treasury board?

Mr. VENIOT: I think there may be some way of doing it and I intend to see if it cannot be done. There are four or five similar cases and I intend to see if it cannot be done by way of a compassionate allowance approved by the treasury board. I think they have that power and an order in council could be passed.

Mr. GEARY: Do I understand the minister to say that he will use his efforts to obtain that?

Mr. VENIOT: I am looking into these cases to see if there is any way of doing that.

Mr. GEARY: I trust the Postmaster General will bear in mind that there was some suspicion against the man and he could have been dismissed after the investigation by the department. You elected to charge him before the court; you took the course which seemed to you to be the right one; it was not successful, but you dismissed him notwithstanding the decision of the court. The grounds for dismissal had not been proved at his trial and you did not choose to dismiss him before you had him charged with theft. It seems to me that there is very little against him in the department.

Mr. VENIOT: It was in the hands of the law before I knew of it and I could not interfere.

Mr. GEARY: I think it can be arranged in some such way as the minister suggests and I assume I may say that the minister is taking it up with a view to obtaining reimbursement in the amount of the contribution?

Mr. LADNER: I presume we are still under the heading of salaries and allowances. The other day I rose to make some observations with respect to the mail service by air and I would ask if such discussion is now in order?

The CHAIRMAN: Strictly speaking, I do not think it is in order. When this resolution was first moved in the committee it was decided by the committee that we should take it item by item. The discussion got along this afternoon to the third item and I suggest that we consider and pass the first item.

Mr. LADNER: I desire strongly to support the stand taken by my colleague the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) with respect to the minimum wage for civil service employees now receiving under $100 per month. The merit of the claim and the justice of the case has been thoroughly discussed in the house and I cannot add anything further to the discussion, it speaks so plainly for itself, but I desire to support the plea which has been made here.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Last session I drew the attention of the house to the dismissal of some nine or ten postmasters in the vicinity of where I live. I have no intention of opening up these cases again, but I was not able to place all the facts before the house during the forty minutes allowed me and I desire to ask the Postmaster General a question or two.

I made a motion for the production of the files regarding the various dismissals but I find that they contain nothing whatever to indicate the reason for the dismissals. The Postmaster General told me at the time that he had the letters indicating the reasons in a private file, but there was nothing in the papers produced and the postmasters do not know why they were dismissed. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if the letters which he received in connection with certain post offices and making recommendations for changes are considered private or if they should not be public letters and become part of the file which could be produced in response to a motion carried by this house.

Mr. VENIOT: Up till about two months ago I did consider that that type of letter was private and could not be produced, but from discussion in the house and from the consensus of opinion expressed and the interpretation of the rules given I must acknowledge that perhaps I was wrong. From that time on I feel certain that that class of letter was placed on the file but last year I was not treating such correspondence in that way.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I think the minister will recognize that if that is the rule to-day it was the rule last year, and I would like to know if he would produce the letters now to complete the files which were laid on the table last year.

Mr. VENIOT: Will the hon. member state just what files he has reference to? I do not think this is the proper way of putting the question.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Will the minister say that he will deliver the letters?

Mr. VENIOT: You name the files and I will see what I can do.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I will do that. In at least one of the cases I had reference to the postmaster asked for a hearing. Certain charges were made against this man and he demanded a hearing which was refused him; in fact, his letters were never replied to. I would like to ask the Postmaster General what his policy is in a case like that. Is he prepared to give the man a hearing before some official?

Mr. VENIOT: That depends entirely upon whether or not it is an official report upon which I am acting. If it is not an official report, I would certainly feel disposed to grant a hearing. If it is an official report from one of our superintendents, I do not consider I have any right to grant an investigation after one of our sworn officials has inspected an office, gone into all the circumstances and made a report thereon.

Mr. CAMPBELL: In this particular case no inspection of the office was made, and the file that has been produced shows no report from an official upon the conduct of the postmaster or the operation of the office.

Mr. VENIOT: Why does the hon. gentleman not give the name of the post office so that the Postmaster General may have an opportunity of dealing with the matter? He has been talking about several post offices and he has not named any.

Mr. CAMPBELL: This particular one is Nut Mountain, Saskatchewan; but I just wanted the minister's ruling so as to know where he stands in regard to similar cases in the future. Do I understand that the Postmaster General will give a hearing in a case of that kind?

Mr. VENIOT: I will deal with every case on its merits and if I feel that any particular case should have a hearing, I will grant it. I think I ought to be left to be the judge on a report that comes from an inspector. If I cannot trust my inspectors, I can trust nobody

Mr. CAMPBELL: In this particular case there is no report from the inspector at all.

Mr. VENIOT: Why does the hon. member not name the post office?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I did name it. It is Nut Mountain, Saskatchewan.

Mr. SPENCER: I should like to get some information from the Postmaster General not in regard to dismissals this time, but in regard to appointments. I understand that all positions that receive a payment of less than $200 per annum do not come under the Civil Service Commission. We have heard a good deal during the past week in regard to the fact that appointments made by the Civil Service Commission are sometimes accepted and sometimes not, but with regard to those positions for which the payment is less than $200, what is the usual practice in the matter of finding out who are the proper people to fill such positions? Is this done either directly by the minister or indirectly through his officials? Does he usually apply to the members representing the particular constituency, or what is the practice?

Mr. VENIOT: There are several ways of finding out who is the proper person to fill a position. I do not think I should be called upon to reveal my ways of finding out whom I should appoint to a small office of that kind. Sometimes we do it through a report of the inspector. For instance, I will cite a case in point that has just reached me. I will not give any names, but it is in connection with a post office in the western country. The postmaster makes up his mind all at once to resign and he notifies the superintendent. The superintendent gets in touch with the department by wire stating that a vacancy is going to occur at that place. He notifies us that he is going there to see how he can straighten things out. He gets there and he places a man temporarily in charge until the appointment is made, even though the position is not under the Civil Service Commission. That temporary appointment is made because the retiring postmaster wishes to get away. That temporary appointee is left in charge until a decision is reached to make a permanent appointment. There are cases where I might consult individuals whom I know in the district. I do not know whether I should really have to call upon and consult members representing constituencies who are not favourably disposed toward the administration of which I am a member. I do not think our hon. friends opposite would do that. I do not say that I would not do it, but I do not think that I should be called upon to say whether I would or would not do it.

Mr. STEVENS: It is unnecessary to say so, is it not?

Mr. SPENCER: Although the Postmaster General did not deliberately tell the committee that he preferred to fill those small positions through political appointments, at the same time he went pretty nearly that far. I am not interested from a patronage point of view; that is the last thing I want to have anything to do with. What I am interested in is in seeing that service is given in the rural districts, especially where postmasters are appointed to those small positions. I have in mind a position that was to be filled by such a man who was to give service to a rural community. This position was held open for a considerable time and no service was given to that community because the officials of the Postmaster General, no doubt under authority from him, did not allow anybody to fill that particular position, and instead of getting in touch with the local member, myself in this case, who might have been in a position to give the Postmaster General some information and who would not be interested in filling the position from a partisan point of view—

Mr. VENIOT: No; my hon. friend would not!

Mr. SPENCER: I would like to remind the minister that not only did he not consult the sitting member, but he went back, not to the last election but to the one prior to that, in order to consult the defeated Liberal candidate. That defeated Liberal candidate happened to live eighty or ninety miles away from the place; he knew nothing about the district; he happened to be busy with his own affairs and he did not reply. The result was that the position was left vacant week after week until the people at last became desperate and wrote to me, their member, to find out what was wrong with the department. I am not interested in filling this position from a political point of view, but I am interested in seeing that service is given to that community, and if the Postmaster General, through his officials, wants to fill a position where they know of nobody in particular and have no reason to ask for any special candidate, they should find ways and means of

filling it quickly to the best of their ability instead of going to a candidate in an election of three or four years ago, a man who lives ninety miles away, does not know the district, and cannot give advice.

Mr. VENIOT: What is the name of the post office to which my hon. friend refers?

Mr. SPENCER: Morecambe. I have the file of correspondence on my desk and I know all about the matter.

Mr. VENIOT: I will look into it.

Mr. SPENCER: I might say that the position is now filled, but it was held up for a considerable time before it was filled.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Under this item there has been a good deal of discussion with regard to the Pacific cable board. That discussion was interrupted by some of these other cases. There are certain facts that I should like to bring out in connection with the matter, but I shall not insist on doing it now if it is understood that the action of the government will come under review in connection with the presentation of a bill and that we shall have an opportunity, by reference of the bill to a committee, of going into the details of the case.

The CHAIRMAN: My hon. friend will have another opportunity, on the third item in this very resolution, to discuss the Pacific cable.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The discussion has been started.

Mr. LAPOINTE: May I say this to my hon. friend; no formal decision has been reached. I am inclined to think that a bill is necessary, but in any case my hon. friend will certainly be given the opportunity he desires. I think I may safely say that it will be by way of a bill.

Mr. STIRLING: Can the minister tell the committee how long the vacancy in the postmastership at Summerland, British Columbia, will continue? The answer to the inquiry that I made to the Post Office Department is that, although the Civil Service Commission has selected an appointee, the appointment is held up on the instructions of the Postmaster General. Could he tell the committee why it is being held up and when the appointment will be made?

[Mr. Spencer.]

Mr. VENIOT: I have not the file here and I could not say offhand because, of course, I cannot carry all these details in my head, but I assure the hon. gentleman that I will go right into the question of the Summerland postmastership and see that there is no further time lost.

Mr. STIRLING: And will the minister be good enough to communicate with me?

Mr. VENIOT: I will let the hon. gentleman know when there is a decision taken in the matter.

Item agreed to.

Mail service, including mail service by air, $16,305,000.

Mr. LADNER: May I inquire whether any portion of this $16,305,000 is to be expended in British Columbia in connection with the mail service by air?

Mr. VENIOT: Not this year. At the present time we are having surveys made by the Department of National Defence to see the best way of reaching Vancouver or some part of British Columbia from Winnipeg.

Mr. LADNER: Has a survey not been made?

Mr. VENIOT: It is not yet completed. They have to get over those mountains and through the passes. Our intention is to extend the air service to within twenty miles of Banff, and connect up there with the train service, rushing the mail across the continent to the coast, but it will be impossible for us to connect up this year with Vancouver or any part of British Columbia beyond the mountains.

Mr. LADNER: Will the minister be able to connect up next year?

Mr. VENIOT: That is the intention; that is part of our program.

Mr. LADNER: How much of this $16,305,000 is to be expended on mail service by air?

Mr. VENIOT: $800,000.

Mr. LADNER: According to Mr. Yarrow, who is engaged in the aircraft business and apparently understands it, 458 air passenger miles were travelled in Canada in 1925 and 3,000,000 miles in 1928. That indicates the great increase there has been in aeroplane transport. In British Columbia, and on Vancouver Island in particular, a number of companies have undertaken aeroplane transportation. The service is established there, and although the minister may require a survey so far as crossing the mountains is concerned,

I submit that an air mail service can be carried on over the existing aeroplane routes because the system is already established. Have any inquiries been made along the line of taking advantage of the existing aeroplane service which operates between Vancouver, Victoria and Seattle? Why could not an air mail service be put on the system already in operation and in connection with which no survey would be required?

Mr. VENIOT: My hon. friend is a little mistaken when he says that no survey would be required, because we never start an air mail service in any part of Canada until we have first had a survey made by the Department of National Defence as to its feasibility, and we are thoroughly informed as to the conditions to be met in regard to landings, and so forth. The only air mail service that we have pertaining to British Columbia is the one we had with the British Columbia Airways Limited, to whom we gave what is known as the sticker privilege, allowing them to carry mail for people who desired to send their mail by the company's aeroplanes, and allowing the company to charge at the rate of five cents.

Mr. LADNER: Does that still exist?

Mr. VENIOT: That privilege still exists.

Mr. LADNER: And will continue?

Mr. VENIOT: Oh yes, we will not take away that privilege.

Mr. LADNER: Between the cities of Vancouver and Victoria, for example, where there is an aeroplane service in actual operation carrying passengers, and with the capacity for carrying mail bags, how would a survey be required in connection with that service?

Mr. VENIOT: It would not be required there because the company is giving that service on its own initiative. They have no contract with us, but only the privilege of carrying mail for people who desire to use that service.

Mr. LADNER: Is any portion of the $800,000 which is to be expended on air mail service to be used by way of subsidy or aid to airports?

Mr. VENIOT: No. We have nothing at all to do with that.

Mr. LADNER: In Vancouver, the city council has submitted a by-law to the people, which we believe will pass, to provide $300,000 for the purchase of a property in or near Sea island, which has been found to be suitable by some of the officers of the Department of National Defence for an aeroplane field. The city itself has submitted that by-law to the people, and if it is passed the field will be acquired. I believe that the Minister of National Defence has announced that as a matter of policy the government is willing to provide a sum up to $10,000 for beacon lights. Can the Postmaster General through his department take any action in aiding in the establishment of airports?

Mr. VENIOT: There is no amount in our estimates for that.

Mr. LADNER: I wish to place on Hansard for the consideration of the minister a few paragraphs from the editorial columns of the Vancouver Sun, dated the 18th of April last. I might say to hon. gentlemen opposite that the Vancouver Sun, generally a champion of the interests of the city of Vancouver in preference to its party affiliations, nevertheless always supports the government in an agressive and vigorous manner at election time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Noble conduct.

Mr. LADNER: The conduct has noble aspects, but it does not always result so nobly.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Unforunately.

Mr. LADNER: For the Liberal party, but not for the country.

Mr. McPHEE: Was there not a reduction from 2,000 to 80 in a by-election?

Mr. STEVENS: You are ninety miles out.

Mr. LADNER: The cause of justice and righteousness did prevail in Victoria notwithstanding the visit of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and some of his supporters. The editor of the Vancouver Sun describes the attitude of the government in these words:

The federal government, according to the estimates of Postmaster General Veniot, will spend $34,926,639 on air mail services in the Dominion.

That is an error; the amount is $16,305,000.

Toronto will be connected with Buffalo and Windsor, and nearly all sections of the east will be linked together by air mail routes.

This is a fine progressive program worthy of a progressive government.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. LADNER: It falls upon sympathetic ears.

But why is there nothing in it for British Columbia?

That is what I am inquiring of the Postmaster General.

Mr. Veniot says that air mail service to the Pacific coast ports cannot be considered this year because surveys of mail routes have not yet been made.

Why should Mr. Veniot not spend part of his appropriation making those surveys at once?

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot.

Mr. LADNER: Why not ?

Mr. VENIOT: Because my department has nothing at all to do with the surveying.

Mr. LADNER: He can call on other departments to do it.

Mr. VENIOT: Let the department of militia speak for itself. I have enough to do to defend my own.

Mr. LADNER: I presume the hon. minister has fully realized that he has a job defending his own department. This article continues:

> The primary purpose of this appropriation is to improve Canada's mail service. The secondary purpose is to aid and encourage commercial aviation.
>
> Why should the encouragement of commercial aviation be confined solely to the east of the rockies?

Will the Postmaster General answer that question?

Mr. VENIOT: I think I have already answered it, with all due respect to the hon. gentleman's opinion. I stated the reasons why we cannot go to the Pacific coast this year. In the program I brought before this house some time ago I went fully into all the contemplated routes. I went from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, and I gave reasons for every one of those routes. I cannot go any further than that. All I can say is, it is impossible for us to get to the Pacific coast this year. The Pacific coast will be in our program just as soon as we can get from the department that is looking after the surveys word that they have discovered a suitable route over the mountains or through the passes, I do not know which; but whenever that is decided upon we will undertake to carry out our program in British Columbia so that we shall have a complete service from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. LADNER: I have one more question. What is the $1,200,000 to be expended on which is now provided in the estimates?

Mr. VENIOT: It will be expended on all the contracts for routes: Halifax to Montreal; Montreal to Rimouski, meeting the ocean liners and taking the transatlantic mail to Montreal, and then despatching it from Montreal to Toronto. After we get the Winnipeg route working we will continue on to Winnipeg, and from Winnipeg to Banff, or to a district within twenty miles of Banff—Canmore, I think.

Mr. STEVENS: Canmore.

Mr. VENIOT: So as to catch the fast transcontinental trains at that point. There is now a contract for air mail between Montreal and Toronto, and we are considering a contract for a similar service between Toronto and Windsor. After the Toronto-Windsor route has been in operation we expect to link up with the American net work of air mail service by means of the connecting link that the American government is undertaking from Fargo to the border of Manitoba; this will give us a direct connecting link with Winnipeg. We have routes laid out from Winnipeg to Regina as a junction point, and from there to Moose Jaw, Medicine Hat, Calgary and Canmore. From Regina on the other leg of the course there will be routes to Saskatoon, North Battleford and Edmonton. Those routes are now being considered for the contracts that I have just spoken of. Those contracts will be let within the next three or four weeks. A good deal of night flying will have to be done on the route I have just named, but in the beginning we will have to use day flying until the lighting towers are placed. It takes about one month of day flying for the aviators to become acquainted with the territory. Night flying is dangerous until the aviators are thoroughly familiar with the route, and we do not want to take any risks.

Mr. LADNER: Are those government or private planes?

Mr. VENIOT: All contract.

Mr. LADNER: This money actually goes to the contractor for the service of carrying the mails?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. LADNER: Not for the purchase of planes or anything of a capital nature?

Mr. VENIOT: No. The Post Office Department have two or three planes of their own, but we are not using them for those long distances. We pass them over to the department of militia at times, and they use them in the surveys.

Mr. LADNER: But if there is a service established as between Victoria and Vancouver, then arrangements can be made with the department for the carrying of mail if such arrangements do not already exist?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes; that system could be put in practice at any time.

Mr. STEVENS: What is the daily cost of carrying the mail from Toronto to Montreal, each way?

Mr. VENIOT: It is on a mileage basis at the present time. I think it is a dollar a mile.

Mr. STEVENS: That would be about six hundred dollars a day?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, I think the distance is about 310 miles.

Mr. STEVENS: How much mail was carried by air from Montreal to Toronto this year?

Mr. VENIOT: I have the figures here. Perhaps I may be permitted to read the full list. This is a statement showing the weight of mail carried over the various air mail routes up to April 30, 1929. For the 1928-29 season we carried 62,830 pounds of mail from Montreal to Rimouski.

Mr. STEVENS: Can you give the number of trips?

Mr. VENIOT: That is three trips a week there. It is only for the transatlantic mail. Then we have the Montreal-Ottawa route and the Montreal-Toronto route, showing the amount of mail carried for 1928-29.

Mr. STEVENS: That is for the year, is it?

Mr. VENIOT: No, that is not the complete year. I forget when we started the Toronto-Montreal service.

Mr. STEVENS: Can you give me the date approximately?

Mr. VENIOT: I have not the date.

Mr. STEVENS: Could the minister put the whole list on Hansard?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, how would it be if I handed it to Hansard now?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Statement showing the weight of mail carried over the various air mail routes up to April 30, 1929

Route	Year	Weight of mails
Montreal—Rimouski	1928	62,830 pounds
	1929	
Montreal—Ottawa	1928	4,365 "
	1929	
Montreal—Toronto	1928	44,250 "
	1929	771 "
Montreal—Albany	1928	4,899 "
	1929	5,652 "
Quebec—Seven Islands	1927-28	15,447 "
	1928-29	26,360 "
Seven Islands—Anticosti	1927-28	6,447 "
	1928-29	3,808 "
Moncton—Magdalen Islands	1927-28	3,017 "
	1928-29	7,444 "
Moncton—Charlottetown	1927-28	2,390 "
Summerside	1928-29	59,712 "
Leamington—Pelee Island	1927-28	17,470 "
	1928-29	20,876 "
Sioux Lookout—Gold Pines	1928	57,566 "
Red Lake	1929	25,510 "
Narrow Lake		
Jackson Manion		
15 April, 1929		
Lac du Bonnet—Wadhope	1928	23,722 "
Bissett		
Cranberry Portage—Kississing	1928	3,071 "
end of March	1929	5,461 "
St. John—Halifax	1929	2,022 "
Ottawa—Montreal—St. John	1929	3,161 "
Winnipeg—Calgary—Edmonton	1928	4,820 "
Canadian National Exhibition	1928	900 "
Mackenzie river district up to 13/3/29	1929	4,914 "
Grand total		416,885 "

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The minister says that when he proposes to initiate a new service he asks for a survey by the Department of National Defence. In determining whether or not that service will be granted do military considerations prevail or is the matter decided purely on the ground of commercial needs?

Mr. VENIOT: No military consideration whatever; so far as my department is concerned the matter is decided purely from the standpoint of commercial service.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I did not catch what the minister said, but I am anxious to know what routes have been decided upon between the

prairie provinces and the coast. I have a telegram from Calgary in regard to the matter, and I may say that the mayor of Calgary is anxious to know. An item appeared in one of the papers to the effect that it had already been decided to go by a particular route.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not yet know what route they will go by.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister could not give the exact number of days on the Montreal-Toronto route, but taking a full year of 365 days it would represent a cost of about $5 a pound to carry the mail; and as I presume they do not run more than half the time it would mean $10 a pound. That is an enormous price.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman may have heard me make the statement on a previous occasion that we are not receiving the encouragement we should from commercial and industrial concerns so far as the Montreal-Toronto route is concerned. I think it is now improving considerably since I made that statement about three months ago and repeated it about a month since. It is not to be expected that our air mail service will give us any revenue that will meet expenses in certain sections of Canada until it has operated for a year or two. I may say however that with the average rate of 5 cents, and figuring on so many letters to the pound, it gives us around $3.60.

Mr. STEVENS: Of course, very often a letter would not be of maximum weight. But what I am pointing out is this. There are three mails a day between Toronto and Montreal by fast rail and consequently there is little inducement for the merchants and others to use the more expensive mail. I am not objecting to the air mail service, but I think that before paying the subsidy of $600 a day, which is a pretty heavy one, there ought to be some ground for the establishment of the service. Rather, in my opinion, an effort should be made to stimulate the carrying of mail by air over long distances so as to provide a service which will be of value. There is no advantage in a short service.

Mr. VENIOT: That is why the Toronto-Montreal link was established, in order to have it connect up with the further long distance route to the prairie provinces. I believe it has been carried on daily since November last.

Mr. SPENCE: I was going to ask the minister how the air routes were paying, but now I understand they are not paying. Let me ask the minister this question: Deep down in his own heart does he think there is necessity for the air routes operated at the present time?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, I do.

Mr. SPENCE: Does the minister think there is real necessity for the one between Toronto and Montreal considering that there are three trains a day on this route? The fact is that letters written between five and six at night in Toronto will be delivered in Montreal as soon as they can be received by air.

Mr. VENIOT: Toronto is not the only place in Canada.

Mr. SPENCE: It may be a connecting link, I admit. I do not want to deprive Toronto of an air service but we should carry on these services to pay; everything should stand on its own feet. The air service is for the accommodation of the jazz element of the country who turn night into day.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Can the minister give us a list of the contracts, together with the names of the contractors, for these different routes, the prices they are receiving, and the services that each of these contractors is rendering?

Mr. VENIOT: These are the services:

Present Services

Rimouski—Montreal	2 trips per week, each way, 330 miles—$1.25 per mile. Contractors—Canadian Transcontinental Airways, Limited, Quebec City.
Montreal—Ottawa	1 trip per week each way, 110 miles—$1.25 per mile. Contractors—Canadian Transcontinental Airways Limited, Quebec City.
Montreal—Toronto	6 trips per week each way, 330 miles—$1.00 per mile. Contractors—Canadian Airways Limited, Montreal, Que.
Montreal—Albany	6 trips per week one way, 200 miles—$1.25 per mile. Contractors—Canadian Colonial Airways Limited, Montreal, Que.

Present Services—Concluded

Sioux Lookout, Gold Pines, Red Lake, Narrow Lake and Jackson Manion..	Weekly—320 miles per round trip, $160 per trip of 400 pounds and 12 cents per pound for next 350 pounds and 19 cents per pound for all in excess of 750 pounds. Contractors—Western Canada Airways Limited, Winnipeg, Man.
Lac du Bonnet to Bissett and Wadhope..	Semi-weekly—82 miles. $6,000 per annum and 10 cents per pound for all mail over 400 pounds. Contractors—Western Canada Airways Limited, Winnipeg, Man.
Kississing and The Pas..	Weeky—100 miles. $50 per trip, limit of weight 100 pounds. Contractors—Western Canada Airways Limited, Winnipeg, Man.
Leamington—Pelee Island..	6 trips per week, 22 miles, $32.00 per trip. Contractors—London Air Transport Limited, London, Ont.
La Malbaie—Seven Islands—Anticosti..	La Malbaie—Seven Islands—weekly, 260 miles, limit of weight 1,500 pounds per week.
Moncton—Magdalen Islands..	An extension of 120 miles to Anticosti four times per season, with a limit of weight of 1,500 pounds per trip. Moncton—Magdalen Islands—weekly, 200 miles, limit of weight per trip 700 pounds. Contractors—Canadian Transcontinental Airways Limited, Quebec City.
Moncton—Charlottetown..	Weekly, 110 miles, limit of weight 300 pounds per trip. Contractors—Canadian Transcontinental Airways Limited, Quebec City.

The Moncton-Charlottetown service was instituted in an emergency as a result of an accident to the ferry boat and it was kept on for six or seven weeks until the mails got regularly going again.

Proposed Services

Toronto—Windsor.
Toronto—Buffalo.
Calgary—Winnipeg.
Edmonton, North Battleford, Saskatoon—Regina.
Winnipeg—Fargo, U.S.A.
Mackenzie River.

For the information of the committee I may say that last winter we sent mail from the head of steel, nearly 400 miles from Edmonton, 775 miles into that frozen Mackenzie river region I think once a fortnight, where previously they never had received mail except once each winter.

Halifax, Saint John, Megantic, Montreal.
Special exhibition or experimental flights.

We made a special exhibition flight from Montreal to Toronto last year and did not lose any money by it; we also established a special western provinces service during the holiday season and came out very well. That is about all the information.

Mr. SPENCE: About what is the flying time between Montreal and Toronto and between Ottawa and Toronto, and what time do the planes leave?

Mr. VENIOT: I have not that information, but I know that under the contract they travel at a cruising speed of 110 miles per hour.

Mr. SPENCE: And at what time of the day do they leave Montreal and Toronto? I do not think the public know very much about this air mail service, and this is the way to give them the information.

Mr. VENIOT: I am told they leave about 1.30 in the afternoon, in order to make the last delivery.

Mr. SPENCE: That mail would arrive too late to be delivered to business offices either in Montreal or in Toronto. Should they not leave at 11 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. VENIOT: You cannot very well do that; you must make connection with trains coming from other directions. We are not carrying on this service for the benefit of Toronto alone.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Were these contracts let after tenders had been invited?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): In each case?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): To the lowest tenderer in each case?

Mr. VENIOT: I think the only case in which there was not a competition was at Leamington. A company was doing business there and the people of the island, the company and the department made a three-cornered arrangement, so no tenders were invited.

Mr. ERNST: Are these tenders advertised publicly, or are tenders requested privately?

Mr. VENIOT: They were not public tenders.

Mr. ERNST: I think the minister should put on record the names of those who were asked to tender in each case and the amounts of the tenders.

Mr. VENIOT: That can be done.

Mr. ERNST: I will ask the minister to do it.

Mr. VENIOT: I will not be able to do it to-day; I could not secure the information so soon.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CALVERT MITCHELL CARRUTHERS

The house in committee on Bill No. 96, for the relief of Calvert Mitchell Carruthers—Mr. Sanderson—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There are two questions of procedure in these cases to which I desire to call attention. When this question was up before, the Chairman declared out of order an amendment moved by the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans). On May 1 of last year when the Deputy Speaker was in the chair I moved an amendment in precisely the same form, but which was voted down by the house. I must confess that the house is left in a very awkward position when an amendment regarded a year ago as being in accordance with the rules is now declared out of order. If I should introduce an amendment to-night I should like to know whether it will be in order; whether the precedent of Monday night or of May 1, 1928, is to rule.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will have to move his amendment and send it in writing to the Chair to be passed upon.

[Mr. H. A. Stewart.]

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The other day the Chairman ruled the amendment of the member for Rosetown out of order on the ground that it was not in harmony with the British North America Act, and we tried at the time to get from the Minister of Justice some statement with regard to this whole situation which might possibly clear the air. Is the Minister of Justice prepared to-night to make a statement in regard to this very important question?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Since the question was raised last week I made it a point to look into this matter and I have come to the conclusion that provisions for alimony or for the maintenance of the wife and children are matters concerning property and civil rights and should be left to the provinces. The power to legislate concerning marriage does not mean the power to legislate concerning the consequences flowing from marriage. Marriage and divorce come within the federal jurisdiction by virtue of section 91 of the British North America Act. Had these matters not been covered by that section of the act they would have certainly remained within the jurisdiction of the provinces under the classification of civil rights. Being an exception I think they should be construed strictly, and that is the view which has been accepted by parliament since confederation. I can find only one case in which a different view was held; it was back in 1879 in what was called the Campbell case. The husband had applied for a divorce the previous year and his application had been refused. In 1879 the wife applied for a divorce. She was not applying for what is known as a divorce a vinculo matrimonii, she did not desire the marriage to be annulled altogether but simply that a separation be granted so that she could live apart from her husband and be granted alimony for the support of herself and the children. There was a very long and strenuous debate in both houses of parliament, but the bill went through by a majority in both the Senate and the House of Commons. Still, I find in the reports that it was opposed by such constitutional authorities as Mr. Mills, who afterwards became Minister of Justice, and Sir John A. Macdonald. I will read just a few words from the remarks of each of these gentlemen. Mr. Mills, as reported in Hansard of 1879, at page 1878, says:

> When the act of confederation was passed, it provided that the subject of marriage and divorce should be reserved to the government of Canada. Now, it was clear that expression must be understood with reference to the past policy of the mother country. They knew it was a rule of legal construction that, whenever general power was conferred, and express exception made to that power, the exception was

to be strictly construed. In the British North America Act the subject of property and civil rights was conferred on the local legislature, and if there had been no exception made, that term was broad enough to include the marital relations. Not only so, but they found that, in the same act, the power to deal with the subject of marriage and divorce was expressly carved out of this general power; these terms, therefore, must be strictly construed.

Sir John A. Macdonald says, as reported on page 2004 of the same Hansard:

He thought that his bill was ultra vires, that they had no right to pass such a bill, and that it would be of no value as a statute. The line between the powers of the local and general legislatures was easily marked. The division was so clear that there could be little or no hesitation as to deciding where the power to deal with the subject rested. If it rested anywhere, it was with the provincial legislatures, and not with the Dominion parliament. It was true, they were told that the statute providing for all matters relating to marriage and divorce, was to be reserved exclusively for the Dominion parliament. Obviously it meant it had the sole control of the legislation respecting the formation and dissolution of the marriage tie, and there was no other power given it by the statute.

I see that this opinion of Sir John A. Macdonald was held by at least one of the judges of the Queen's bench court of Ontario. It came before the appeal court of Ontario in this way. The husband was sued by his solicitor or counsel for costs, including the costs for having prosecuted the petition for divorce, and Mr. Justice Wilson, in the course of his remarks delivering judgment, says:

It would be necessary, I think, on this count to ascertain how much, if any, of the charge made was for the claim for a divorce a mensa et thoro, and how much for the claim for alimony and the custody of the children; because I am strongly impressed with the opinion that the senate has no more claim to award alimony and to decide upon the custody of the children than it would have to devise a scheme for the education of the children, or to fix the times and places the father should have access to them, or to appoint the form of religion in which they should be brought up. These are matters with which our tribunals are better calculated to deal, and which I say without any reserve they understand better than the senate possibly can do.

Such an enactment would, if my view of the powers of the Senate be correct, be disregarded by the courts here. It would not be allowed to overrule the decision of our own court, which has deliberately pronounced against this claim for alimony, which the senate seemed ready to grant.

The plaintiff cannot therefore recover for a proceeding which was not only unconstitutional but in disregard of the authority of our courts.

I find that writers have expressed their opinion on the matter and on the Campbell case. Evans on the Law and Practice of Divorce, 1923, at page 405, deals with the matter, as follows:

The insertion in a bill of provisions as to the custody and maintenance of children and as to the maintenance of the wife created in various cases considerable discussion which showed a wide divergence of opinion and it has been urged that questions relating to such matters could under the provisions of the British North America Act only be dealt with by the provincial courts and under provincial laws since questions of that kind fall within the term "property and civil rights". In the Campbell case, supra, however, this view was not upheld and provisions as to custody and maintenance were incorporated in the bill. Despite this case it should be remembered that parliament has made it a practice not to grant any relief which might be obtained through the courts, and since these matters can in all the provinces be adjudicated upon and determined by the provincial courts a continuation or extension of the precedent set by the Campbell case, supra, and a few other cases can scarcely be expected. It is more than probable that parliament will, except in exceptional cases, relegate petitioners to the provincial courts for the determination of questions relating to the maintenance and custody of the children or the maintenance of the wife or to other matters over which the provincial courts exercise jurisdiction.

Sinclair in his work on Parliamentary Divorce, 1915, at page 59, referring to the Campbell case, states as follows:

The view at present held is that the question of custody of children is one falling within the competence of the courts of the provinces, and that the making of such a provision would be an interference with civil rights which, under the constitution, are under the sole control of the provincial legislatures.

So I desire to lay down as the principles which I think are sound:

(1) Power to legislate regarding marriage does not include power to legislate regarding the consequences flowing from marriage. It is for parliament to say who may properly marry, but it is for the provincial legislature to declare what shall be the property rights and the respective duties and liabilities and privileges as between married persons. I submit that parliament would have no power under the word "marriage" to enact the Ontario Married Women's Separate Property Act.

(2) Similarly, the power to legislate regarding divorce gives power to bring about a dissolution of a marriage, but it does not include power to deal with property rights and obligations as between the divorced persons this being a matter of property and civil rights in the province.

(3) If parliament were to enact legislation conferring jurisdiction in divorce upon the Ontario courts that is all the legislation need provide. All questions of property and civil rights following on divorce can be dealt with by the provincial legislature.

I will add that even if this parliament had the legislative power to deal with alimony

and provision for the children and the wife, there is no doubt the provinces have also that right and it is certainly better to leave the field clear for the provinces in this matter.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the minister allow me to ask him another question? I should like to have this cleared up. In authorizing the remarriage of the petitioner, are we obliged by law to give the guilty party, so declared, the same right of remarriage?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No; I think that is different.

Mr. MARCIL: The other point is this: once the divorce is granted by parliament, have the divorced parties any standing before the courts if they apply to them for alimony or for care of the children?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have no doubt that they have in both Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the minister be prepared to say whether the guilty party could remarry?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think parliament could declare one way or the other because there it is a question as to marriage itself.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed, on division.

FLORENCE JANE SHEPPARD

The house in committee on Bill No. 165, for the relief of Florence Jane Sheppard—Mr. Sanderson—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. EVANS: I think there are two children in this case, and I wonder whether we have the right to grant divorce without providing for the children of the marriage. Perhaps the sponsor of the bill will explain the circumstances.

Mr. SANDERSON: My hon. friend is quite correct; there are two children in this case, one twelve and the other nine years old. The evidence in the case is not very long, and I presume that most hon. members have already gone through it. Briefly, the petitioner in this case is the wife. She was married on the 9th day of November, 1915, in a village in the county of York, in the province of Ontario. The evidence can be read in five minutes, and any hon. member who will take the trouble to read it will agree that the case is not complicated in any way. The senate committee after careful consideration have recommended that this divorce be granted. I would therefore ask the house to agree to the passing of this bill.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed, on division.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 86, for the relief of Frederick Rutherfoord Zoppi.—Mr. Kay.

Motion for second reading agreed to on division.

AGNES VICTORIA LEADER

Mr. A. M. EDWARDS (South Waterloo) moved the second reading of Bill No. 154, for the relief of Agnes Victoria Leader.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think we ought to have some explanation of this bill because the case is of quite a different order from those hitherto presented.

Mr. EDWARDS (Waterloo): The petition is from Agnes Victoria Leader, praying for the passing of an act to annul her marriage with Robert Elmer Leader, the claim being that the marriage has not been consummated. Evidence was given before the senate committee by Mrs. Leader, by her mother, Mrs. Watson, and by Doctor Buchanan, physician and surgeon.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I want to point out that this illustrates another of the anomalies of our present practice of granting divorce. We are asked to grant a divorce in this case simply because of a physical defect. Were this man hopelessly insane, a divorce would be refused. If he were a criminal, absolutely immoral in every conceivable way, a divorce would be refused. But simply because there is a certain physical defect, we are proceeding to grant this divorce. I call attention to it on this occasion simply because there has been an impression prevalent that divorce was granted in this country solely for moral delinquency, that always adultery was the ground. That is not true, as this case goes to prove, and I think we ought to consider the bill very carefully. In fact, as the Minister of Justice was enumerating the matters connected with marriage that came within the jurisdiction of this house, it struck me that it is quite doubtful whether, if he is correct in his statement, parliament is competent to

deal with this case. The Minister of Justice says that "the respective duties, liabilities and privileges as between married persons" is entirely a provincial matter. If that is so, there being no charge here of adultery, the petition is based on certain privileges as between these two married persons. I should like to have a statement from the Minister of Justice as to whether or not parliament is competent to deal with a case of this character.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I must admit that I have not read either the bill or the evidence. I could hardly be expected to answer my hon. friend's question.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then, Mr. Speaker, I would request that this bill stand until we can have some statement from the Minister of Justice as to the power of this house in regard to this bill.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): Mr. Speaker, from a purely legal standpoint I can see some merit in the argument of my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth). The parliament of Canada has jurisdiction in questions of marriage and divorce. If I understand the statement made by my hon. friend from South Waterloo (Mr. Edwards) there has never been a marriage in this case. There has been a solemnization of marriage, that being, as I understand, within the jurisdiction of the provincial authority; but there has never been a de facto marriage. Therefore it is not within the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada to act. If there has been no marriage the parties need no divorce. They have absolutely no standing before this parliament. We may dissolve a marriage, but we cannot deal with something that is not a marriage. I think that is the argument set forth by my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre, and I am under the impression there may be considerable legal merit in it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has already spoken. Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the second reading will kindly say "aye".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Aye.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those opposed will kindly say "nay".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Nay.

Mr. SPEAKER: The ayes have it. I declare the motion carried on division.

Bill read the second time on division and referred to the committee on miscellaneous private bills.

DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS

RIGHT OF MARRIED WOMEN TO ESTABLISH DOMICILE

Mr. W. J. WARD (Dauphin) moved that Bill No. 75, respecting the domicile of married women in proceedings for divorce, be committed to committee of the whole.

Mr. SPEAKER: This bill was given second reading on April 23. The motion now is to commit the bill. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have some remarks to make, but probably it would be just as well that I should do so in committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to standing order 38 no debate is permissible on a motion to commit a bill unless it be an order of the day.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this bill was given second reading on division, and that there was opposition to the principle when it was so passed. I was absent at the time, but now I want to register a strong protest against the bill and to dissent from its provisions. I believe that it seeks to enact a principle which is absolutely contrary to British law and British doctrine, and that if enacted into law it will create difficulties and complications, which perhaps have not been foreseen.

When I saw that the bill was being introduced I went to the library to peruse a judgment of the privy council in the case of Cook v. Cook and Attorney General for Alberta, which is referred to in the explanatory notes accompanying the bill. In that case it was decided that the domicile of the husband was the only place of jurisdiction for divorce proceedings. The case will be found at page 751 of the Western Weekly Reports, 1926, and there will be found the following

views by two or three eminent judges of the British Privy Council. Lord Haldane said in Lord Advocate v. Jaffrey:

> Since Le Mesurier v. Le Mesurier . . . nothing short of a full juridical domicil within its jurisdiction can justify a British court in pronouncng a decree of divorce.

And then:

> There can be only one real domicil.

And further:

> There is no authority for the proposition that the husband and wife can have, while they continue married, distinct domicils . . . . If it were otherwise . . . . proceedings for dissolving the status of marriage might be carried through in two jurisdictions, possibly with different results.

Lord Cave said:

> I doubt whether the rule as to a wife's domicil following that of her husband is founded only upon her obligation to live with him. It appears to me to be more correct to say that it is a consequence of the union between husband and wife brought about by the marriage tie. . . . The rule is no doubt abrogated by a divorce a vinculo and possibly (although this has not yet been finally decided) by a divorce a mensa et thoro or a judicial separation. . . . (As to a possible exception in a) case where a husband who, having been guilty of desertion or some other matrimonial offence in this country, endeavours to deprive his wife of her remedy by changing his domicil; and there is no doubt authority (which it is not now necessary to examine) for the proposition that in such a case the husband will not be allowed to set up his own wrong as an argument for prejudicing his wife's rights.

And Lord Shaw said this:

> I must not myself be held as assenting to the view that it has ever yet been decided by law that even a judicial separation properly and formally obtained would operate as a change in the so-called, and, in my opinion, very doubtfully named domicilium matrimonii. I see the greatest difficulty in any invasion of the principle which appears to me to be fundamental—namely, that that unity which the marriage signifies is regulated by one domicil and one domicil only—i.e., that of the husband. I am quite sure that Lord Watson in Le Mesurier v. Le Mesurier treated the matrimonial domicil as the real domicil and nothing but the real domicil, but considered that as the real domicil of one person—namely, the husband. Much confusion may be caused by the introduction of the idea of there being two domicils of the marriage or two domicils of succession while the marriage tie continues.

In a later pasage Lord Shaw adds:

> In the great fundamental issues of status and succession the domicil of the wife is the domicil of the husband until divorce a vinculo matrimonii has been obtained.

If this bill becomes law there will be two domiciles, even before the divorce is granted and while the marriage bond between the two parties still exists. As I have said, even in England and in other British countries where the principle of divorce is recognized and where divorce courts function they have never so far accepted the principle which this bill seeks to translate into law.

If we adopt the principle of this bill I see certain difficulties. The effect of the bill on persons residing in Quebec and Ontario, for instance, would be peculiar. Any husband residing in either of these provinces could obtain a divorce only by application to parliament, but the bill would enable his wife, in the cases mentioned, to acquire domicile in any of the provinces where there are divorce courts and to obtain a divorce from him, which divorce would be effective in Ontario and Quebec just as though it had been granted by this parliament. Indeed, as I read the bill, I think it is even wider than that so far as its language goes. It sets no limitation, and it would enable the wife to acquire domicile in any part of the world and to obtain a divorce from her husband which would be recognized as valid in Canada.

I may say that I have no experience in this matter inasmuch as I have not practised law in other provinces where there are divorce courts; but I am told that under the present practice the courts go a long way towards trying to ascertain the facts in any given case, and in cases of desertion the matrimonial domicile has not been changed. It is only in a clear case that they will hold the husband to have changed his domicile so effectively as to defeat the wife's action.

The question of domicile as well as that of nationality and naturalization is one which is very difficult of solution, and there has been no practical scheme to meet all the difficulties which are presented. If the provisions of the present bill were given their full effect the result would be that in some cases two actions for divorce might be pending in relation to the same parties and at the same time, one in one province at the suit of the husband and one in another province at the suit of the wife; and there is the possibility that there would be a race to see which would be tried first. And the same thing would happen before the appeal court if the first judgment were appealed from.

I think we ought to adhere to the old British doctrine, which is also the doctrine of natural law, that there should be only one matrimonial domicile for all purposes. It is not a question, as one hon. member suggested when the bill was before the house for second reading, that now that women have equal rights with men we should pass this legislation. It is not a question of equality or

rights; it is a question of one marital tie, of one matrimonial domicile. Whether it be the domicile of the husband or of the wife, I care not; but I contend that so long as the marriage continues, so long as that marriage has not been dissolved, there is but one domicile and there should remain but one domicile for all purposes.

Those who believe in divorce may consider that there are at times deserving cases which at present cannot be relieved by reason of certain difficulties. But to redress possible grievances in a few cases you are apt to create troubles and difficulties in a large number of others; and apart from the principle of divorce itself, to which I am opposed, I am for these reasons opposed to the present bill.

Mr. MARCIL: I wish to quote from the civil code of Quebec the law regarding this matter, seeing that divorce, in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, is a matter of special legislation in each individual case. The civil code of Quebec, article 52, provides:

> A married woman not separated from bed and board has no other domicile than that of her husband.

Clearly, therefore, the passage of the present bill would be a contravention of provincial rights.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: If a wife has been deserted by her husband, who has gone to live in a foreign country, has she no domicile?

Mr. MARCIL: It makes no difference in the eyes of the law if she has not obtained a judicial separation.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Then her domicile might be in any part of the world—in Peru or Chile. If she is deserted by her husband and he is a foreign country, what is her position? Is her domicile then in the foreign country?

Mr. MARCIL: According to the code, when judicial separation has taken place then the wife has a domicile of her own; but until that occurs her domicile is the domicile of the husband.

Mr. LAPOINTE: She has a domicile of her own when the husband has really established a new domicile. If he is going around the world, not being settled anywhere, the last matrimonial domicile still exists.

Mr. BOTHWELL: There is a great deal of force in the remarks of the Minister of Justice in regard to this bill, and it does appear that the bill possibly goes too far in the endeavour to provide a remedy for the married woman. The first subsection of section 2 relates to any woman who is judicially or otherwise separate, and living separate and apart from her husband. That makes the bill very broad indeed.

Mr. WARD: I had intended moving that those words "or otherwise" be deleted.

Mr. BOTHWELL: Even with that change there is still possibly an objection to that clause. Where a judicial separation has been granted, the parties have chosen the remedy which they desire. They make application to the courts for a judicial separation and when that is granted—or if you go further in the paragraph and take the case of those who have entered into a separation agreement, which would be included within that section as I read it—the parties have agreed between themselves upon the nature of the remedy. So far as I can see, that first paragraph goes too far; I should like to see it eliminated altogether. As to the second section of it, regarding the case of desertion, I believe there is much merit in the language of the bill in this respect.

The Minister of Justice says that as he understands the situation in the courts the judges are always very careful to bring out all the facts regarding any offence by reason of which divorce is sought and that if possible, presuming the facts warrant it, they will endeavour to find that the matrimonial domicile is the domicile of the parties for the purposes of divorce. I want to give just one illustration of what might happen even if the judges were favourable to accepting the matrimonial domicile. A short time ago my attention was drawn to the case of a couple who were married in Ontario twenty years ago. At the time they were married they intended going to the west; immediately after the wedding they did go west, where they homesteaded and preempted land. Their family of four were born and raised on that farm. Through some misfortune the husband lost part of his land and subsequently rented land and continued farming for a few more years. One fall he thought he would come back to Ontario to work in the bush during the winter months, which he did, leaving his wife and four children on the farm of a neighbour, where his wife kept house and the children were cared for by the neighbour. The husband did not return in the spring, although during the winter he sent her a very little money from time to time. Later on she found he was living in Ontario with another woman, and the evidence disclosed that children were born to that second union in Ontario. Notwithstanding the fact that

these people married with the intention of going west, and in fact did go west where they took up land and brought up their family, that woman's domicile was in Ontario. The husband deserted her; she was left with these four children to support, and in order to get a divorce it would be necessary for her to come to Ontario and follow the husband in that domicile. Ontario is not so very far away, but supposing her husband had gone to Florida or some place in South America. The situation would be exactly the same; she would have to follow him and would have no right to take action in the west or in Ontario after he left Canada. It is to provide for cases of that kind that the sponsor of this bill has been endeavouring to secure legislation which will do justice to all, and in a case such as I have mentioned I see no danger in changing the law in order to permit a woman to acquire a domicile. In that particular case there would be no more danger than in allowing her to acquire a domicile under a judicial separation or under a separation agreement, which is not legal now. With the elimination of that first subsection I think the bill should go through in order to do justice to people who are placed in the position I have mentioned.

Mr. RYCKMAN: As the bill is drafted I find myself altogether in support of the position taken by the Minister of Justice; I believe some of us do not know just to what extent this legislation may go. The Minister of Justice instanced a case involving the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and then he went on to state a case which I believe to be equally appropriate. He pointed cut that if this legislation were adopted by this house a married woman could go to Nevada, take up her residence and obtain a divorce upon grounds which are not recognized in any part of Canada; then she could say that she was entitled to choose her domicile and entitled to a divorce on the basis of that domicile under a statute of the Dominion of Canada. A woman could go to Peru or Chile, she could go to Paris, as has been done quite often recently. As this bill is drawn now it does not limit the woman's domicile to Canada and does not provide that she may acquire a domicile for herself within Canada; it allows her to acquire a domicile in any part of the wide world. Those who support this bill should at least provide that after the first line of section 2 should be added the words "living within Canada" and that the words "within Canada" should be added after the word "herself." That would make the bill read as follows:

[Mr. Bothwell.]

> For the purposes of this act a married woman living within Canada . . . . may acquire a domicile for herself within Canada. . . .

I have no sympathy with the man who disregards the obligations he took upon himself in contracting marriage, obligations which I am glad to say most Canadians are proud to observe; I do not believe he should be allowed to treat his wife inhumanly, contrary to the law, and then move away and so prevent an action being brought against him. I am in favour of divorce on the statutory ground; when that ground exists I believe divorce is a duty. I know there are others who take a different view, but I do not think divorce should be granted on other than the recognized statutory grounds which obtain in this country at present, so I am not prepared to support anything which will permit a woman to go away and obtain a divorce on other grounds. I believe these people should remain within Canada and have their cases disposed of by a competent court or by the senate.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): It seems to me that a great many of the objections which have been raised to this bill are made on the presumption that the sponsor of the bill intends to try to put it through the house in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN: Nine o'clock.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mail service, including mail service by air. $16,305,000.

Mr. BRADY: As this estimate greatly concerns the constituency which I represent as well as the larger part of northern and central British Columbia, even at the cost of detaining the committee for a short time I feel that the matter is of sufficient importance to justify my speaking on it in the hope of enlisting the sympathy of the Postmaster General and also in order to bring before this house the importance of a good mail service in the isolated parts of Canada. As we all know, efficient mail and telephone service is very important to the settled parts of our country, but it is particularly important to the sparsely settled portions of this Dominion. I do not believe there are two other factors which tend so much to solidify the rural population and to give courage and confidence to the people who are filling up the big spaces which need

population as good mail and telephone services. The greatest handicap that people in the rural districts have to overcome to-day is the lack of an efficient mail and telephone service. As the Postmaster General knows, various requests have been sent to his department, not merely by representatives but by every board of trade sitting individually as a board and by the associated boards of trade from Prince George on the east to Vancouver on the west, a distance of over five hundred miles. After looking through the estimates it seems to me that those that have get more and those that have not get nothing. I notice that in the big centres, where there is undoubtedly and necessarily a good service, there is a duplication with an air mail service, but in the places where the greatest need exists we find very often that only a partial or an irregular and uncertain service exists.

I do not intend to offer any criticism which might be considered as adverse to the Postmaster General's department, but I desire to show a picture of the actual conditions which prevail throughout the northern and central parts of British Columbia. There are four methods of handling mail in Canada. The first and latest is the air mail service. I am sure that every member of the house who has listened to the story of the development of the air mail service in Canada during the last few years must look forward with great optimism to the future of this service. The report of the Deputy Postmaster General shows that there is air mail service now to the Magdalen islands and to the island of Anticosti. These places have had a very infrequent mail service in the past but they are now being brought in touch with the outside world. I regretted very much to hear the Postmaster General say that he did not intend to inaugurate any air mail service this year in British Columbia. I regretted that still more when I read the following words in the report of the Deputy Postmaster General with respect to the air mail service to the Magdalen islands and Anticosti:

> Both from a mail service and a humanitarian point of view, the successful operation of such a service it was thought would do much to ameliorate the conditions under which these islanders existed during the winter months.

This service was inaugurated not merely to give them mail communication but also from a humanitarian point of view. I wonder if the Postmaster General's humanitarian point of view could extend at this moment across the prairie provinces, through the rockies and dip over into British Columbia?

Mr. LAPOINTE: To Prince Rupert?

Mr. BRADY: The hon. Minister of Justice is quite right, yes, and I will refer to that in a moment. I intend to give the house two or three striking instances by mentioning some districts which have practically no mail service. When I asked a question this afternoon as to the sources of information which the Postmaster General had as to the need for rural mail services, I was pleased indeed to find out how the Postmaster General was notified of the districts where mail service was required. I spent the four and one-half months between the closing of the house last year and the month of November in travelling through my constituency but even though I spent that length of time in practically continuous travelling I was not able to complete the circuit of three-fourths of the country. When I went up the Naas river I found a large settlement of people there and they complained that the mail service had been so infrequent that parcels mailed before Christmas had not reached them until the month of April. I do not directly blame the Postmaster General for that but I do say that as long as the district postal supervisor is living in Vancouver and is not in touch with the conditions which prevail in the northern part of the country, it is hopeless for me to come here and try to give an accurate description of the conditions which prevail there. When I went to Mill Bay to start up the Naas valley, I hoped to be able to get the little mail boat going from Mill Bay to Aiyansh. If that little boat, which was supposed to take the mail up the river fifty-two miles—and it was a mail day when I reached there—had been in operation and at my disposal, I could have gone up that river for $7.50. The boat was lying at the wharf, but the man who was taking the mail was drunk.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. BRADY: He was not a white man; he was an Indian. I went up that river, but in order to do so I had to pay $60 out of my own pocket. No hon. member here representing a city like Ottawa, or Montreal, or Toronto, or Vancouver, can realize what it means for a member of parliament to have to travel over practically half an empire in extent and under very difficult conditions in order to come into contact with the people who are working against difficulties. Ontario and Quebec for hundreds of years back were known as Canada; indeed, it is not many years ago when the word "Canada" meant Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces. In British Columbia we find a young country and we shall find one day that Canada will be proud of the great wealth of that province

and particularly the northern part of it. I believe nothing can stop the development of British Columbia, but to-day what we need to give the people there is good mail service and telephone communication wherever we can possibly do so.

I have on my desk resolutions from the associated boards of trade of British Columbia assembled. They travelled hundreds of miles in order to formulate these resolutions for presentation to the department. I will not read them because I think the Postmaster General knows what they are. What are they asking? They ask, first; that better mail service be inaugurated in the rural districts, and, second, that Prince Rupert east to Edmonton be given a daily mail service.

What has been done by the Post Office Department this year? I find that a daily mail service has been introduced between Quebec city and Cochrane, and the explanation is that on account of the great lumber and mineral resources through which that line passed, it was necessary to put on a daily mail service. There is also a daily mail service into Rouyn. I do not object to these; I think they are essential; but let me direct the attention of the Postmaster General to this: if a daily mail service is essential between Cochrane and Quebec, and into the mineral fields of Rouyn, it is equally important that a daily mail service be inaugurated between Edmonton and the port of Prince Rupert. From Prince George to Prince Rupert the Canadian National travels through, I think, one of the largest mineral, lumbering and agricultural areas in northern British Columbia. Rather than trouble the house with a lengthy description of that section of the country, I will simply read the resolution of the associated boards of trade. This was the result of a long study and visits along the Canadian National line from Prince George west to Prince Rupert. This resolution, which was sent to the Postmaster General and also to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm), reads:

> I beg to inform you the following resolution was duly passed at the last regular meeting of this board of trade:
>
> "Whereas, owing to the inadequacy of the present mail service between Prince Rupert and Edmonton, great inconvenience is caused to merchants, farmers and those engaged in mining and other industries;
>
> and whereas, this inadequate mail service is the cause of serious loss of business and time to all those enumerated above;
>
> and whereas, recent inquiry by a special committee of the Prince Rupert Board of Trade into the whole situation revealed the inadequacy of the present mail service west to and east from Prince Rupert;
>
> and whereas the Prince Rupert Board of Trade has been petitioned by the various boards of trade in northern British Columbia to lend their full support to their demand for a daily mail service;
>
> and whereas the Prince Rupert Board of Trade fully realize that the development and best interests of this district urgently demand a daily mail service to and from Prince Rupert east;
>
> Therefore, be it resolved, that the Prince Rupert Board of Trade urge that the Hon. P. J. Veniot, Postmaster General, take immediate action whereby a daily mail service will be established between Prince Rupert and Edmonton."
>
> As this is a matter of the most vital importance to the welfare of Prince Rupert and the country lying to the east of it, we sincerely trust that you will give the matter your very earnest and immediate consideration, in order that the daily service might be inaugurated upon the resumption of the daily passenger train service.

Mr. VENIOT: What is the date of that?

Mr. BRADY: January 15, 1929. The last time that we took this matter up with the Deputy Postmaster General and we asked that he should, at least on alternate days, put on a baggage service, the reply, after some weeks, was that the cost would be prohibitive. I went to some trouble in order to find out what it would cost to put on a baggage car service three days a week during the summer schedule, and I believe the cost would be nothing like what the deputy minister said it would be. Furthermore, I think there is a daily mail service from Vancouver down through the Okanagan to Calgary. If any part of British Columbia deserves consideration in the matter of a daily mail service it is the port of Prince Rupert, and the country lying contiguous to it east to Prince George. Why the department has refused to grant that legitimate demand is beyond me. I feel assured that if the Postmaster General realized the great need of this country for a daily mail service he would not fail to see that it was inaugurated this very year. A great number of the people in the east are ignorant of the west. Very few people that I meet, I am referring particularly to people in the eastern provinces, are aware of the great future and of the splendid strategic position which the port of Prince Rupert occupies on the Pacific coast. I am not speaking to-night in a way that can be construed as having the slightest political tinge, but I do want to bring home to the Postmaster General and his department the fact that outside of Canada the port of Prince Rupert has received very high recognition indeed. Just as in the east we find in Montreal the great powerful and central lever which dictates and guides to a great extent the movement of commerce, so in the west I

say, even though there may be Vancouver members present here, that Prince Rupert on the Pacific coast has not had a square deal. An elevator was built there, and left lying idle. Vancouver got over eighty million bushels of wheat, and the wheat is going there still, while Prince Rupert got only two million bushels, and then the elevator was closed down.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Who was to blame for that?

Mr. BRADY: Never mind about the blame just now.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Who can remedy it?

Mr. BRADY: That situation can be remedied easily, and I may have a few words to say on this subject when the elevator items are up for discussion. I was saying that Prince Rupert is recognized by outsiders as occupying a strategic position on the Pacific coast as a base for an aeroplane service. In that connection I would like to quote just a few words from Captain McCarthy, the cousin of Captain Kingsford Smith, of the Southern Cross, the famous hero whose deeds in the air have won for him immortal fame. Captain McCarthy, representing the International Airways Company of Seattle, in his biplane made a survey flight from Seattle to Alaska prior to an ambitious air service being inaugurated between Seattle and Alaska. He landed in Prince Rupert on March 18th of this year on his way to Nome, and it is very interesting to note what he had to say of the port of Prince Rupert. Here are his exact words:

> In any event air service between Seattle and Alaska or to the Orient, Prince Rupert will through its location have to be a base of call or departure. This port is in a strategic position and will eventually have to be equipped with a radio beacon and other aids to aerial navigation.

He went on to say that Prince Rupert today was fully ripe for an air mail service between Prince Rupert, Telegraph Creek, Atlin, Dawson and Mayo, and every bit of that line would be within Canada. I do not expect after what the Postmaster General has said that we can have that air mail service inaugurated at this time, but the hour will come, and come soon, when such a service must be established. What I am asking the Postmaster General to do is to have a survey made of the conditions that prevail in the great constituency of Skeena, and find out the actual needs for rural mail delivery. I noticed in looking over the returns that have been laid before the house of applications for rural mail routes, that there has been no demand from the constituency of Skeena. The Postmaster General admits that that is correct? Very good. I went through the whole Skeena country last year, travelling through it for four and a half months, and I want to assure the Postmaster General that the time is ripe in all sections of the Ominica and Skeena country for the inauguration of rural mail delivery. Here is what I saw. I saw farmers come in to Smithers, a distance of sixteen miles—sixteen miles, mark you—to get their mail at the Smithers post office, and when they reached there, owing to some difficulties with which they met on the way, the post office was closed. They had to wait over the whole of that night or else go home without their mail till the following morning when the post office opened. I am not going to blame the Postmaster General for that because it is quite evident from this report that has been tabled that no recommendations have been made to him for the establishment of rural mail delivery in that country. At Telegraph Creek to-day the mail service is very inadequate. It is very difficult to get a decent mail service in winter. The mail is brought in by dog sled, and from October until June, the people are supposed to get ten deliveries and the maximum that the dogs can haul is 125 pounds weight. What happens very often is that the people do not get anything like that number of deliveries, and what I want to drive home to the Postmaster General to-night is that the time has come when these needs for rural mail delivery in very difficult country must be met in some way. We should at least do for these people what has been done so well for the inhabitants of Anticosti and the Magdalen Islands. To my mind it is much better to be able to guarantee seven deliveries of mail to these people living in these outlying places, seven mails that they are sure of getting, than offering them fifteen deliveries and actually giving them only two or three. The people in the rural districts of Ontario know nothing of the difficulties that beset the people in northern British Columbia. It would be impossible for them to know what the conditions there are like. It is a young country among the mining camps, the great lumbering camps and fishing places, and the big need of these people is a mail service. I ask the government and the department of the Postmaster General to attack honestly and courageously that problem of giving an efficient mail service wherever the needs of the people demand it. I do not agree with

those who say that the Post Office department should always show a credit balance. Of all the departments of government the Post Office department most intimately affects the well-being and happiness of the people by providing a proper mail service. Whenever we are considering the installation of a mail service we should not say: that is going to cost too much. I think the federal government should follow where the provincial government leads, where the latter constructs roads, opens up land and brings in the people. In such cases I contend that the federal government should follow close behind the provincial government in the matters of mail service and telephone communication.

As regards the geography of Ontario and Quebec, and the maritime provinces, I would not take second place to any man in knowledge of the climate, the conditions, the people, and the resources of those provinces. I should like the same thing to be said regarding the country whence I come. Sir, to reach the Naas valley I had to navigate a river where you took your life in your hands. That river is the only way in and the only way out. Now, sometimes in this house we have a rather poor sense of humour. I used to be very humorous but I have lost all sense of humour since I entered this house. When I am outside in the broad fields, where I can talk to men who are willing to understand, I have no difficulty in telling them a good story; but in the House of Commons it seems to be really futile, and for this reason—oh, I sense it from the psychological standpoint—I know that anything I say by way of pleading is given by hon. members opposite, the political tinge. That is the sad part about our proceedings here. Now, I do not think that of all hon. gentlemen across the way, but I believe there is in this house to-day a spirit broad enough to interpret the wishes of the people. Up in that valley a mother broke her leg in the fields where she was working. The only one who could succour her was her husband. He set her leg. There was no medical aid. She had to endure the agony. Now, I wonder how many hon. members here could do that? What I want to drive home is this: It is all very well for us to be sitting in comfort here; we do not realize what pain is.

An hon. MEMBER: We only think we are sitting in comfort. We are not so comfortable.

Mr. BRADY: Oh yes, you are. For two months or more this woman suffered intense pain, for it was impossible to give her medical attention; the nearest doctor would be a little over 150 miles away. She would have had to go down to Prince Rupert, and in her condition the journey was out of the question.

[Mr. Brady.]

Mr. HEPBURN: You do not blame that on the Postmaster General do you?

Mr. BRADY: No, I am not referring to the Postmaster General. I am just giving the conditions that prevail, to show the necessity of a sympathetic understanding on the part of the government. To the people in these isolated places the government should give a mail service—not a daily service, they do not ask for it, but a good weekly service. I do think that the two most important requirements in western Canada to-day are proper mail service and proper telephone communication.

Now, sir, I am going to ask the Postmaster General one or two questions before taking my seat. First, is there any chance that the wishes of all the people at Skeena as well as of the Cariboo, in which district Prince George is situated, will be met, and that a daily mail service will be inaugurated between Edmonton and Prince Rupert?

Mr VENIOT: The only answer I can give the hon. gentleman now is that this is the first time the case has been placed before me so clearly, and I will certainly go into it in a serious way.

Mr. BRADY: Thank you, sir. Would the Postmaster General give me the cost of the baggage mail service between Quebec and Cochrane that was introduced last year?

Mr. VENIOT: I could not tell the hon. member offhand, but I could give him the rates we have to pay.

Mr. BRADY: Has not the deputy minister the information?

Mr. VENIOT: Perhaps he has the details. We have to pay for baggage car service the following rates: three-feet unit space, four cents per mile; seven-feet unit space, 6.5 cents per mile; fifteen-feet unit space, thirteen cents per mile; thirty-feet unit space, twenty cents per mile. Those rates are regulated by the railway commission.

Mr. BRADY: I have some figures on the subject. I found that we could get a baggage car service three times a week during the summer months at the following rate: seven-feet space from Edmonton to Prince George, serving points en route, would cost $45.50 a trip; a fifty-feet space from Prince George to Prince Rupert, $18 a trip. Multiplying the whole thing it would give us a summer schedule of twenty weeks for about $6,109.

Mr. VENIOT: I will go into the matter. I should not like to take the hon. gentleman's figures.

Mr. BRADY: I would not expect the minister to do that. I mentioned them just to give him an idea.

Mr. VENIOT: I shall go into it.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): The hon. gentleman's time is up.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Chairman, there are two or three small items I should like to clear up.

Some hon MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I am serious about it—if you do not get too gay.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): Order.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): At six o'clock the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg, who is not here now, asked for certain information in connection with the tenders for air mail services. On his behalf I want to request that the Postmaster General lay on the table a list of the parties who were asked to tender for these various services, the amounts of their tenders, the names of the successful tenderers, and copies of the contracts. I do not expect that this information can be given to-day, but perhaps it can be brought down soon.

Mr. VENIOT: It will take at least three or four days to get that information together, but we will get it.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): With reference to the Mackenzie river mail service, what was the volume of mail carried over that route?

Mr. VENIOT: I do not know whether I can give that information.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It could be obtained?

Mr. VENIOT: I have not the information; I did not expect it would be asked for, but I will get it. I think we can get the poundage. One thing I do know is that considerable mail gathers there, and I know we had to make several trips with 750 to 1,000 pounds of accumulated mail. That gives some idea of what was carried, but we will get that information.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): That will be satisfactory later on. When did that service up the Mackenzie river begin?

Mr. VENIOT: During the winter; I think it was around January or December.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Is it still being carried on?

Mr. VENIOT: No, I think it has been discontinued now; it was only a trial.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Who had the contract for it?

Mr. VENIOT: I gave the name this afternoon; I think it was Western Canada Airways.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Does the Department of National Defence provide airplanes in connection with these mails?

Mr. VENIOT: No. The Department of National Defence did provide some of their planes in emergencies for eastern services this winter, but only for a short time.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): There is one other matter to which the Postmaster General referred upon the request of my leader, who is not here to-night. He requested some information in connection with the complaint of the Commercial Airways Limited and the Great West Airways Limited, that when tenders were asked for the transportation of mail between Winnipeg and Calgary these companies were given no opportunity to submit tenders. The Postmaster General promised he would look into the matter and give the information.

Mr. VENIOT: I did give some information and I said I thought Captain McCall was on the way; he had been wired to and had replied he was coming to town to discuss matters with us. He has been here with Mr. Sick and has been in conference with myself for a short time and with the superintendent of air mail services for a considerable time. He was given further specifications required for such services and has left his memo. I did not have an opportunity of discussing it further with him and I understand that both Captain McCall and Mr. Sick have gone home.

Mr. KENNEDY: Give us the figures showing the amounts paid the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway for the carriage of mails.

Mr. VENIOT: The Canadian National Railways received $3,133,767.67; the Canadian Pacific Railway, $3,822,983.94, and other railway lines $481,140.52, making a total of $7,437,892.13 for rail service for mail.

Mr. KENNEDY: Is there not a discrepancy between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railway figures when one considers the mileage of the two systems?

Mr. VENIOT: What was that?

Mr. KENNEDY: If I have the figures correctly the Canadian Pacific Railway, with 16,000 miles, gets about $3,800,000, while the Canadian National Railway, with about 20,000 miles, gets about $3,100,000.

Mr. VENIOT: $3,133,767.67.

Mr. KENNEDY: What is the reason for that discrepancy?

Mr. VENIOT: The only reason I can see for it is that the Canadian National Railways do not give the same mail accommodation.

Mr. KENNEDY: And is it not clear that the Canadian Pacific Railway territory has more frequent mail service?

Mr. VENIOT: No, I do not think so.

Mr. KENNEDY: That is one of the cases of which we had an illustration to-night in connection with this service between Edmonton and Prince Rupert, as against the service further south on the Canadian Pacific Railway line west of Calgary.

Mr. VENIOT: They may have more frequent train connections between those places than on the Canadian National between certain other places; I do not know.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is preference shown to railway mail clerks in the appointment of district superintendents?

Mr. VENIOT: There is no preference shown.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is it not a fact that more railway mail clerks than others are selected as district superintendents?

Mr. VENIOT: I would not say that. Whenever there is a vacancy it is advertised and railway mail clerks as well as other permanent employees have a right to contest for the vacancy. Their applications are received, and they go before the rating board, which judges as to their ability, capacity and seniority. They are given examinations each year during a period of years; the results of those examinations are placed before the Civil Service Commission, and their rating decides who gets the position. There is no other preference at all.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Who compose the rating board?

Mr. VENIOT: The district superintendent is a member of the rating board, and in other cases we take members of the board from the head office of the department.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It may be that the district superintendent, in most cases being a former railway mail clerk, does show a preference in the rating.

Mr. VENIOT: I would not want to say that; it would be expressing want of faith in the honesty of the officials.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): But there is criticism among inside men that they are not getting a show in the matter of these positions.

Mr. VENIOT: I have heard the criticism and I have had one or two cases pointed out to me, but I found no ground for such criticism.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It does seem that a post office clerk would have more experience than a railway mail clerk for such a position.

Mr. VENIOT: Not always.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I would like to ask what is included in the item of $150,000 for the Yukon Territory. What service does the government get for that amount?

Mr. VENIOT: There is no increase over last year; that amount covers mail service in the Yukon Territory and the salaries of postmasters and staffs of Dawson and White Horse, also telephones, rentals, telegrams and so on. The staff of the Dawson post office consists of one postmaster with a salary of $5,000, plus $900 rent allowance, and three postal clerks. The staff at White Horse consists of one postmaster with a salary of $3,120 and two postal clerks, one of whom is temporary. The salary range for postal clerks at Dawson is from $2,520 to $2,640. Owing to the unusual conditions existing in the Yukon Territory salary ranges are higher than those in other parts of Canada, and that salary range is approved by the Civil Service Commission. The balance of that amount provides for the transportation of mails.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Does that include the amount paid the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian National Railways for hauling mail up the west coast of British Columbia and Alaska and into the Yukon. They carry the Canadian mails north as well as the Alaskan mail, a large quantity of which goes north through Yukon.

Mr. VENIOT: I will secure that information for my hon. friend.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Under this item I would like to direct the attention of the Postmaster General to a matter of local service within my own district, at a point

with which I am very familiar. As some of the members of this committee may know, the little city of Red Deer lies midway between Calgary and Edmonton on the C. & E. branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and acts as a distribution centre for the settlements in that locality. The service on the Canadian Pacific Railway is excellent; and I have no complaint to make upon that point. Their service with regard to passengers, freight and mail is as good as it possibly could be, but Red Deer is also situated on the Brazeau branch of the Canadian National Railways, the branch running out to Brazeau and terminating at Nordegg. On the west side of Red Deer and on that branch of the Canadian National there are a number of small towns and villages, situated between Red Deer and Nordegg. These villages are provided with a baggage car service from Red Deer west. The small villages east of Red Deer are without that service at the present time; the two villages are Joffre and Haynes. Baggage car service is carried on between Red Deer and Nordegg and that provides for the small towns west of Red Deer, but the towns east of Red Deer situated on the Canadian National Railways are served by rural mail routes running from points on the Canadian Pacific Railway and providing the farmers and the residents of these small towns with mail service. The service is bi-weekly, and it has been felt for some time by the business men and residents of that locality that the service is hardly sufficient to meet the needs of that productive, well settled territory.

I stated that Red Deer formed a distributing point for most of these small villages, and as a matter of fact these places east of Red Deer on the Canadian National railway get most of their supplies from Red Deer. They have found it extremely difficult to carry on business and are greatly handicapped by the fact that any business correspondence coming to them from Red Deer or other points must travel north to Lacombe by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in one case must be transferred to the Stettler line, and from a point on that line the mail is hauled to the villages. The result is that while they can order their goods from Red Deer easily enough the business correspondence in connection with these supplies arrives two and sometimes four days later than the supplies themselves. That situation affects not only the business men in these places where a good deal of business is done, but also a large number of farmers and settlers who are not upon the present routes, but who get their mail at the post offices in these villages.

Mr. VENIOT: They are back from the railway?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Yes. These people request that a baggage car service be given them on the same terms as it is now given to the towns lying west from Red Deer. The Postmaster General is somewhat familiar with the situation, although I do not expect him to carry all the details in his head. However, he has had some correspondence with me in this regard and apparently the difficulty is the additional cost involved, because it is fairly well understood that it would be impossible to discontinue the rural mail routes in favour of the baggage car service. Once you have the rural mail route established it is a difficult thing to take away that service, to which the farmers have become accustomed. So I am not suggesting that that be done, but I do suggest that it would be worth while to give the additional service by rail. I have here an estimate as to the additional cost, provided by the Post Office department. As a result of the proposed change the estimated additional cost would be something like $725 a year, which is considerably more than the revenue derived from these two points at present. However, there is a fact which never had been considered by the department, namely, that we will not get revenue until service is provided, and it is impossible to compute the loss involved or the revenue involved unless the additional business that will be done through the establishment of better service at these points is considered. I have asked the Postmaster General to give this service; I have gone into the matter carefully and my estimate is that the additional revenue which will be produced through the sale of stamps, money orders and so on, which cannot now be carried on at these two points, will go a long way towards meeting that suggested deficit. I am not asking the Postmaster General to give me an immediate promise in this connection; I do not think that would be fair to him, because he should have an opportunity of again considering the matter before making any definite announcement. However, I do ask that he again consider establishing this service, taking into account the fact that the districts are old and well settled, and already provide quite a good deal of business and quite a heavy freight tonnage.

Mr. VENIOT: I will go into the matter fully.

Mr. BELL (St. John): I would like to ask the Postmaster General to give me some particulars in connection with the St. John post office. In the list of post offices I notice there is a decrease in the estimate for St. John amounting to $11,640. I would like to ask the Postmaster General why this estimate has been reduced.

Mr. VENIOT: The decrease of $11,640 is made up as follows:

Difference between salaries of employees promoted or who have left the service and the salaries of persons appointed or promoted to replace them.		$ 4,200
Eight positions not required.. .		11,400
		$15,600
Less:		
Twenty-nine statutory increases of $120 each..	$3,480	
Eight statutory increases of $60 each..	480	3,960
		$11,640

The following are the positions which have been vacant for some time and are no longer required:

One senior postal clerk..	$ 1,980
Seven postal clerks:	
One at $1,740	
Four at $1,320	
Two at $1,200	9,420
	$11,400

Mr. BELL (St. John): If there is a reduction in the staff is it on account of decreased business?

Mr. VENIOT: No, reorganization and superannuation; new persons coming in from lower positions and receiving the minimum salary. There has been no great decrease in staff.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Would the Postmaster General be good enough to inform the house if the total vote of $150,000 for the Yukon territory is required for mail service?

Mr. VENIOT: Just a portion of that vote is required for mail service. The main service in the Yukon is the winter service from White Horse to Dawson which is arranged for by the tender and contract system. The summer service is a monopoly, the British Yukon Navigation Company being the only company operating boats. The other services are quite small and are arranged for from year to year.

[Mr. Speakman.]

I know of no transportation costs which are paid to the Canadian National or to the Canadian Pacific Railway in connection with that service.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I notice that the Postmaster General is now calling for tenders for the winter mail contract, the present contract expiring at the beginning of navigation this year. It is rather disappointing to see that a better service is not being contemplated. I think we should get a better service for the money which is paid, a rather generous amount for this winter mail service. The route covers about four hundred miles, with a branch line of eighty miles, and the contract provides for a weekly delivery of mail each way between railhead at White Horse and Dawson, the northern extremity of the route. During the broken period between the closing of navigation and the opening up of winter travel the contractor is only required to haul 1,200 pounds per week. During the winter period he is obliged to haul 2,500 pounds per week and under the regulations the contractor is obliged to haul merchandise paying first class mail rates in preference to newspapers and reading matter. The consequence is that the mails are cluttered up with tons of merchandise and the newspapers and periodicals are left at railhead and accumulate there all winter until there is almost a boatload of them in the spring, when they are not worth moving. I think that should be remedied by allowing merchandise to go forward to railhead at parcel post rates and it could be hauled into the interior at freight rates that would cost the consignees less than the present rates and would not congest the mails. I think the contract for the future should require that more tonnage be hauled per week.

Mr. VENIOT: I am glad the hon. member has drawn my attention to that; I will go into the matter immediately.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I believe you should ask for more than 2,500 pounds per week. I notice that the specifications permit the contractor to haul the mail by aeroplane. The present contractors have been enterprising enough to install an aeroplane service and they are hauling the mail by that means without any extra cost to the government. I do not think that has occurred anywhere else in Canada.

Mr. VENIOT: They asked for that permission some four months ago and we granted it to them, saying that it did not make any difference to us how they got the mail in.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I believe the Postmaster General could get that extra tonnage hauled at the same contract price, as there will probably be a number of bidders for the contract. The present specifications cover only the same tonnage as the old contract, that is, the 1,200 pounds during the broken period and 2,500 pounds during the winter period. That is not enough.

Mr. VENIOT: I thank the hon. gentleman for calling that to my attention.

Mr. SPOTTON: I intend to take up only a few moments of the time of the house, but I have been asked by friends or by people who were friends of the government for particulars regarding the Walton post office. I gave the Postmaster General notice that I would be asking for these particulars, and I desire to know why a returned soldier was passed over and the post office given to a civilian who had just moved into the riding a few months before and had purchased a store there. This is not a case where the Postmaster General disapproved of the action of the Civil Service Commission—I am not laying that charge at all—but if the Postmaster General's sympathy is as great as he says it is for the returned soldier, this is a case which he might have held up until he went into the matter. Let me quote—I will be very brief—from a letter of the district superintendent dated November 23, 1928, as follows:

> The applicants given in order of merit from a postal service standpoint, irrespective of military or residential qualifications, are as follows:
>
> William Clarence Bennett
> John McLeod
> Richard Wright Hoy
> Carl William Oakley

John McLeod had just moved into the riding and purchased a store there. He seemed to have the good offices of the member for North Perth (Mr. Hay) and consequently received the appointment. It may be said that Mr. Bennett was not residing within the village, but I find a letter on the file from W. J. May, the district superintendent, dated December 1, as follows:

> Having reference to his report of the 23rd ultimo, on the applicants for the position of postmaster at the above mentioned office, the district superintendent now begs to advise that he has been informed by Mr. W. C. Bennett one of the applicants for the position that he has now purchased the Cooperative store in Walton in which the Walton post office would be conducted were he to receive the appointment. In this event Mr. Bennett should now be placed in class B.

I may say that while the post office is in South Huron, it is just on the boundary line. In the riding of South Huron there is just this store in which the post office has been located for many years, and three or four houses. The village consisting of a few hundred people is entirely in my constituency of North Huron as is all the rest of the business section, and the United Farmers' co-operative store would be very central. I am making no attack on the Postmaster General; I have no knowledge that he has in any way interfered with the Civil Service Commission, but this seems to be a case where for some reason or another a returned soldier was passed over who, ninety-nine per cent of the people of the district believe, should not have been passed over. If he was not a resident there for the full length of time, he was a resident there on December 1 and had a store and this matter could very well have been left in abeyance for a while until he had the necessary length of residence. I have been asked to bring this matter to the attention of the Postmaster General. I am making no attack upon his administration in the matter, but it seems to be a case where the Civil Service Commission has passed over a returned soldier and where the Postmaster General might very well have used his influence.

I should be glad if at some time the Postmaster General would give the house a concise statement of what the air mail service has cost the Dominion of Canada to the present date, and what revenue we are deriving from it. This matter of "keeping up with the Joneses" and trying to have an air mail service equal to that of a country with a population of 120,000,000, is very fine, but I have to struggle to get mail boxes for a few farmers and I cannot get them on account of the cost, while at the same time we are placing an item of $800,000 additional in the estimates for a play-toy running between Toronto and Montreal which the Postmaster General says very few appreciate and very few are patronizing. I would plead with the Postmaster General to get away from the big interests and the moneyed classes and get his ear to the ground. Let him listen to the hon. member for Skeena and other members and grant some of the requests of those who are rolling back the map of this Dominion. Let him listen to those in the far-flung parts of Canada and to bona fide farmers who have to go a mile or a mile and a tenth for their mail. Let him get down and serve the masses before he spends millions more each year in the interests of the classes, and in trying to "keep up with the Joneses" with this play-toy, the air-mail service. As regards the air mail service between Montreal and Toronto, I really think it is a joke where there are

three fast trains a day each way with an excellent mail service. Canada has prospered wonderfully under the old system and I am sure, if the question is one of an order coming in, it does not take long when you have three fast trains a day, and if it is a dunner that is coming in, the slower it is the better.

I would ask the Postmaster General, since I have brought the matter to his deputy's attention, to give me some little explanation for our people in the village of Walton, if he has it at hand.

Mr. VENIOT: I have no explanation at all to give if the Civil Service Commission—

Mr. SPOTTON: Some future time will be all right.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous, including Lucien Pacaud, secretary of the High Commissioner's office, as the representative of the Canadian government on the Pacific Cable Board, at $1,500; and $5,000 for the payment of compassionate allowances to employees injured while in the performance of their duties, or to dependents of employees killed while on duty, such payments to be made only on the specific authority of the governor in council, $1,176,175.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: This afternoon my colleague from North Winnipeg introduced the question of the beam system and we were interrupted by some other matters relative to local post offices. Since the Minister of Justice has intimated that a bill will be introduced giving confirmation to the action of the government along this line, I do not want to spend any length of time in discussing this question to-night, but I should like to call attention to some of the outstanding facts in the case. I note, according to a resumé which I find in the New Leader of November 23, 1928, that the beam system was in reality owned and operated by the post office in Great Britain. The beam system, as I understand it, is a very great advantage over the ordinary cable means of transmission. It possesses both secrecy and economy and it is hoped that with these advantages it will mark a great advance in communication. The beam system was instituted as a state service by the Labour government and it compelled the cable companies to reduce their rates by an average of fourpence a word. Then the various cable companies began to protest that their business was being undermined and the Daily Mail, for example, stated:

The fall in the revenue of the cable companies due to the growing use of wireless telegraphy—more particularly the government-controlled wireless beam service linking Great Britain with the dominions—is reaching a crisis.

There followed a great financial merger, together with a threat to the government that unless it agreed to surrender the beam service to the companies, they would cease operations and let their cables go derelict. To quote:

The government promptly surrendered. Up soared the market. Marconi shares, which had fallen as low as 13 shillings, rose to 71 shillings. "Buy Marconis" was the tip. "The government is going to sell out, competition will be squashed, and we have a world to conquer".

There was in connection with that transaction a very considerable scandal: in fact, there was in certain quarters more criticism of the Postmaster General in Great Britain and of the Post Office Department generally than there has been of the Canadian Postmaster General in the last few days.

Mr. VENIOT: I am glad to hear that somebody else is getting it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: For example, it is stated in connection with these cable companies:

The undertaking was burdened with £59,000 for directors' fees, plus £8,000 for their expenses, while Mr. F. G. Kellaway, Postmaster General in the coalition government, was receiving a salary of £10,000 a year as managing director. Senator Marconi received from the funds of the company £8,000 a year for his yacht.

And so on. As I say, there was a decided ground for criticism in connection with the matter. I cannot do better than to quote a very brief summary of the situation as contained in an article by Walter J. Baker, M.P. A great deal of this material is contained in the English Hansard, and in fact a certain amount of it is referred to in the correspondence which has recently been laid on the table, but which I have not had the time to read carefully. Mr. Baker states:

When it was decided in 1924, to utilize the newly perfected beam system, four government stations were established for communication with Canada, South Africa, India and Australia. All of them were under post office control.

Again:

On December 19, 1927, the Postmaster General announced that an imperial conference had been called to consider the position created by the successful government competition.

To prepare the way for this conference and to meet the new situation, the Eastern and Associated Cable companies and the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company agreed to form a merger. But they made it a condition that the government should transfer the beam installation to them!

The upshot was that the imperial conference recommended that the Pacific cables, the West Indian cable and wireless system and the

Imperial Atlantic cables be sold, and the post office beam services should be leased to private cable and wireless interests for twenty-five years.

Here we have a curious situation. The beam system operating under the post office, publicly owned and controlled, was able to do the work at so much cheaper a rate that it was practically putting the private companies out of business. Something must be done. It possibly may be that if this had gone on, we as having some share in the private companies might have experienced some loss. It might have been necessary for us to insist that if this beam service was to prevail we should have some share in its benefits, but in consenting to the amalgamation it seems to me that this government has played into the hands of those who set the interests of the private companies ahead of the interests of the public system of Great Britain.

Mr. VENIOT: We are in pretty good company when we are in the company of Great Britain.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It may be, but it seems to me rather curious that the Postmaster General, representing a Liberal government, should be so anxious to be found in the company of Mr. Baldwin in the Conservative government in Great Britain.

Mr. VENIOT: No, it is because it is a British government.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Another British government just a short time before had instituted the beam system as a public service, and it had been hoped by those who had been interested in the MacDonald government that this would be continued as a public service, but when Mr. Baldwin came into power the policy was completely reversed, and if I understand the situation aright I say that this government played into the hands of the opponents of the publicly-owned system. I know—and it is stated in the correspondence—that various proposals were brought forward at that conference to provide some way out of the difficulties that had been experienced, but Mr. Baker points out that every one of the eleven witnesses examined by the imperial conference represented one or other of the interests which stood to lose by the post office wireless competition, and although the conference discussed five possible methods of dealing with imperial communications, the possibility of developing the imperial service under the joint control of the home and dominion governments was not debated. That you will find is corroborated by the correspondence as laid upon the table. I want to read a few more words from this summary of Mr. Baker's:

> In other words, the companies demanded a complete monopoly within the empire for their own financial benefit, with the result that the conference reported that if the threat were carried out, it would enable foreign interests to strengthen their position.

Again:

> The cables owned by the British government and the dominion governments jointly, which cost £7,134,797, are to be transferred for a sum of £2,500,000, without information as to the basis of valuation.

Now when we ask for some further information with regard to this transaction we are told that a good deal of it is confidential, and we in this house are at a loss to know how to form a judgment on a matter of this kind. We have here and there letters which refer to the deal, but there are evidently great gaps, and when we come to these gaps the Postmaster General tells us that the information is confidential and cannot be given to this house. Mr. Baker, speaking from the British end, says:

> It is also clear that the beam wireless is to be leased for twenty-five years at an immediate annual rental of £250,000, plus a lump sum payment of £60,000.
>
> And yet, while the publicly-owned cables are being taken over at a greatly depreciated figure and the beam wireless is being leased for a long period at an initial rent which is little more than the profit for the first complete year, the plant of the private companies is, apparently, being taken into the new concern on the basis of their share value.
>
> In November, 1927, for instance, the Marconi Company stated before Mr. Justice Eve, that the book value of its assets was £3,177,433, but these same assets are to be sold to the new concern for £17,350,000 in shares.

Mr. Baker sums up thus:

> It is said that a complicated and powerful network of financial, banking, insurance, electrical and newspaper interests stands behind the cable companies; that by a process of linked directorships these forces can be effectively mobilized, and that the existence of this combination compelled the government—

That is the British government:

—to yield.

I may say in passing—I do not care to develop this at this particular point—that certain great Canadian corporations are involved in this matter. Under those circumstances I do not think we have any right to pass this item so readily. It is true that we are dealing simply with one particular item that does not involve the whole transaction. It may very

well be that on account of our connection with the cable companies we have a right to demand better terms of the British government. But I would repeat that our action has apparently assisted the reactionary forces in Great Britain to gain a very decided victory, and we find ourselves, as a part of the British Empire, giving over very largely the control, and certainly surrendering the profits, of this wonderful beam wireless system. I would ask the minister to give us even at this stage a little further information concerning Canada's part in this transaction.

Mr. VENIOT: I gave all the information this afternoon that I could possibly give, and so did the Minister of Justice. The agreement, while generally accepted by Canada has not yet been entered into, nor has it been entered into by the other contracting parties. When we have word from the home government that there is certain information that should not be given out to the public because it is still confidential, I do not think it is fair for the hon. gentleman to press the Postmaster General to give any further information than he has been able to give under the circumstances.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is it possible, then, that this whole matter could be deferred until the Postmaster General is in a position to give the information to this house?

Mr. VENIOT: What does the hon. gentleman mean? Under this heading of "miscellaneous" is an item of $1,500 for somebody who is looking after certain interests that Canada may have in connection with the old cable service, which will be done away with after this year. Does the hon. member mean that until a full explanation is given in connection with this transaction, which to a considerable extent is still confidential, my estimates should be held up because there is a $1,500 item for one of the officials of the old cable service? I do not think it is reasonable.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I frankly admit, Mr. Chairman, that the practice which has prevailed for a long time of discussing general policy in connection with particular items is an absolutely absurd one. But on the other hand here is a very large matter involved.

Mr. VENIOT: $1,500.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, not the $1,500. But there is a very large transaction involved, that of the transfer of our interest in this cable company.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. VENIOT: What has that got to do with this item? Nothing at all.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: So far as the cable company transaction is concerned this is the very first opportunity this house has had for discussing the matter. The matter has not in any way come before the house, notwithstanding that questions have been asked and we have tried to get at some of the facts of the case. Early in the session we asked that the correspondence be placed on the table, and, as my colleague said, some six weeks have passed by and at last, on the eve of the discussion on the estimates, the correspondence is tabled—and very little of it at that.

Mr. VENIOT: Simply because we have been in communication with the British government, the Australian government and the government of New Zealand, and just lately we got the information we required, that is, that they were not in a position to permit us at the present time to place certain correspondence on the table. The hon. gentleman is not fair to throw the blame on the Postmaster General for holding back that record. It is not fair criticism.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that we are facing a still bigger question than that if indeed business transactions of this kind are secret in their nature—business transactions that have involved a very heavy expenditure on the part of the Canadian government, and in which national policies are involved. Surely before such transactions are finally completed there should be the very fullest discussion in this house.

Mr. VENIOT: The hon. gentleman will have every opportunity for such discussion. The Minister of Justice guaranteed that this afternoon. He gave his word of honour that even if it was decided that a bill was not necessary, the hon. gentleman would on another occasion have ample opportunity of discussing the whole situation. I am sorry he did not hear the Minister of Justice.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Postmaster General understood that the Minister of Justice gave a definite undertaking that if a bill were not presented, there would be ample opportunity for discussion?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, and I repeat it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Under those circumstances I am quite satisfied to let this item pass.

Item agreed to.

Post Office

Salaries, including amount required to pay allowance to office appliance operators, grade 2, operating mechanical audit card punching machines in accordance with provisions to be approved by order in council, $1,375,039.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I want to bring to the notice of the Postmaster General the discrepancy existing between the position of the superintendent or post office inspector in Prince Edward Island and that in other districts in Canada, and to ask why the classification for one district should be different from that of others.

Mr. VENIOT: That matter has been up for consideration by the department for some time, on the application of the inspector himself. Mr. Whear, I think, cannot expect to have the same salary classification as inspectors in the larger districts. The district of Prince Edward Island is a limited district in comparison with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and he has been notified that he cannot expect to have the same salary rating as the district superintendents of those two provinces. Further than that, the matter has been laid before the Civil Service Commission, and their decision is that they will not consent to an increased salary at the present time, based on the reasons I have given.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I quite understand the reasons as given by the Postmaster General, but there are other considerations that I should like to bring to his notice. The post office inspector in that district has probably more work to do, involving greater responsibility than have inspectors in the other districts, for the reason that he alone of the inspectors has no assistants.

Mr. VENIOT: I will go into it further with the commission, but that was their decision.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): For a great many years that district was recognized as being on the same footing as the other districts. It is true that when the classification came into effect in 1921 the district was abolished altogether and attached to New Brunswick for a short period. However, during the fall of that same year the arrangement was found to be so very unsatisfactory to the island people that the district was reinstated, but left in a different classification. I am not particularly interested in the official at all, but I do feel that as a matter of provincial rights the province should at least be on the same footing in this regard as the other provinces. I feel that further consideration ought to be given to this matter. We are recognized in other respects. For instance, until this year the same discrimination existed with regard to taxation, but the Island has now been established as a separate district with an inspector of taxation. I think the Post Office department in conjunction with the Civil Service Commission should find some means of establishing a similar condition in regard to our post office inspector. Our supreme court judges and others in the provincial service are on the same footing as similar officials in other parts of Canada. Is there not some means whereby this district may be dealt with similarly as a matter of provincial rights?

Mr. VENIOT: I will give it my attention.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: There is one item I think we should call attention to,—

Mr. VENIOT: Which one?

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: —and that is regarding the increase to the deputy. The policy has been adopted by the government of increasing the salaries of some of the deputies and not of others. Some have been increased $2,000, others $1,000, while others again have not been increased at all. This is the first department of civil government that has come up for discussion, and that is why I am mentioning the matter here, not with the intention of objecting to this vote, but in order to reserve our right to discuss the whole question at some suitable time.

Mr. VENIOT: That will be all right.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I do not understand how the government can justify the line they have taken. There are some deputies for whom no salary increase has been provided. I think they should be given an increase. I want to reserve the right to us on this side of the house to discuss the general question, which I think we ought to be given an opportunity of doing at some suitable time.

Mr. VENIOT: I think there will be no objection to that.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

South Bay, Ingonish—purchase, reconstruction and extension of Corson's wharf, $6,000.

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): No. 131.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have done enough work for the day. The Minister of Public Works will make better headway if he takes up this item next week.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps we might go this far. I know that one hon. member on the other side of the house has something to say in regard to this vote. It will not be convenient for him to be here on Monday. I suggest that we hear him and so make a little headway.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: All right.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman. I desire to bring to the attention of the minister some very important harbour and river improvements in the public service in the county of Cumberland. Last session I mentioned to the minister that at Port Greville, on the bay of Fundy, a good deal of money a few years years ago was spent in improving the breakwater. The information that has come to me—and I am sure it must be in the possession of the department—is that the breakwater does not extend far enough out to prove of sufficient advantage to the shipping interests at that point. In addition to that, during a very severe storm last fall the beach protection, which joins the breakwater at a certain point, was completely washed out, making harbour conditions at this point very hazardous. I appeal to the minister again to give immediate consideration to this matter, because Port Greville is not served by a railway. A great deal of shipping is carried on at this point, particulars of which I gave the house last year, and this port is in the centre of a lumbering district. I think the conditions there should be brought up to a standard which will enable people using that accommodation to carry on their regular businesss with efficiency.

There is another point along the shore of the bay of Fundy where improvements are also necessary in connection with a wharf; I refer to Spencer's Island. I am not going into particulars to-night but merely mention this case in order that the minister might make a note of it and possibly include an item in the supplementary estimates to take care of this work.

Another matter to which I will direct attention is a wharf which has been requested by the citizens of Northport. This village is on the Northumberland straits, and I believe a petition was forwarded to the minister within the last few months urging that a wharf be built. This is a very important fishing district and there is no accommodation at this point of any kind. The people there feel themselves justified in requesting that some assistance be granted them by way of a wharf; it need not be an expensive affair, but a small wharf will enable them to carry on their regular business much more efficiently.

I also spoke to the minister in connection with the wharf at Pugwash, which is also on the Northumberland straits. That wharf is in a very dilapidated condition. As a matter of fact there are two wharves at this point, one owned by the railway company and the other by the government, and my information is that both these wharves require immediate attention. This is also an important port, and I believe petitions have been forwarded requesting that this accommodation be brought up to a certain standard.

The last matter about which I wish to speak concerns the dredging in the inner and outer harbour at Parrsboro, which is on the bay of Fundy. I believe the minister has received communications from the board of trade in this town and from other prominent citizens urging that immediate action be taken to dredge the harbour in order to enable the business of this port to be carried on freely and to the general advantage of all concerned. I wish to impress upon the minister the importance of this port, which also needs a government wharf in the town. There is a government wharf a short distance outside the town but it does not properly serve the shipping interests, since a great deal of lumber and other material is shipped from this centre. There are some privately owned wharves at this point but they are in a run-down condition and are not properly serving the shipping public. That is all I have to say; I appeal to the minister to give these matters his immediate attention and, if possible, to place amounts in the supplementary estimates this year to bring these works up to a proper standard and in order that the shipping interests to be served may be able to take full advantage of the accommodation offered.

Mr. MANION: May I suggest to the minister that the house adjourn now, because a number of the Nova Scotia members on this side thought we would not get through the Post Office estimates in time to deal with anything else to-night, and they particularly requested the hon. member for Argenteuil and myself to ask the minister not to take up anything else to-night. There is only ten minutes left, anyway.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have no objection. I would say to my hon. friend, with regard to the matters of which he has spoken, that I know some of them have been receiving consideration, and the others will be given attention. If my hon. friends saw fit to pass

this item, reserving the right to anyone to refer to it again, I should be very glad to get it through, but I am not going to insist upon it.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: We will be satisfied with that reservation.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Robb the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Monday, May 6, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 179 for the relief of Madelaine Virginia Lumsden.—Mr. Bothwell.

Bill No. 193, for the relief of Mary Bertha Dupuis Ranger.—Mr. Millar.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—ROBERT J. ELLIOTT

Mr. HANSON:

1. On whose recommendation was Canadian National Railway baggage master, Robert J. Elliott, placed as conductor on Canadian National trains No. 23 and No. 24, between Sussex and St. John (Atlantic region)?
2. Was said appointment made with the approval of the order of railway conductors?
3. If not, has that organization protested Elliott's appointment?
4. What explanation has the Canadian National Railway Company to offer if Elliott has been advanced over those who are senior in the service to him.

Mr. DUNNING:

1. The relationship between the men and the management is entirely an internal affair of the railway, and any question arising therefrom is dealt with under well recognized rules. In case of grievances there has been set up machinery by which such grievances may be adjusted between the representatives of the management and representatives of the employees. That being the case, the management feel that it is not in the interest of the railway, nor in the public interest, to attempt to deal with such matters except in the prescribed manner.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—APPRENTICE INSTRUCTION

Mr. SENN:

1. What is the total cost to Canadian National Railways for apprentice instruction on the entire system?
2. What is the total annual cost for each of the regions of the system?
3. What is the total annual cost per apprentice for each region?

Mr. DUNNING:

1. $77,551.48.

2.

Central	$ 48,977 74
Atlantic	10,428 00
Western	18,145 74

3.

Central	$115 29
Atlantic	69 52
Western	90 73

BEDFORD BASIN MAGAZINE

Mr. ERNST:

1. What was the total amount paid to A. S. McMillan and C. A. McNearney with respect to construction work at Bedford basin, in the county of Halifax, concerning which the payment of $100,000 appeared on page 270, volume 2, Auditor General's report, 1928?
2. Of such total amount, how much represents: (a) the contract price; (b) extras?

Mr. RALSTON:

1 and 2. The total amount paid to A. S. McMillan and C. A. McNearney in connection with their 1927-1928 contract for construction work at Bedford basin magazine is as follows:

Amount of work done under contract dated August 1, 1927	$ 107,900 00
Additional work ordered by engineer in charge	909 02
Total	$ 108,809 02

EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION FARMS

Mr. MANION:

1. How many Dominion experimental and demonstration farms are there in Canada?
2. Where are they situated, by places and provinces?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. There are twenty-two Dominion experimental farms and stations, besides one substation, three tobacco stations and one fox station.

The Dominion government does not operate any demonstration farms, but it does supervise the operation and, in a small way assist the owners of a considerable number (186 in 1928), of what are called illustration stations. The illustration station area of a man's farm includes only that part of it fronting on a

well travelled road and varies in area from eight or ten to forty acres. For the privilege of saying what crops shall be grown, what rotation shall be followed and how and when cultural operations shall be performed the department pays the owner or operator a small amount ($5 per acre) each year. The purpose of these stations is to demonstrate the varieties of the different crops, the cultural methods and the rotations that have been found to give the best results on an experimental farm or station where conditions are judged to be similar to those which maintain on the illustration station under consideration.

The crops harvested off these illustration stations are of course the property of the men operating them.

2.

Experimental station, Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Experimental station, Kentville, N.S.
Experimental farm, Nappan, N.S.
Experimental station, Fredericton, N.B.
Experimental station, Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, Que.
Experimental station, Cap Rouge, Que.
Experimental station, Lennoxville, Que.
Experimental station, La Ferme, Que.
Experimental station, Kapuskasing, Ont.
Experimental farm, Ottawa.
Experimental station, Morden, Man.
Experimental farm, Brandon, Man.
Experimental farm, Indian Head, Sask.
Experimental station, Rosthern, Sask.
Experimental station, Scott, Sask.
Experimental station, Swift Current, Sask.
Experimental station, Lethbridge, Alta.
Experimental station, Lacombe, Alta.
Experimental station, Summerland, B.C.
Experimental farm, Agassiz, B.C.
Experimental station, Invermer, B.C.
Experimental station, Sidney, B.C.
Experimental substation, Beaverlodge, Alta.
Tobacco station, Farnham, Que.
Tobacco station, L'Assomption, Que.
Tobacco station, Harrow, Ont.
Experimental fox ranch, Summerside, P.E.I

PELAGIC SEALING TREATY CLAIMS

Mr. NEILL:

Is it the intention of the government to take any steps this session of parliament, or in the near future, towards meeting the wishes of the sealers regarding the matter referred to in their petition to the right honourable the premier, during 1927, which asked for an investigation of their modus vivendi sealing claims of 1892?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

These claims were against the British government. They were submitted to that government through the government of Canada, but they were not favourably considered. The British government explained that the modus vivendi was adopted in the interests of the seal fishery, and due notice of it in the seasons of 1892 and 1893 was given. As the claims were fully considered by the British government, it is felt that no good purpose would be served by reopening the question at this time.

DR. W. A. GROVES

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. Was Dr. W. A. Groves, Fergus, Ontario, employed in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?
2. What length of time did he serve in this department?
3. In what year was his appointment made permanent?
4. Was any agreement for superannuation made?
5. When did Dr. Groves leave the service?
6. How much had Dr. Groves paid into the superannuation fund?
7. Has Dr. Groves been reimbursed for such payments or is he entitled to any?

Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. Yes.
2. Including service with the Board of Pension Commissioners, from the 24th April, 1919, to the 30th June, 1926.
3. Dr. Groves was granted permanency under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act, with effect from the 1st October, 1925, but was not made permanent under the civil service or superannuation regulations.
4. No.
5. 30th June, 1926.
6. $150.03.
7. Dr. Groves was duly reimbursed. He is not entitled to any further payment.

SYDNEY-NEW WATERFORD-GLACE BAY MAIL SERVICE

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South):

1. By whom is mail conveyed from Sydney to New Waterford?
2. What amount is paid for the service?
3. Is there a contract for the work?
4. By whom is mail conveyed from Sydney to Glace Bay?
5. What is paid for the service?
6. Is there a contract for the work?

Mr. VENIOT:

1. Sydney and Louisburg Railway.
2. $287.96 per annum, on mileage basis.
3. No.
4. Cape Breton Electric Railway.
5. $1,687.80 for year 1928-29 on a mileage basis.
6. No.

MONTREAL POSTAL STATION B

Mr. QUINN:

1. Is a portion of postal station "B", 676 St. Catherine street west, Montreal, occupied as a private residence?
2. If so, is this the residence of the Deputy Postmaster General as indicated in the Montreal directory and telephone book?
3. If so, how long has the said postal station been occupied as a residence, and what rental is paid for the same?
4. What floor space is so occupied for residential purposes?
5. Is the government renting any buildings for government offices in Montreal on or near St. Catherine street? If so, what rent per square foot per annum is paid?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. (a) The living quarters in this building have been occupied as a residence since its completion some twenty years ago; (b) $500 per annum.
4. 3,010 square feet.
5. Government rents ground floor space for postal station purposes at two points on St. Catherine St. Postal station "N", corner St. Catherine St. E. and City Hall ave., at $2.64 per square foot. Postal station "T", St. Catherine St. E. and Amherst St., at $3.85 per square foot.

MR. W. M. CORY

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond):

1. What is the position and salary of W. M. Cory in the Department of the Interior?
2. How long has he been in the department?
3. What was his salary when appointed?
4. Is this man a son of the Deputy Minister of the Interior?
5. What sum has he drawn in travelling expenses during the past twelve months?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1. Assistant departmental solicitor—$4,020, by Civil Service Commission.
2. From January 1, 1916.
3. $600.
4. Yes.
5. Nil.

MR. T. L. CORY

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond):

1. What is the position and salary of T. L. Cory in the Department of the Interior?
2. What was his salary when appointed to the said department.
3. Is this man a son of the Deputy Minister of the Interior?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1. Special legal officer, international water problems—$4,140, by Civil Service Commission.
2. $300 per month.
3. Yes.

MARITIME FREIGHT RATES ACT

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Will the act based on the Duncan report with reference to preferential freight rates of 20 per cent in favour of the maritime provinces be amended during the present session in order to locate the railway terminus in the city of Quebec instead of in the city of Levis?
2. If not, will this important question be soon settled, conforming to the request of public bodies in Quebec?

Mr. DUNNING:

1. The legislative program does not contemplate any revision of the Maritime Freight Rates Act during the present session.
2. Answered by No. 1.

QUEBEC RAILWAY TERMINAL

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

Is it the intention of the government to consider the question of the railway terminus in the city of Quebec at the same time as they consider the terminus in the city of Montreal, which is asking $50,000,000 for said terminus according to the Palmer report?

Mr. DUNNING:

The management of Canadian National Railways is at present considering the terminal situation at Quebec.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE—ENLISTMENTS

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

What was the total number of enlistments during the Great War of 1914-1918: (a) voluntary; (b) compulsory, in each of the provinces of Canada.

BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. BARBER:

1. How many cattle were slaughtered as reactors under the bovine tuberculosis test, during the twelve months ending January 31, 1929, in the provinces of: (a) Quebec; (b) British Columbia?
2. What is the total amount of compensation awarded the owners in each of these provinces for the same period?
3. What amount of the compensation was paid, and what amount is still due the owners as of April 30, 1929, in each of these provinces for the same period?

CONFEDERATION PARK

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. Has the government paid the purchase price of property recently acquired in the city of Ottawa, bounded as follows: on the north by

Wellington street, on the west by Elgin street, on the south by Queen street and on the east by the post office?

2. Do the various properties mentioned in question 1 now stand in the name of the crown free from all liens, charges and encumbrances?

3. Is the government aware that the municipal corporation of the city of Ottawa claims arrears of municipal taxes on the various properties mentioned in question 1?

4. If the government has been advised of arrears of taxes on the various properties mentioned in question 1, what does the same amount to on: (a) Russell hotel property; (b) Francis McDougall estate; (c) C. W. Mitchell estate?

5. Has the government paid any taxes to the city of Ottawa in respect of arrears on the various properties mentioned in question 1? If so, what amount of arrears of taxes has been paid?

6. What firm of solicitors acted for the government in the acquisition of the various properties mentioned in question 1, and did such solicitors give the government a certificate that said properties were free of all liens, charges and encumbrances when acquired?

7. What were the names of the tenants or owners of the various properties mentioned in question 1?

8. Was compensation paid to any of the said tenants or owners when the various properties were expropriated?

9. If compensation was paid, what sum was paid to each tenant or owner?

10. Was the government advised that the said tenants of any of them had any legal claim against the government rather than against the owner for compensation?

IMMIGRATION IN 1926-27-28

Mr. LUCHKOVICH:

How many immigrants entered Canada in 1926, 1927 and 1928 from: (a) British Isles; (b) United States; (c) other European countries, designating country of origin?

IONA, CAPE BRETON, PUBLIC WHARF

Mr. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton North-Victoria):

1. What was the expenditure on the government wharf at Iona, Cape Breton, 1928?

2. How was the work done?

3. What were the names of those engaged in this work and what was paid to each?

HENDRY'S LIMITED, HALIFAX—CHARTER OF STEAMBOATS

Mr. BARBER:

1. How many steamboats were chartered by various departments of the Dominion government from Hendry's Limited, of Halifax, for 1927, 1928 and 1929?

2. Under what terms were these steamboats chartered?

3. What are the names of the steamboats, the tonnage of each, when was each one built, and what is the charter price of each?

4. What is the fitness of each boat for the service called for?

5. Has any transfer of service of these boats been made from one department to another, and if so, what are the changes, and why?

[Mr. W. F. Garland.]

6. Have any changes been made as regards charter price, and if so, why? If no change has been made, why?

7. How many steamboats owned or chartered by Hendry's Limited, Halifax, are subsidized by the federal government for 1927 1928 and 1929, and what are the names, tonnage, route and subsidy of each, and when was each one built?

8. Has each one of those boats passed favourable examination by the federal steamboat inspector?

9. Will the government hand down report of such examination?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. A. M. GRAHAM

Mr. BROWN:

For a copy of the report of the investigation of Judge Stubbs regarding the dismissal of Mr. A. M. Graham from the staff of the soldier settlement board.

HORNEPAYNE POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. COWAN:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, complaints, petitions, applications and reports from the Civil Service Commission in connection with the appointment of the present postmaster at Hornepayne, Ontario, and the dismissal of Mr. Leggatt from the postmastership at Hornepayne.

ONION LAKE INDIAN AGENCY

Mr. McQUARRIE:

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents relating to the appointment and dismissal of C. B. Rothery as clerk at the Onion Lake Indian agency, Saskatchewan, and the appointment of a successor to that office.

MANYBERRIES DOMINION RANGE EXPERIMENTAL STATION

Mr. GARDINER:

For a return showing: 1. The number and names of employees at the Dominion range experimental station at Manyberries, Alberta, from April 1 to November 30, 1928.

2. The actual wages paid monthly to each of the aforesaid employees from April 1 to November 30, 1928.

PARK SITES

Mr. BISSETT:

1. The report of R. W. Cautley or any other officer of the government relative to any investigation made, (a) in the proposed eastern Manitoba park site; (b) in the proposed Riding Mountain park site.

2. All letters, telegrams or other documents between the Department of the Interior or any other department of the government and the government of Manitoba or any member of the government of Manitoba or any member of the House of Commons, relative to the establishment of a national park in the province of Manitoba.

3. All letters, telegrams or other documents between the Department of the Interior or any other department of the government and the

government of Saskatchewan or any member of the government of Saskatchewan or any member of the House of Commons, relative to the establishment of the Prince Albert National Park in the province of Saskatchewan.

4. All reports made in connection with any investigations relative to the establishment of Prince Albert national park in the province of Saskatchewan.

HARRY BRONFMAN

Mr. EVANS moved:

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents in the possession of the government in connection with the alleged charge of attempted bribery of Customs Officer Knowles against Harry Bronfman.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This concerns more particularly the Minister of National Revenue, but I must say on behalf of the Department of Justice that this must not include documents and papers which, under the rules and practice, must remain confidential. I have no objection to the motion passing with that understanding.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE GEORGE GREGORY

Mr. GARDINER moved:

For a return showing: 1. The total amount of money paid to or on behalf of Private George Gregory, No. 160599, since his discharge from the overseas expeditionary forces at Calgary, Alberta, on June 4, 1928.

2. The amount of money paid directly to Gregory and for what purpose, namely, pension, etc.

3. The amount of money paid on behalf of Gregory and for what purpose, namely, hospitalization, etc.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would be glad if this question could stand until I have had an opportunity of inquiring of the pensions commissioners as to the information that should be brought down.

Motion stands.

PRIVATE BILLS

NIAGARA FALLS MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMPANY

On the order:

House in committee on Bill No. 22 to incorporate Niagara Falls Memorial Bridge Company.

Mr. PETTIT: I notice that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) is not in his seat, and I would therefore ask that this bill stand.

Order stands.

78594—142½

ANNIE FORBES SANGSTER

Mr. L. H. JELLIFF (Lethbridge) moved the second reading of Bill No. 200, for the relief of Annie Forbes Sangster.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would ask, do these bills standing in the name of the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Jelliff) all relate to cases in his constituency?

Mr. JELLIFF: I wish to inform the hon. member that none of these bills standing in my name relate to cases in my constituency. I think most of them come from Toronto.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the second time, on division.

CHARLES STANLEY CUNEO

Mr. L. H. JELLIFF (Lethbridge) moved the second reading of Bill No. 203, for the relief of Charles Stanley Cuneo.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Some time ago those of us who come from the west were criticized in this house because we had anything to say with regard to divorce bills simply because they related mostly to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I think it is a very strange thing now that members from the province of Ontario cannot sponsor their own divorce bills. It seems to me that we ought to have an explanation of these bills since they have to be loaded on a man who comes from the province of Alberta. I would suggest that we have an explanation as to this particular bill.

Mr. JELLIFF: It is one of the ordinary cases that we have before us, of infidelity in the matrimonial relationship. I imagine that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) is most concerned as to the future of the children who are involved in these cases. In the particular case before us I can assure him that there are no children involved. As to the bills standing in my name generally, I am pleased to inform the hon. member that I have examined the evidence in each case carefully, and I think it is amply sufficient to sustain the divorce applied for.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the second time, on division.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 178, for the relief of Adele Cawthra Rogers.—Mr. Matthews.

Bill No. 182, for the relief of Maud Parker.—Mr. McGibbon (for Mr. Church).

Bill No. 183, for the relief of Eleanor Vair.—Mr. McGibbon (for Mr. Church).

Bill No. 186, for the relief of Isabel Honor Gilderoy.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 192, for the relief of Catherine Goring.—Mr. McGibbon (for Mr. Church).

Bill No. 194, for the relief of Harvey Baden Powell Haney.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 196, for the relief of Ivy Georgina Lloyd.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 197, for the relief of Helen Steele.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 198, for the relief of John Campbell.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 202, for the relief of Joseph Nicholl.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 204, for the relief of William Allan Griffith.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 205, for the relief of Sydney Bishop.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 209, for the relief of Patrizio Nardini.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Motions for second readings agreed to on division.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS

LOWER LAKES TERMINAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston City): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the terminal at the lower lakes, may I ask that there be placed on the file the original correspondence addressed to the United States, between certain dates, I do not know specifically when, in which a summary of the note from the United States, dated July 28, 1928, is contained?

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St. John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, sessional papers No. 266 have reference to the correspondence which has taken place between the government of the province of New Brunswick and the federal government in respect to the sale of the St. John and Quebec railway. My impression is that the file is not quite complete. I am given to understand that there has been correspondence between the premier of New Brunswick and the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) which is not on this file. If that is the case, may I ask that the file be completed?

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): I think the hon. gentleman is right and that there is some correspondence between the premier of New Brunswick and myself. I will see that it is produced. I was not aware that it was not on the file.

Mr. MacLAREN: This had probably not been brought to the attention of the Postmaster General?

Mr. VENIOT: No, it had not.

CANADA'S GOLD RESERVE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): I wish, Mr. Speaker, to direct a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb). There is an article in the current issue of the Monetary Times in which the statement is made that sixty million dollars would be required to bring Canadian exchange back to parity with that of the United States, and that there is not that amount of gold in Canada's reserve. May I ask if that is the real reason why gold is not being shipped at present to the United States?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet read the article. I will read it, and then I shall be in a better position to give my hon. friend an answer.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is not the article, Mr. Speaker, that I am concerned about; I want to get at the facts.

Mr. ROBB: I am not sure that the facts are as stated.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Secondly, I wish to ask the Minister of Finance: Is it true that it will require sixty million dollars to bring our exchange back to par in New York? According to the Minister's own statement there is not sixty million dollars in our treasury reserve. I think in a matter of this importance we have a right to hear from the Minister of Finance. Do I understand that the minister refuses to answer the question?

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Speaker, I have been some twenty years in this house and I have observed that it is not etiquette for a minister to rise to answer a question until the hon. gentleman putting the question has sat down. Let me say to my hon. friend that the Dominion of Canada is in a position to meet all obligations, at any time, anywhere.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that a general statement is not an answer to my specific question. I ask again: Is it true it will require sixty million dollars to bring Canadian exchange back to par in New York?

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. A. BOYS (North Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) when we may expect his opinion regarding appointments by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I have asked one of the officers of the department to communicate with both the Civil Service Commission and the officers of the Post Office Department and to make a full report to me. I shall be quite pleased to communicate it to my hon. friend.

NOVA SCOTIA FISHERIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. W. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton North-Victoria): I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin) when I may expect an answer to my question of April 29 with reference to the fisheries of Nova Scotia?

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): The officers of the department are working on the answer to the question of my hon. friend.

WESTERN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

READJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF THOSE DISMISSED AND RE-EMPLOYED

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide for the readjustment of the salaries of certain postal employees in western Canada who were dismissed in 1919 and subsequently re-employed, to give them the benefit of salary they would have received had they re-entered the service in the class equivalent to the one they were in when dismissed, and of subsequent salary revisons, and to make provision whereby certain former employees not now in the said service shall be eligible for reappointment as vacancies occur.

Mr. BENNETT: Explain. The motion is very indefinite in its terms.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Speaker, in bringing this resolution before the house I might refer to what happened last session. When the supplementary estimates were submitted, three or four days before prorogation, several hon. members took part in the discussion and it will be remembered that later the item was withdrawn, and I stated that the matter would be taken up next session. The reason I gave for withdrawing the item was that judging from what appeared in the press and from the speeches in the house the matter had not been sufficiently studied, and I thought with a closer study of the question a better understanding could be reached. Now I am bringing the matter forward again in the shape of a bill which will be founded on this resolution. Its object is to provide for payment to the men taken back after the Winnipeg strike of 1919 of the salary they would have received had they re-entered the service in the class equivalent to the one they were in when dismissed.

It is not my intention to go into the merits or demerits of what happened at the time of the strike, but merely to relate what took place afterwards. On July 7, 1919, a special act was passed authorizing the Civil Service Commission to appoint to the permanent staff any person employed to replace anyone who went out on strike, and in January, 1920, the government agreed to an arrangement whereby employees who had gone out on strike would be re-employed, provided: First, that they had the approval of the governor in council; secondly, that they gave satisfactory assurance that a repetition of the offence would not occur; thirdly, that they passed the civil service examination; and in the fourth place, that they should begin anew in the service. The age limit was waived in their favour.

Now these ninety-six men who were taken on after the strike and reinstated as the agreement here states were demoted to lower positions; that is to say, they came in at the bottom of the ladder or as postal helpers to work their way up. That is what they were supposed to do. But when they did return to employment they were engaged in the same advanced class they had occupied in the service before the strike, although they were paid the wages of employees of a lower grade. By way of comparison, although these figures may not be quite exact, I may put it this way in order to show what I mean. A postal clerk drawing a salary of $125 or $135 a month came back into the service as a postal helper at $85; he did the work of a postal clerk who would receive $125 but he himself received a remuneration of $85 only, or $90 as the case might be. There was that spread between the two.

On my tour to the coast in 1927 I stopped off at Winnipeg for three days, and this matter was brought to my attention. I went into it fully, and met a committee composed of some twenty-five or thirty persons representing all classes of postal workers in the city of Winnipeg. That committee was composed of men who had gone out on strike and had been taken back; of men who had replaced the

strikers—there were some six hundred in all—and were working in the service; as well as of those who had not gone out on strike but had continued to work in the service. I met this committee representing these different classes of those concerned in the question, and they were all unanimous that those who had been taken back, the ninety-six, should be paid the salaries which they earned. I would point out that if the intention was to punish those men by demoting them they should have been demoted not only as respects the amount of salary they received but, as well in the class or kind of work which they were to do. I have always believed in the principle that the labourer is worthy of his hire, and if these men were brought back and engaged in work of a higher class they should have been paid for that class of work; they should not have been demoted in the matter of salary alone.

After studying the situation very carefully and looking into all phases of it, without however inquiring into the pros and cons of the strike, or what may have brought about the strike, I submitted to the government that in my opinion these men for several reasons should receive the pay contemplated in section 1, the only section, of the bill to be brought down. As I stated before, I felt that they were worthy of their hire. I felt that other participants in the strike, those who had gone out from the service of the railways, industrial concerns and so forth having been taken back on the same conditions as previously, it would not be fair that the employees in the postal service should alone be signalled out for this demotion. That was one of the reasons on which I based my recommendation to the government, and it has been accepted. I do not intend to take up very much of the time of the house discussing the resolution; when the bill is before the committee we shall have an opportunity to go more fully into the merits of the question. Let me observe this, however. I read in one of the newspapers this statement: "These men are in receipt of larger salaries than they had at the time they went out." If that is so then there is nothing to pay them; it will not be necessary to put into operation this provision of the bill relating to those who went out, as regards any who may have reached after a few years the position wherein they would receive such salary as was paid them before the strike took place. Let me point out further that in this bill there is nothing which will give a preference in the way of seniority over the men who remained in the service or over those who were taken in to replace the strikers.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Did the ninety-six pass the civil service examination?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes. As I say, there is nothing to give these men a preference, in the way of seniority or classification, over the men who were taken in to replace the four or five hundred who were not taken back. When the resolution is in committee I shall ask to have it amended by the omission of these words:

> And to make provision whereby certain former employees not now in the said service shall be eligible for reappointment as vacancies occur.

At the time this resolution was prepared I was not aware that there was an order in council which met that very condition. Having been made aware of it, and having obtained a copy of the order in council, I did not deem it necessary to go further than the first clause of the resolution in order to meet the conditions as I found them in Winnipeg. On January 7, 1920, an order in council was passed which reads:

> Many evidences have reached the Department of Labour from ex-postal employees that they now recognize they participated unwisely in the sympathetic strike in western Canada last May, and that they sincerely regret the action they then took. The gravity of their offence against the state being now realized, the government has given consideration to the possibility of removing the bar to their application through the Civil Service Commission for re-employment in the public service, and His Excellency the Governor in Council is disposed to exercise clemency so far as reasonably consistent with necessary discipline.
>
> Ex-postal employees may therefore be considered as eligible to be appointed to positions in the civil service for which they make application as vacancies occur, and to which, in the opinion of the commission, they are justly entitled under the regulations, subject to the following conditions:
>
> Ex-postal workers must not be re-employed in the civil service without the approval in each case of His Excellency the Governor in Council;
>
> Inasmuch as a number of those affected have been a long time in the public service, and are now past the age limit fixed for new employees entering the service, it will be permissible for the commission to appoint them notwithstanding the age requirements.

The words which I wish to omit from the present resolution refer to the age limit.

> In every case before being reappointed satisfactory assurance must be obtained that a repetition of the offence will not occur.

This is order in council P.C. No. 1152, containing the report of the committee of the Privy Council, and approved by the Governor General on June 4, 1920.

There is nothing much more for me to say except to endeavour to correct a wrong impression which seems to have spread in certain quarters. The Montreal Gazette of April 8, 1929, contained this statement:

> These men were dismissed from the service, and for some reason, which no one has ever been able successfully to explain or defend, were reinstated.

This order in council explains why these men were reinstated, and I merely draw attention to that statement in order to keep the record straight. A further reference was made to this matter, which I think should be corrected. The Gazette stated:

> The Postmaster General failed to secure the passage of his bill; the measure went through the House of Commons—to the discredit of that body, but it never left the Senate. That was Mr. Veniot's opportunity to do some learning.

Everyone knows no bill was introduced and no bill went to the senate last year; consequently this statement is without foundation. I do not refer to it in a critical way but simply wish to keep the record clear.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): How many men were dismissed?

Mr. VENIOT: I can give all that information in committee, but speaking from memory I think 623 men were affected. I will have all those details when we go into committee. I think 96 men applied for reinstatement.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before this house involves questions which have been fruitful sources of much unfortunate and painful discussion. I do not think it advisable to canvass the whole situation as we did last year; it is sufficient for my purposes to direct attention to the fact that a number of postal employees left the service of the crown under such circumstances as dislocated the public service and rendered it impossible for mail to be delivered in the city of Winnipeg. Later these men were offered the opportunity to go back to work but, not having availed themselves of that opportunity for reinstatement, they were later re-employed to the number of 96 on certain definite terms and conditions which constitute the contract between them and the state. Those conditions are contained in an order in council and are four in number. As the Postmaster General has stated, that order in council provided first that all who desired to re-enter the service should pass an examination before they were employed; secondly, that the age limit should be no bar to their re-employment as new employees; thirdly that they should be re-employed subject to approval by the governor in council in each case and lastly that they should commence as new employees in the service.

That there was an unfortunate condition in Winnipeg in 1919 goes without saying. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) last year thought the observations which were made by myself were rather stronger than the facts warranted, and not having been in Winnipeg at the time of the strike I shall content myself for the moment by reading an editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press of April 8 of this year. The Free Press was a daily newspaper at the time of this occurrence. The proprietors endeavoured to publish it as such during the strike and I take it that they had a clear appreciation and understanding of the situation which developed in that city during the progress of events. The following is the editorial, headed "The Vote for the Postal Workers" which appears in that newspaper:

> It is regrettable that the Dominion government did not profit by its experience last year to the extent of declining to resubmit to parliament the vote for the Winnipeg postal strikers, which they found it advisable last year to withdraw. This matter cannot be considered without reopening the whole question of the Winnipeg strike of 1919. This is something which considerations of prudence and public welfare should suggest leaving alone; for the passage of time has not in the least led to any adjustment in the points of view of those who have disagreed as to the original, motives and purposes of the strike. Last year, in a brief but bitter debate which followed the submission of the vote to the house, Mr. Bennett said the strike was, in the minds of its promoters, a consciously revolutionary movement intended to subvert the government of the country and he cited the findings of the court in Winnipeg to support this view: while Mr. Woodsworth took the line that it was a comparatively innocent development, the character of which had been grossly misrepresented. This involved, of course, the necessity of representing the court cases, which followed the strike, as part of a policy of injustice. Mr. Woodsworth did not boggle at this requirement. He talked about dastardly conspiracies, travesties of justice, farcicial trials.
>
> This interchange of views illustrates what is bound to happen whenever the Winnipeg strike of 1919 comes up for discussion. All the old bitternesses revive. By an agreement entered into by common consent the issue is left alone pretty much in Winnipeg on the principle of letting sleeping dogs lie; but the Dominion government is prepared, it seems, to have the question stirred up anew and made the subject of discussions, which are bound to be violent, in both the Commons and the Senate. Because it is not possible to deal with this business of paying back money to present members of the post office staff who went on strike in 1919 without bringing up the question of the merits of the great strike. The justice of making these payments can only be established if certain things are first established; that the Winnipeg strike was in itself right; that the postal workers did right in striking in sym-

pathy with it; that the Dominion government of that day had no business to issue an ultimatum that the workers must return to work or lose their jobs; that the Dominion government did wrong in trying to man the post office and give the public a service; and that the men who took the strikers' positions had no claims to consideration and should have been turned into the street when, after the strike, the strikers returned and asked for their positions. Mr. Heenan, the Minister of Labour, took all these positions flatfootedly in 1926 when he made a recommendation to Mr. Veniot, the Postmaster General, which was the immediate cause of Mr. Veniot's efforts to induce the government and parliament to make these grants.

It is not surprising, however, that the Dominion government does not relish being put in the position of appearing to confirm these conclusions; and last session Mr. Veniot and Mr. Thorson made an attempt, which will doubtless be repeated this year, to make it appear that there is no connection between the granting of this money to the postal workers and the question of the merits of the action of the postal workers in leaving their employment and defying the state. They failed hopelessly because the connection is explicit and undeniable. Mr. Thorson argued that the Dominion government was under no obligation to take the strikers back, but that, having done so, it should have put them back in the positions they held when they went on strike and at the same salary; he intimated that the post office sought out these workers because it required their services and took advantage of their necessities to pay them the minimum wages. This is a very inaccurate account of what happened. Within three months of the close of the strike a concerted effort was begun by the strikers to get the government to lift the embargo and enable them to apply for employment on terms which governed entrants to the service. They appealed to every available agency to intercede with the government to induce it to recede from its position that they could never re-enter the service. Among others, the Free Press was asked to use its influence with the government to this end and gladly did so. But there was no suggestion of reinstatement to their old positions and salaries. Had this been their demand, they would not have got the support which enabled them to overcome the reluctance of the government, well known at the time, to recede from its position.

Having regard to the seriousness of their offence and to the distinct understanding upon which they re-entered the service, it cannot be said that these postal workers have been harshly used. With respect to employment, they were given a preference, subject only to prior claims of returned soldiers; the age limit, where necessary, was waived; and they were, for purposes of pensions and service, allowed to count the period of previous employment. They have been so advanced in the service that with the exception of one or two, who have been taken on within the last two or three years, they are all in receipt of larger salaries than they had at the time they went out. The average increase is about fifty per cent. There is good ground for doubting the spontaneousness of their demand for additional payment; but naturally, being human, they joined in the movement when they were advised that if they all pulled together and used their influence they might force the government to hand them over the money. The proposed vote last year was $115,000; this year it will be larger—the assumed figure is $150,000. The division of this sum among ninety persons, even allowing for handsome deductions for "legal expenses", would be a pretty fat thing for the recipients; and it is not surprising that there is a persistent push to secure it.

The sum, large though it is, does not, of course, mean much to the Dominion treasury; but the Dominion government ought not to delude itself with the idea that the simplest thing for it to do and the one having the least dangerous consequences, is to pay the money and stop the clamour. The Dominion government cannot accede to this demand and pay over the money without thereby agreeing to the propositions, with respect to the postal strike, set forth above; and it cannot agree to these propositions without taking a responsibility which we should think it would be to its great advantage to avoid.

That is the editorial in the Free Press. I will now quote from another newspaper, The Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine of London, of April 18, 1929, which I think publishes a western edition. The paper is entirely out of politics and its criticism of what is being done is as follows:

Politics in the Postal Service

Canadians have had reason in the past to point to our postal service as an example of successful state ownership of a great public utility. Irrespective of partisanship and political affiliations the people of Canada have expressed their pride and confidence in this department of government; but if the Postmaster General succeeds in reinstating and reimbursing the post office employees of Winnipeg who sided with the red element during the desperate strike of 1919 the Post Office Department will soon be known as a mere political cesspool.

This action to restore the strikers to the same position and status they would now enjoy had they never defied the crown nor joined the revolutionary forces in those awful days of the Winnipeg strike is of more than local political significance. A great principle is involved; a principle that no minister of the crown, not even a government, should be allowed to profane.

Last year a considerable item was included on the estimates to adjust the salaries of and compensate a number of the strikers dismissed from the service during the Winnipeg strike. Opposition to the measure was so strong in the commons that the item was finally struck out of the estimates and the Postmaster General executed a temporary retreat. This year, however, a bill is under consideration, and parliament will be asked to vote approximately $125,000 to reinstate and reimburse the strikers.

Anyone acquainted with the efforts put forth to prevent utter demoralization of public services in the city of Winnipeg during the hectic days of the strike is aware of the masterly manner in which Thomas Bower, postmaster at the time, kept the mail moving and prevented a total tie-up of the service that affected not only the city, but the prairie provinces as well. Mr. Bower consistently refused to reinstate the striking post office employees and give them seniority over the staunch supporters who

remained loyal to the crown and, even in the face of serious danger to themselves, remained long hours at their posts and made it possible for the office to function. Now as a reward for this service to the state, the Honourable Peter Veniot has forced a vacation and ultimate retirement on the postmaster at Winnipeg, for the purpose, obviously, of making it easier to reinstate the strikers and thus consummate some political bargain with the Labour party.

The postmaster at Winnipeg has been released from duty in a manner quite characteristic of Honourable Mr. Veniot's administration of the department. But the reinstatement of strikers and adjustment of salaries fortunately require a vote of money in the commons, and this provides the opportunity for the people of Canada, through their representatives in parliament, to rebuke the Postmaster General and put a stop to his high-handed political manoeuvering.

This abject surrender to the Winnipeg Labour party would be an unpardonable affront to everyone who remained loyal to state laws and state institutions and struggled against fearful odds in 1919 to maintain them. More than that, any officer of the crown merits and must have, in the honest and conscientious pursuit of his duties, the unfaltering support of the department of government under which he labours. That is one of the tenets of successful business and sound government administration. These principles the Postmaster General would violate for a mess of political pottage.

Without partisanship or political affiliations "The Farmers's Advocate" is forced to condemn untoward action in any administration. Principle is above party. The people, in the last analysis, are supreme.

Under our system of government the people, fortunately, have a means of expression; and the opportunity here presents itself, before it is too late, to demand adherence to principle and honour in the conduct of public affairs.

As I have said, that article appears in an independent newspaper which in times past could not be charged with any particular lack of appreciation of the services rendered to the state by the government.

In common, I suppose, with most of the other members of the house, I have received a photographic copy of issues of the Western Labour News, taken from the provincial library of Manitoba. This was sent with the compliments of the Employers' Association of Manitoba, the prairie division of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Winnipeg board of trade, the Winnipeg builders' exchange and the Winnipeg realty exchange. These articles are four in number, the first one being dated May 17, 1919. The opening sentence is:

How does the idea of using the new parliament buildings for a labour temple strike you?

Mr. THORSON: I might explain to the hon. leader of the opposition that the photographic copy is made up of a number of sentences which were cut out of various pages and pasted together before being photographed.

Mr. BENNETT: I am indebted to the hon. member for the explanation, because I was not aware of that fact until he stated it. This photographic copy which we have received—I suppose every member of the house has received it—is, as the hon. gentleman assures us, and he must know, being from Winnipeg, a photographic reproduction of a number of paragraphs cut out of different issues of the Labor News and then photographed in the form in which we now have it.

Mr. THORSON: I wanted to explain that the sentences had been cut out of their contexts and then pasted together and the whole photographed.

Mr. BENNETT: The sentences may have been quoted apart from their contexts, but it seems to me that the sentence "How does the idea of using the new parliament buildings for a labour temple strike you?" is certainly a sentence complete within itself. Another paragraph quoted is:

It is reported that certain rigs are delivering ice, bread, etc., without the printed card authorized by the strike committee. Some of these carry written notices. We warn all such drivers that this is contrary to the orders of the strike committee. Certified permits will be supplied on request by the food committee.

Another paragraph is:

Theatres and picture shows are running under strike permit so that the workers can keep off the streets.

Another one is:

All these concerns are organized fully and could be stopped on a minute's notice, but for the present the strike committee believes that it is better to let them run—hence its order for them to stay on the job under permit.

Edition No. 2 contains this paragraph:

All telegraphers are out on strike. But, in order to avert unnecessary hardship, such men as are absolutely necessary have been sent back under strike permit to send out such wires as are passed by strike committee.

Special strike edition No. 8 contains the following:

The postal federation and the telephone operators have received their ultimatums. We wonder why they delayed so long to do this. In a few hours more it may be expected that the city council will do the same thing re its employees. Then the individual employers will follow suit.

The reply of labour is explicit. No worker will return to work until the principle of collective bargaining and a living wage is recognized.

Then follows a paragraph from the last issue, as follows:

What will the governments, and the city councils, and the railroads, and the private

bosses do? Not a single worker will go back till all are reinstated. The governments say that their employees are dismissed and that their dismissals are final. Then the issue is clear. Either the governments must eat humble pie or they must resign.

They have no other choice. Labour comprises the majority of the population. The 1,000 are so insignificant that it would need a magnifying glass to see them. It looks as if they will have to abandon the field and let their governments resign.

I think the sentences which I have just read are complete within themselves. I read them because they indicate the conditions which prevailed before and after the postal workers left their employment. The hon. minister quoted from an order in council which was passed in June, 1920, which contains very significant words: The order in council sets out the fact that it was a "sympathetic strike" under which the postal workers left their employment, that they were advised of "the gravity of their offence against the state," but that "clemency" would be extended consistent with "maintaining the necessary discipline." According to the admissions of the minister, it was a sympathetic strike which induced the postal men to quit their employment and tie up the postal service of Winnipeg. It is apparent that they left for no grievance of their own—they had none at the time—but rather because others had grievances and they were in sympathy with them. I think that is abundantly clear from what the minister has said.

Then it occurs to me that we have to ask a very simple question. Is the attitude of the government different from that taken by most employers under similar circumstances? I received, I dare say in company with other members of the house, a resolution passed by a body of locomotive engineers. It was signed by at least one engineer whom I know and I recall that within a very short space of time prior to that he with others had called upon me asking me if I could not use my influence, such as it was, for the purpose of helping them in seeking employment, not as engineers, but as men who had ceased to be in the service, because they had been dismissed for what their fellow employees said were just causes, as hostlers or in some other branch of the service of a great railway corporation, regardless of the fact that they were as well able to render service as engineers as they ever were. Having committed an offence against the rules of the corporation they had been dismissed from the service and now they sought re-employment not as engineers, with all the knowledge they had of that business, but in any capacity in which they could find employment as beginners in the service. They said very frankly that some of those who had been dismissed should not be entrusted again with a locomotive hauling a passenger train.

Need I remind the house that during the Great war, aye, prior to the Great war, we have the history of a great soldier who for an offence was cashiered from the British army. He volunteered as a private in a foreign army, rose to a position of great importance and became a commander. During the war I recall perhaps not many but some similar instances at least. I remember in particular one who was a friend of mine, who has since passed to his reward. He was employed as an officer. For good and sufficient causes he was dismissed from his position, and he enrolled as a private. He began again to work his way up the ladder to place and position in the force of which he was a member. So it is all through life. I venture to point it out in these words, words which I think we all have to keep in mind because we all at one time or another realize the soundness of them:

> Not heaven itself upon the past has power,
> But what has been, has been.

The fact is that these unfortunate men, for sympathetic reasons only, left the employ of the state, tied up and dislocated the postal service of Winnipeg and, when they were afforded an opportunity to go back and be reinstated, declined to do so. When the period was extended; when the government saw fit to say to them: You may have a longer time in which to make up your mind, a number of them still declined to make up their minds to go back into the service of the state. Under those circumstances the question is: Have they a claim for retroactive pay from this parliament? Under the conditions mentioned by the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot), have they a right now, seeing that they joined as new employees, to ask parliament to make them employees as from the date of their first employment, without taking into consideration any breach of employment or any time during which they were not employed? The principle is very far-reaching. Think what it means to this country to have the House of Commons declare to-day that men who were employed many years ago, who left their employment for sympathetic reasons, who declined to go back having two opportunities to do so, and who then went back under a distinct contract with the state that when they did so they joined as new employees, are now to be told that they are to be treated as though they had never left the service, as though there had never been a break in their employment, as though they had never gone on a sympathetic strike. I

for one cannot bring myself to that state of mind. When I remember the statements that have been made to me by dismissed employees of corporations in this country who have sought my assistance that they might get back to any employment, and who have gladly gone back to subordinate positions, positions where men who were once their juniors became their seniors and their superintendents, I also remember that we do not take, with relation to ordinary transactions, the action that is now proposed. I remember further that, according to the very language of the Free Press newspaper, we put the imprimatur of the approval of this parliament upon the validity of that strike. As the House of Commons of Canada we will have said that that sympathetic strike was justified; that the leaving of their employment by the postal workers was justified, and that the consequences which follow every man for his act shall not follow in this particular case. As I have said, I cannot bring myself to agree to that reasoning. As a citizen, as a lawyer, as a member of parliament, I cannot give my assent to such propositions.

But let us for a moment ask us these further questions before we leave that phase of the matter. First, ninety-six men were employed by the state in the postal service.

Did they leave the service? Answer, yes.

Have they a grievance against the state that employed them? Answer, no.

Did they leave for sympathetic reasons because of grievances that others alleged they had? Answer, yes.

Were they afforded an opportunity for reinstatement? Answer, yes.

Did they avail themselves of it? Answer, no.

Were they afforded a further opportunity for reinstatement? Answer, yes.

Did they avail themselves of it? Answer, no.

Did they subsequently request the government to reemploy them? Answer, yes.

Was that request granted? Answer, yes.

By what method? Answer, by an order in council just read by the minister.

Did it impose conditions? Answer, it did.

Was one of those conditions that they should be treated as new employees? Answer, yes.

Under those circumstances we are asked to disregard period of the unemployment and reinstate them in salary. They have already had many of the other benefits, and reinstatement as regards salary means putting them in the position as though they had never left their employment and giving them back their money from the date of the strike until today—

Mr. THORSON: No, no.

Mr. BENNETT: —on the basis of the salary they had before they left the service.

Mr. THORSON: There is no suggestion at all that they should be paid for the time they were out on strike.

Mr. BENNETT: I mean from the date of reemployment. I mean from the day they went to work after the strike, the day of reemployment after the strike. While, as I have said, I find it difficult to think that any government would submit such a measure to parliament, it has been done, and we have to meet the situation. We who sit to the left of the Speaker are not unmindful of the fact that at the time of these unfortunate occurrences, the Hon. Gideon Robertson, who has been a supporter of those who sit to the left of the Speaker, was Minister of Labour. He visited Winnipeg at that time, under circumstances to which I referred last year and with which I shall not trouble the house again. I thought it desirable, in view of my inability to arrive at any conclusion that would permit me to support this measure in justice to my fellow-citizens, in justice to my fellow-Canadians in every walk of life, to consult with him, and he made to me a suggestion which I shall give to this house for what it is worth. Senator Robertson, being very familiar with the matter, suggested that after all punishment should not be eternal—none of us believes in eternal punishment. One of my colleagues suggests that there are still some who do believe in eternal punishment, but certainly my friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) and I do not. It is now ten years since these men left the service and Senator Robertson suggested that as a period of ten years had since elapsed, justice would be done if those who had attained to the position which it was contended from their long service they were entitled, on recommendations made by their superior officers on the basis of their merit, regardless of the years of employment, received the increased salary up to the maximum of their class. I have thought over this suggestion very carefully.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Would my hon. friend explain that a little more clearly? Does he mean from the date of their employment?

Mr. BENNETT: No. Let me make that clear; from a date to be fixed, from the 1st of June or the 1st of July or the 1st of May, if you like, and that they should receive upon the recommendation of their superior officers such increased compensation as their meritorious service would have entitled them to receive had that service been continuous. In other words, in the case of a postal worker who has worked in the service fifteen years, five years in the service before the strike and now for ten years more, if his superior officer recommends that by reason of that man having had five years' experience in the service previous to being re-employed he is better able to discharge the duties of his position he should receive the added salary or compensation to which he would have been entitled had he remained continuously in the service. It should not, however, be made retroactive, but should date only from the time this provision becomes effective, either the 1st of June or the 1st of July, or whatever date is thought desirable.

Mr. THORSON: On what principle would that be based?

Mr. BENNETT: On the principle that punishment should not be eternal, and that these men having served for fifteen years, in two instalments one of which was terminated by the employee himself, now as an act of "clemency"—to quote the wording of the order in council—we should consider the service as a whole for the purpose of future compensation, but not past compensation.

Mr. THORSON: Would it not also be partly on the principle that that man was a more valuable employee to the public by reason of the service which he had rendered prior to his removal from the service?

Mr. BENNETT: That is the ground which was urged by the Postmaster General and by the hon. gentleman last year, and which is urged again here to-day. Of course you cannot apply that principle in life. The demoted officer was a better private than any other private in the battalion because of his knowledge; the demoted officer who went into the Egyptian army was a better man than the other men in that army, and rose to be its commander; the demoted locomotive engineer became a better hostler than the men engaged in that work; the demoted conductor who became a brakeman was a better brakeman because of his past experience. But in the particular cases to which I referred, these employees of a private corporation lost their seniority, their pensions, and their claims to consideration on the part of their employers, and now I say that in order to end this matter, in order to have it no longer dragged into parliament as it has been under the circumstances alluded to by the Postmaster General, in order to prevent these acrimonious discussions to which the Free Press refers, in order that it may not be said that one party in the strike triumphed over the other—which is, after all, apparently what is to be done—in order to prevent all that, I thought the suggestion of Senator Robertson not an unreasonable one. If therefore the government were disposed to provide that from a future date, on the recommendation of their superior officers as to the character of the service rendered, those employees who had terminated their employment and afterwards been reemployed by a contract of re-employment which is fixed by order in council should receive this increased compensation, we on this side would not be unwilling that they should receive that consideration which their superior officers might recommend, in the light of the services they had rendered counted in years of service without regard to any interruption that had taken place in it. That is the best compromise suggestion, if you call it such—because after all, statecraft they say is always compromise—that we can make. Neither as a lawyer nor as a citizen nor as a member of this parliament could I legally become a party to it, but because of a very earnest desire to bring about happy and peaceful relations between the state as employer and the postal workers as employees and to prevent the harrowing discussions that take place in this parliament with respect to what happened ten years ago, the then Minister of Labour, who has as warm a heart for the men who toil as any man in this Dominion, has offered this suggestion, and after listening to his observations and his reasons I am convinced that it would be fair solution of what is a difficult problem. It is a compromise, it is true, but it violates no principle. It places no imprimatur of the approval of this parliament upon the validity or invalidity of what has been done in days gone by. It leaves out all the harrowing discussions with respect to the strike. It does not deal with the problems of re-instatement or re-employment, but leaves the question to be considered whether or not in the light of the greater experience of the worker he is entitled to receive greater compensation than the one who has less experience in that particular class of work, although it is perfectly clear that in the ten years that have elapsed the new men who have come in must

have become as experienced as it is possible for a man to become by reason of length of service in work of that kind.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) has cited as a parallel case the demoted commander who did the work of a private after his demotion, but I understand that these postal workers when they went back into the service did their old work, not new work at all.

Mr. BENNETT: Surely my hon. friend knows that any man who engages in a job as postal worker does the work of a postal worker whether he be a new employee or a man of ten years' experience. It may be that he could do more work because of his greater experience, but that is all that can be said with respect to it.

Mr. ADSHEAD: There is a class of work that the newly engaged postal workers cannot do.

Mr. BENNETT: The demoted officer who became a private was better able to do his work by reason of his previous experience than the other privates, but they were all privates. These men were all postal workers. True, one may have had greater experience than the other and therefore if he so desired he could do more work, just as the demoted locomotive engineer was a better hostler than the one who had no experience.

Mr. ADSHEAD: But he was not an engineer again.

Mr. BENNETT: He certainly was not. But there were grades in the postal service, and these men came in under their contract as new employees. That is the point of the whole thing.

Mr. ADSHEAD: They were put back in their old work.

Mr. BENNETT: Excuse me, they went back as new employees, and that is one of the conditions there stated.

Mr. VENIOT: Will my hon. friend allow me? If they went in as new employees they would have to begin as postal porters and postal helpers; but instead of that they were put to work as postal sorters and postal clerks —a higher grade of work. It is not the quantity, it is the class of work that counts.

Mr. BENNETT: And they received pay as new employees in that class?

Mr. VENIOT: No, they received pay as postal clerks and postal sorters.

Mr. BENNETT: No, they received pay as new employees, as postal helpers.

Mr. VENIOT: But the postal helpers and the postal clerks have different duties.

Mr. BENNETT: I realize that, but they went to the work that was assigned to them in connection with the handling of the mail in the Winnipeg post office. And they agreed to it. They would never have been there but for that. These men would never again have been in the employ of the Dominion government, according to the order in council read by the minister, unless they had agreed to go back as new employees. Now they say: We want to break that contract. If so, why not put it on one side altogether? There was no coercion. They had failed to take advantage of the two offers made. Then, as the Free Press said, having sought new employment—mark you—they came back as new employees notwithstanding the provisions of the Civil Service Act. Having so come back, they now ask us to overlook all the circumstances under which they terminated their former employment and be treated as though there had never been any such termination. Can we do it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my hon. friend one question? It is a little aside from what he is discussing. On what authority did the government give anyone the right to return to the postal service notwithstanding the provisions of the Civil Service Act? I cannot understand how these men got back at all by order in council. I should think their appointment ought to have come under the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BENNETT: As a matter of fact, my understanding would be that as the War Measures Act was still in force, the wide provisions of that act enabled the order in council to be passed. I only say that to the right hon. gentleman because I asked the same question in relation to it, and that is the only answer I have at the moment. The War Measures Act conferred on the executive almost legislative—some have said wholly legislative—powers, in many regards. They thus had power, without coming to parliament, to override the provisions of the Civil Service Act to that extent. The men still had to pass examinations; the age limit was disregarded. Then they had to have the approval of the governor in council with respect to every specific case of employment. Lastly, they came in as new employees.

Now, I submit, the question is a very simple one. Why should parliament overlook the fact that the men themselves terminated their employment? Nobody asked

them to leave the service. They did a grievous injury to the body politic by leaving their employment. What is more, it was stated in that order in council, and I once more direct attention to these words, that, first of all, it was a "sympathetic strike" that prevailed in Winnipeg; secondly, "they now realize the gravity of their offence against the state." Now we are going to reward them for realizing "the gravity of their offence against the state" by saying that they are to get full pay from the moment they went back to employment, regardless of the fact that they themselves acknowledge they were guilty of a grave offence against the state? That is what it gets down to.

It is my earnest desire, as I have said, to promote amity and good feeling between the great body of civil servants of this country and the state that employs them. Having had the benefit of a discussion with the gentleman whom I regard as being more fitted to speak in relation to the matter than anyone else that we have in parliament at the moment, I can only say that the compromise as such violates no principle. It merely says that if the postmaster, or whoever is the superior officer, reports with respect to fitness, he shall not be limited by reason of the fact that these men have been in the employment of the department during a limited number of years, that having been in the post office before 1919 they have more experience by reason of that fact, and that experience shall be taken into account to increase their compensation or salary—not retroactively, not as a reward for their grave offence against the state, but at a future date, to be fixed either by the governor in council or by this parliament, in satisfaction of these long outstanding claims, in the hope that this action may change to some degree of harmony what has been a very discordant note in the history of this young country.

Mr. J. T. THORSON (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I at the outset congratulate the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) on the comparatively moderate tone of his contribution to the debate as compared with the tone of his remarks on this subject last session. I am very strongly in favour of this resolution as it stands. I think that the criticism which has been directed against it has been based upon a misconception of its purposes and a misunderstanding of the situation in Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Calgary and Vancouver which it is designed to correct. When that situation is clearly understood and the purposes of this resolution are fully appreciated, I think the resolution will commend itself to the members of this house.

In order to make the situation a little more clear and to meet some of the objections that have been raised against this proposal, I think certain facts ought to be brought to the attention of the house. It will not be possible in the short space of time at my disposal to deal with all the aspects of the question which have been brought up, but I intend to deal with the more important ones at this stage and then when the house is in committee I shall be able to deal more fully with other aspects.

The postal employees of western Canada in 1919 belonged to an organization called the Amalgamated Postal Workers. The Winnipeg branch of that organization was and had been for some time affiliated with the Trades and Labour Council of Winnipeg. The fact of that affiliation was well known to the post office authorities at that time. When the general strike was called on May 15th, 1919, the Winnipeg branch of the Amalgamated Postal Workers went out, as did many other labour unions affiliated with the Trades and Labour Council of Winnipeg, and the strike spread to the post offices of Saskatoon and Calgary.

On May 24, when the strike had been in progress for some nine days, an ultimatum was issued by the postmaster at Winnipeg, on behalf of the government, to the postal workers who had gone on strike. The essential part of that ultimatum reads as follows:

> To-day voluntary workers are temporarily taking the posts these people have left. The government announces that those returning before 12 o'clock noon on Monday the 26th instant, will be accepted and that all failing to resume their duties by that hour will be definitely refused thereafter a place in the federal service. Commencing at the above stated hour new employees will be engaged on the usual permanent basis.

It will be noticed that this ultimatum was delivered on the 24th of May, a public holiday. It was also a Saturday and it called upon the employees to return to duty by noon of the following Monday. A number did return to duty but a great many did not. Those who did not return were removed from the postal service by two orders in council, the first being P.C. 89-1474, dated July 15, and the second, P.C. 2224, dated November 3. This latter dealt with those who had not been covered by the former. The ultimatum which I read a moment ago definitely notified the postal workers that if they did not return

before a certain hour they would be definitely refused thereafter a place in the federal service; that is, the federal service was to be closed to them completely.

I am trying to give the facts to the house fully so that the record may be accurate and as complete as I can make it. Representations were made on behalf of these men to the authorities at Ottawa with regard to the terms of the ultimatum. Many of these men had been trusted employees; they had been efficient and conscientious servants of the public; many of them were returned soldiers who had recently been demobilized and had returned to the postal service shortly before the general strike. The government listened to these representations and appointed a subcommittee of council consisting of the Hon. P. E. Blondin, who was then Postmaster General, and the Hon. G. D. Robertson, who was then Minister of Labour, to look into the whole question and see whether some solution of the difficulty could not be found. These two ministers prepared a memorandum to the Civil Service Commission dated January 7, 1920, and presented it to the Hon. N. W. Rowell, who was then president of the privy council. That memorandum was accepted by council and became the basis for the reemployment of the men who had been dismissed. Perhaps I might read it and comment upon some of its terms. It is dated January 7, 1920, is entitled "Memorandum to the Civil Service Commissioners," and reads as follows:

Many evidences have reached the Department of Labour from ex-postal employees that they now recognize they participated unwisely in the sympathetic strike in western Canada last May, and that they sincerely regret the action they then took. The gravity of their offence against the state being now realized, the government has given consideration to the possibility of removing the bar to their application through the Civil Service Commission for reemployment in the public service, and His Excellency the Governor in Council is disposed to exercise clemency so far as reasonably consistent with necessary discipline.

Ex-postal employees may therefore be considered as eligible to be appointed to positions in the civil service for which they make application as vacancies occur, and to which, in the opinion of the commission, they are justly entitled under the regulations, subject to the following conditions:

Then three conditions are enumerated:

Ex-postal workers must not be reemployed in the civil service without the approval in each case of His Excellency the Governor in Council;

Inasmuch as a number of those affected have been a long time in the public service, and are now past the age limit fixed for new employees entering the service, it will be permissible for the commission to appoint them notwithstanding the age requirements.

In every case before being reappointed satisfactory assurance must be obtained that a repetition of the offence will not occur.

The only two conditions of reemployment referred to in this memorandum are that in each case approval by order in council must be obtained and satisfactory assurance must be given that a repetition of the offence will not occur. In other words, the government was prepared to recede from the position it had taken in the ultimatum, that these men would be forever barred from the federal service; it came to a different decision, namely, that they might be reemployed in the federal service subject to certain conditions. I think the government took a very fair-minded attitude to the general situation and I should like to commend it for so doing. However, in my opinion, as I shall point out later, it did not go far enough.

In consequence of this change in the attitude of the government a number of men have been reemployed in the federal service notwithstanding the terms of the ultimatum of May 24, 1919, and I wish to emphasize this—that all the men who have been so reemployed have been specially approved by order in council; all of them have given satisfactory assurance that the offence for which they were dismissed will not be repeated.

In respect of all the ninety-six men who were dismissed and are now back in the service there are orders in council; so far as I can ascertain the first of these orders is P.C. 1152, dated June 4, 1920, which reads as follows:

The committee of the privy council have had before them a report, dated 31st May, 1920, from the Secretary of State, submitting that the Civil Service Commission has recently received applications for positions in the civil service from ex-postal employees who participated in the sympathetic strike in western Canada in the spring of 1919. In accordance with the understanding arrived at by the government, as embodied in a memorandum forwarded to the Civil Service Commission by Senator Robertson on the 7th January, 1920, ex-postal employees are to be considered eligible for appointment to positions in the civil service, subject to certain conditions therein mentioned. The ex-postal employees mentioned in the attached list have complied with the conditions of this memorandum. The minister, therefore, recommends that authority be granted for the appointment of these candidates to positions for which they are eligible. The committee advise that the requisite authority be granted accordingly.

Mr. MANION: What is the date?

Mr. THORSON: June 4, 1920. That was the first order in council. I am told that similar orders in council were passed with regard to the men who have been taken back into the service from time to time. It will be

noticed, Mr. Speaker, that order in council P.C. 1152, to which I referred a moment ago, incorporated the memorandum to the Civil Service Commission of January 7, 1920, in which reference was made to only two conditions, first that re-employment should be subject to approval by order in council and secondly that the men should give satisfactory assurance that they would not again participate in a sympathetic strike. The other consequences of their re-employment followed by reason of defects in the Civil Service Act with regard to re-employment, which this bill is designed to correct.

Mr. POWER: May I ask a question?

Mr. THORSON: I have only forty minutes; I would like to finish this part of my argument and then I shall be glad to answer questions.

In all there are now 79 men in the Winnipeg post office who were dismissed by reason of their participation in the general strike. There are also a few such men at Saskatoon, Calgary and Vancouver. I should like the house to take note of the numbers in which these men came back into the service. Of the 79 men in Winnipeg 35 came back in 1920, a year after the strike; 11 came back in 1921, 10 in 1922, 14 in 1923, 6 in 1925 and one in each of the years 1926, 1927 and 1928.

I should like to point out also that the regulations regarding the re-employment of these men, which were framed in 1920, are still in force. The government in 1920 reserved to itself the right to determine whether or not a man should be re-employed in the federal service. That right is still reserved; this resolution does not affect it at all. The memorandum of January 7, 1920, proposed that appointments should be made only as vacancies occurred, and that these appointments should be made by the Civil Service Commission. This resolution is not intended to change that procedure in any way. There is not a single man in the employ of the Dominion government either in the Winnipeg post office or elsewhere who will be prejudiced in the slightest degree by effect being given to the resolution now before the house.

I have endeavoured to outline very briefly the steps which led to the dismissal of these postal employees and to the framing of the regulations for their re-employment. I commend the action of the government of that day, a Conservative government, in going as far as it did; I think it acted in a humanitarian way, but I have one criticism to offer. I think every member of this house will agree that the government of Canada should set an example for other employers of labour to follow, and I was very glad indeed to have for that proposition the approval of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Geary) who stated the other evening that the Dominion government should be a model employer. The Dominion government should at least be as fair to its employees as other employers of labour were to theirs. What happened? These men who were taken back into the employ of the government were in most cases, particularly in 1920 and 1921, put back at the identical work they had been doing previously; full use was made by the Dominion government of their training, their experience and their efficiency. This is not a case of rewarding these men for something they did not do but rather a case of paying them what they have already earned but have not received.

I have here a statement showing in detail with respect to the 79 men who were dismissed from the service by reason of their participation in the strike of 1919 and are now back on the staff of the Winnipeg post office, their length of service, their classification or rank and the salary they were receiving prior to their dismissal. Of these 79 men 20 had been in the service of the Post Office Department ten years or more at the time of their dismissal, and their average length of service was over eight years. I think that is proof that it was the trained, experienced, capable men who wanted to get back into the postal service and who were accepted into that service. This was the result of the policy of requiring approval by order in council in each case where these men were re-employed. Their classifications ranged from the lowest to the highest, from that of transfer agent to that of a comparatively high class clerk, and their salaries ranged all the way from $1,180 per year including bonus to $1,830 per year, including bonus.

Mr. MANION: That was before the strike?

Mr. THORSON: Yes. Yet what happened? These men were all taken back as new employees. Notwithstanding their length of service, their training, their experience, the fact that they were put to the same work after the strike as they had been doing before it, notwithstanding their classifications and the salaries they had been receiving, they were all taken back as new employees at the lowest grade in the postal service and at the minimum salary of the lowest grade. They did the same work, particularly those taken back in 1920 and 1921, after they were taken back into the service as they had been doing prior to their dismissal. Let me take as an example

the man whose name appears first on this list which I have before me. At the time of his dismissal he had served thirteen years in the Post Office Department; he occupied the rank of a high class clerk and received a salary of $1,830, including the bonus which was paid at that time. That man went on strike in May of 1919 and was taken back into the service on September 7, 1920. When he was taken back into the service he was placed at exactly the same work he had been doing previous to his dismissal; the value of his services to the state was just as great in 1920 as it had been in 1919! Why should he be paid differently? What happened to this man? He had been receiving $1,830 per year, which was the estimate which the state itself put upon his services, but when he came back he was taken on as a postal helper and paid $85 per month.

Mr. HEAPS: And doing the same work.

Mr. THORSON: And doing the same work which he had been doing. I appeal to the sense of justice and fair play which exists in the mind of every member of this house and ask them to say whether that was fair. Are we going to rest upon an imperfection in the law when that imperfection can be cured? I say that the government of the day should have gone further and done what other employers did, even if it meant an amendment of the existing law.

What does the resolution which is now before the house propose to do? Simply this: that the postal employees shall be paid by the Dominion of Canada for the services which they have rendered according to the value of such services. The principle of the resolution is this: that the Dominion government should do as other employers of labour did and recognize the fundamental principle, of which the Postmaster General spoke, that the labourer is worthy of his hire. The government should pay its postal employees in Winnipeg and elsewhere what they have actually already earned. That is all that was involved in the item in the supplementary estimates last year. That is the fundamental principle underlying this resolution and every member of the house can accept that principle as being sound and just.

Since the time at my disposal does not permit me to deal with it in detail, I shall deal very briefly with the argument of the hon. leader of the opposition. Why should not the Dominion government treat its former employees who went on strike as other employers of labour treated theirs? It was quite within the rights of the railway companies not to reemploy their striking conductors; likewise it was quite within the rights of the Dominion government not to reemploy its postal employees who had gone on strike. They both did so, however, and in so doing they acted in a humanitarian way. We commend the railway companies for acting as they did, and we commend the Dominion government for its action, but there is this great difference between the action of the Dominion government and the action of the private railway companies; when the railway companies took back their conductors and used them as conductors they paid them the wages of a conductor and not the wages of a wiper; they paid them the wages of a conductor because that was what they were worth to them. What did the Dominion government do? It took back its postal employees, used their training and experience, had the full benefit of their services to the state, and paid them as green hands. What did employers of labour generally do? The employers of carpenters, masons, mechanics and other skilled workmen reemployed their men who had gone on strike as they saw fit; it is quite true that not all of them were reemployed, but those who were reemployed were taken back at the current rate of wages—they were not paid as apprentices. Yet the Dominion government in all cases, regardless of the value of the services which these men were performing, paid them as green hands, as beginners in the service.

This resolution proposes to do two things; first of all, to pay these men as from the date of their re-employment the salary they would have received had they been taken back into the service at the salary they were receiving prior to their dismissal.

Mr. BENNETT: May I interrupt the hon. gentleman to ask a question?

Mr. THORSON: Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to ask it after my time has expired? The resolution proposes also to put the government in the position which it would have occupied had it followed the example of other employers of labour.

I should like to deal with one more point, since it has been raised. It has been said that the approval of this resolution involves a justification of the strike. When, a year ago, I was discussing the item in the supplementary estimates relating to this question, I said that I did not intend to discuss the merits or demerits of the general strike of

1919 in which these men had participated. I do not intend to do so to-day; I do not think that the merits or demerits of the strike are in any way involved in the great principle that the labourer is worthy of his hire, and that the Dominion government should pay for services rendered according to the value of such services. Whether the strike was right or wrong, if a man was worth a certain sum of money in 1919 before the strike, then in 1920, after the strike, when he was doing the same kind of work as he had been doing before, he was worth just as much then as he was worth before. That is all that is involved. He is the same man, the value of his services to the state are the same; the value of his services to the state did not decrease merely because he participated in a general strike, perhaps after being unwisely advised. I take the view, notwithstanding the editorial in the Free Press—for the editor of which I have a very high regard—that the questions involved in the general strike are in no way involved in this resolution. There is only one principle involved in this resolution. I have enunciated that principle several times.

May I refer, Mr. Speaker, to a precedent for the application of this general principle? I see no reason why this principle should be applied in the case of the Toronto strikers, who took part in the strike of 1924, and not applied in the case of the Winnipeg strikers, who took part in the strike of 1919. I know it will be said that in the case of the Toronto strikers the men were striking in respect of a grievance of their own and that in the case of the Winnipeg strike it was a sympathetic strike and the men had no grievance of their own. I do not agree that that is altogether so, but I have not time to deal with that argument at this stage of the discussion. After all, the principle is the same; the men went on strike contrary to the terms of an ultimatum similar to that delivered at Winnipeg, and they were dismissed from the service, as the Winnipeg men had been dismissed; they were re-employed as postal helpers, as the Winipeg men had been re-employed. Yet, on March 20, 1926, the Hon. Charles Murphy, who was then postmaster general, listened to the representations which were made on behalf of the Toronto strikers and applied to them the same principle which we are asking this house to apply to the Winnipeg strikers. That principle was this: that these men were doing the same kind of work as before the strike and they should be paid accordingly. Hon. Mr. Murphy ordered that the Toronto strikers who had been taken back should be paid as from the date of their re-employment the salary which they had been receiving at the time of their dismissal from the service. In this connection I should like to commend the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion). I think he has taken a very sympathetic attitude towards this question, and the principle that is involved. During the course of the election campaign of 1926 he paid us in Winnipeg a memorable visit which was much appreciated by many members on this side of the house. In the course of his visit to Winnipeg he had occasion, I believe, to meet a committee of the postal workers in the Winnipeg post office who had been dismissed because of their participation in the strike and who were back in the service. He was then Postmaster General, and I assume that in the attitude which he took towards that committee he was acting for the government of which he was then a member. The committee laid before him the facts of the Toronto strike: they explained to him the action which had been taken by the Hon. Charles Murphy, in 1926. I am told that the hon. member for Fort William in his capacity as Postmaster General told these men that, in his opinion, from the facts laid before him, their application should be and would be favourably considered if the government of which he was a member should be sustained at the forthcoming election.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. THORSON: Might I complete my statement?—and then if I have been incorrectly advised, I shall be glad to correct it. I am told further that he informed these men that he saw no reason why there should be any difference of treatment between the Toronto men and the Winnipeg men, and that if his government should be sustained he would give to the Winnipeg strikers the same favourable treatment as the Toronto strikers had received. I hope I am reporting accurately what took place on that occasion because I consider that the attitude he then took was eminently just and fair.

Mr. MANION: Unless I put the hon. gentleman right, I might be quoted later as having taken an attitude which I do not remember ever having taken. My attitude was this: I was asked to meet these men. I met them and listened to them. I told them that if we were returned to power the matter would be thoroughly discussed and that so far as I was concerned I would give it the fairest consideration I possibly could. I could not have promised them that they would be treated as the Toronto strikers were

treated; I could not have promised them anything because I was only one member of the government.

Mr. THORSON: I had hoped that the hon. member for Fort William would be willing to accept my version. I was informed as to what had taken place by persons whom I have reason to believe, and I thought the attitude he took on that occasion was eminently fair and just.

Mr. MANION: I think the attitude I took was eminently fair and just.

Mr. THORSON: Then I think I may agree with the hon. member in these remarks. After all, the principle is the same even though the causes of the strikes were different. The Dominion government is proposing to pay these men for services rendered; it does not intend to give them something for nothing. The position that we have taken all along in connection with this resolution is that these men have earned what we now propose to pay them.

This resolution may now affect directly only very few men, but it will be of interest to many because of the nature of the principle involved. We on this side of the house do not intend to limit our efforts to do full justice and to follow the example of other employers of labour by reason of imperfections in the law if we can correct those imperfections by an act such as we now propose to have passed with the consent of the house.

I should like to bring to the attention of the house another feature of the matter. Canada has taken a very prominent place in the International Labour Organization which has its office at Geneva. Anyone who has heard our Canadian representatives speak of Canada's attitude at Geneva in international labour matters must be proud of the part that she has played. If we are to continue our pride in Canada's achievements, in Canada's attitude in labour matters, how can we justify that pride if Canada is not willing to follow the example of other employers of labour in recognizing the fundamental principle that the labourer is worthy of his hire whether he went on strike or not; that services should be paid for according to their value?

When the Hon. Charles Murphy adjusted the salaries of the postal workers in Toronto in 1926, he had in mind the creation of greater harmony, greater cooperation between the government and its employees and increased efficiency in the public service. If this resolution is put into effect, I think it will pay handsome dividends to the public in the way of increased harmony, increased cooperation and greater efficiency of service. We should all like to hear the last of the Winnipeg strike in this house, but we shall not do so as long as there are grievances to be remedied and the men involved in that strike who are back in the service still have a grievance. The passing of this resolution will remove that grievance and we from Winnipeg ask the members of this house to assist us in writing the last chapter of that great strike. I hope, when that last chapter is written, it will be entitled "Justice to the postal employees of the Dominion government."

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman's time is up.

Mr. McGIBBON: Does the hon. member justify that strike? All his arguments would lead to that conclusion.

Mr. THORSON: Not at all. I say frankly to the house that I do not intend to discuss the merits or demerits of that strike. They are not involved in this matter in any way. I do not know what the final history of that strike will be.

Mr. McGIBBON: The merits and demerits are very much involved.

Motion agreed to on division and the house went into committee on the resolution, Mr. Marcil in the chair.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I move, Mr. Chairman, to strike out all the words after the word "revisions" in the fifth line of the resolution.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT: Just before the motion is put, I should like to ask the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre a question; I did not desire to interrupt him as his time was nearly up. I wonder if he realizes the effect of what he said. It may be described in the words of the right hon. the Prime Minister as giving effect to "a vicious principle." This parliament is now going to make a new contract with these men; that is all, and it applies retroactively. That is what we are doing. Are we going to do that also for the unfortunate mail courier who tenders for $1,000 and holds his contract on that basis for four years; then on the expiry of the contract and the calling of new tenders, finding there is much competition he tenders for $800 and gets the contract only because of that fact, whereas the evidence is that the contract is worth $1,000? Are we going to make up the $200 to him? My hon. friend says that the labourer is worthy of his hire. What about the unfortunate mail couriers? Are we going to make new contracts or not? Are we going to make their contracts retroactive because

the prices at which they tender are not adequate? Where is it all going to end? The labourer is worthy of his hire, the hon. gentleman says. Well, go and tell the men who receive from this government less than $100 a month that they are worthy of their hire. What about the 4,000 letter carriers, the mail carriers in the cities, carrying tons of mail each year? Are you going to make a new contract with them retroactively? They are worthy of their hire. Everybody agrees that their hire is not enough. Are we going to make it over again? That is what we are doing in this case. It is retroactive, and that is why I direct the attention of parliament to what is involved.

Mr. THORSON: That argument sounds very convincing at first blush, but not so convincing when it is more carefully analysed. No one on this side of the house has suggested that we are overpaying the lower paid servants.

Mr. BENNETT: We are suggesting that they are underpaid.

Mr. THORSON: The hon. leader of the opposition asks whether we are going to rewrite these contracts and make them retroactive. May I draw the attention of the committee to this distinction between these postal employees and the other classes of the service whom he mentions? The Dominion of Canada itself fixed the measure of the value of these men's services to the state by the salary they were receiving when they were dismissed; perhaps it was not correct, but the government did fix the value of their services, and we have that to proceed on. Is my hon. friend the leader of the opposition going to rely upon an imperfection in the law? He knows perfectly well that the only two conditions which were laid down for reemployment by Senator Robertson and the Hon. Mr. Blondin were these, that the men should renounce the principle of the sympathetic strike, and that they should be approved by order in council. The other two that followed, namely that they must be reexamined, and that they must enter the service as beginners, were legal consequences due to the fact that the Civil Service Act makes no provision for doing justice in cases of this sort. That is why those other two conditions became attached to the reemployment. I think that the Hon. Mr. Robertson and the Hon. Mr. Blondin would have received favourable comment from the public had they gone the whole way and said: We will do to you as other employers of labour are doing to their employees.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. MANION: The hon. gentleman mentioned that I met the strikers in Winnipeg during the last election campaign, and he is quite correct in that. I met them as one member of the cabinet and as Postmaster General of that day. I must confess frankly that I did not know the circumstances very fully, that I had but a very general knowledge of them. I met these men in the most friendly spirit, I listened to their story, but I heard only one side of the case. I repeat, I did not know the circumstances as well as I have since learned them. I have always felt very friendly toward labour, I have always desired and I desire now to take what is a fair-minded Christian attitude towards a group of men like this; I say that sincerely. My attitude towards them when I met them in Winnipeg was this, that I was only one member of the cabinet, that I could not definitely promise anything, because being only one I was subject to the opinion of the whole cabinet, but I promised that if we were returned to power I would give most fair consideration to their demands after looking thoroughly into the case. Naturally I had to hear the other side of the case before I could commit even myself to anything, let alone the rest of the government. I certainly intended if we were returned to power to give their case fair consideration, and certainly so far as I am concerned I am willing to go as far as most men in a case of this kind. We were not returned to power, and therefore it is up to this government to deal with the matter as they see best.

I submit that the proposition put forward by my leader is an eminently fair one. I do not wish to get into a discussion of the whole case, but while my hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre says that he will not discuss the strike, he will neither justify it nor condemn it, at the same time he is absolutely justifying the strike by the attitude he takes, because his proposition is to put these men back exactly as they would have been if the strike had never occurred at all.

Mr. THORSON: Not at all. I think the hon. member forgets that these men have lost their seniority rights by reason of their participation in the strike, and this resolution does not give them back any seniority rights whatsoever.

Mr. BENNETT: They could not retain their seniority rights because there was an interval of time during which they were not in the service.

Mr. THORSON: I understand that they are keeping their superannuation benefits, but

they have lost their seniority rights, so they are not being restored to exactly the same position they would have been in had they not gone on strike.

Mr. MANION: They lost their seniority rights by the very fact that they went on strike, and by putting them back with wages absolutely the same as if they had not gone on strike I submit that my hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre is justifying the strike. That is my feeling at all events; I do not wish to misinterpret the hon. gentleman's attitude; I want to be fair with regard to the whole matter.

I submit that the attitude taken by the leader of the opposition is a very fair one. It treats these men in the future as if they had not gone on strike, but for ten years they have been losing a certain amount of their wages. His attitude, in other words, is this, that they have been sufficiently punished by the loss of those wages in the past, and that we will now clean up the account, call it a thing of the past, and put these men in the position of receiving pay for the work they are doing. His attitude is that the men have been punished for the ten years during which they have lost a certain amount of their wages. For those ten years they have been paying for having gone out on a sympathetic strike on a matter with which they were not directly concerned. That is my impression of it. I think it would be a very reasonable compromise for my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to accept on behalf of the government, and I am entirely in accord with it. Of course, I cannot go further than that, but I think it would be treating the men fairly, and I have been advised by some people from Winnipeg that the men themselves would be really well satisfied if that attitude were taken by the house.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Will the hon. member permit a question? He is fully conversant with railway affairs. If, for example, the engineers on the Canadian Pacific Railway were to go on strike, and afterwards were reinstated, would they be given engineers' wages or wipers' wages?

Mr. MANION: Much as I would like to answer my hon. friend's question I am sorry that I cannot; I am not familiar enough with railway conditions to do so. But I do know that many men engaged by private corporations are never taken back after going on strike.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre tell us how much on an average these men lost in wages before going back to work?

Mr. THORSON: I have not computed that. I have a statement of when they were taken back into the service, and I gave the figures of how many came back in the respective years. Thirty-five came back, for example, in 1920, eleven in 1921, ten in 1922, fourteen in 1923, six in 1925, and one in each of the years 1926, 1927 and 1928. I have not been able to compute the amount that they lost in those intervals. Some were out of the service for nine years, others for only a year or so.

Mr. MARCIL: During that time they received no wages at all?

Mr. THORSON: I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. VENIOT: Oh no, they were not entitled to any.

Mr. MACDONALD (Cape Breton): Perhaps the member for Winnipeg South Centre would help me to clear up a difficulty. I am sympathetic to labour, but I am not quite clear as to what is intended. The member mentioned one case of a man who was receiving $1,830 a year. He was taken back in 1920, the year after, at only $1,020. That man lost $810 a year.

Mr. THORSON: Perhaps that is not quite correct. The $1,830 included bonus. I think the bonus in his case would be $430.

Mr. VENIOT: It was $420.

Mr. MACDONALD (Cape Breton): We will say he was receiving $1,830, and was taken back at a salary of $1,020—a loss of $810 a year. He has been on duty ever since. I suppose he has received some raises during the ten years.

Mr. THORSON: Yes, that particular man has reached his maximum again.

Mr. MACDONALD (Cape Breton): Is it proposed to pay that man at the rate of $1,830 during all those years?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. THORSON: Yes, that is the proposition, less the bonus.

Mr. MACDONALD (Cape Breton): That is the idea?

Mr. THORSON: Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: That is the principle on which it is being worked out.

Mr. THORSON: This particular man has now reached his maximum of $1,740, which happens to be less than the maximum he was receiving originally.

Mr. MACDONALD (Cape Breton): But it would be figured out on that line?

Mr. THORSON: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: This man was out of employment for a year?

Mr. THORSON: It is not proposed to pay for the period during which these men were out of employment.

Mr. MARCIL: He was penalized to that extent.

Mr. BENNETT: He was not penalized. We should like to have the number of men affected; the salaries each one was receiving, less bonus; and what is meant by the observation with respect to legal expenses mentioned in the Free Press editorial.

Mr. VENIOT: There will be absolutely no consideration of legal expenses so far as the department is concerned. When I went to Winnipeg in 1927 this committee of twenty-five did have a legal gentlemen with them. I would not listen to him at all. I told the men they would have to state their case without any legal gentleman interfering. I did not want any legal gentleman to put anything over on me or on any of the men.

Mr. CLARK: You did not want to have any real justice around you?

Mr. VENIOT: I do not admit that legal gentlemen are always—what shall I say?—the personification of real justice. The information the hon. leader of the opposition asks for can be procured. I am sorry that I cannot get it this evening.

Mr. BENNETT: I certainly want to know what is involved financially in this proposal.

Mr. VENIOT: Roughly speaking, between $120,000 and $125,000.

Mr. BENNETT: I want to know how it is made up. That is not an unreasonable request.

Mr. GLEN: Mr. Chairman, I had intended to take part in the discussion on the resolution, but I was getting some information at the time and the resolution was carried before I had an opportunity to intervene in the debate.

I wish to put myself on record with regard to this proposed settlement with the postal workers at Winnipeg. So far as I can understand the argument of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, it is based purely on the question of what in law we call "quantum meruit," namely, that these postal strikers are entitled to wages for the period from their re-employment until to-day at the rate they were paid before the strike, and that they would be entitled to any raise that is usual in the service. He puts forward that as a very good argument in law. But, if I understand my law correctly, quantum meruit is usually invoked where there is no contract between the parties—

Mr. BENNETT: Not usually, but always.

Mr. GLEN: Yes; and therefore you must take into account the surrounding circumstances of the employment and then fix the amount of compensation accordingly. I think that is a correct statement of the law. But in this case there has been a contract between the postal employees and the department. That contract was based on an order in council, and whether or not the order injected two other provisions than those that were contained in the memorandum submitted by the Hon. Gideon Robertson, nevertheless the fact is that these postal employees entered into that contract knowing the effect of the conditions contained therein.

I saw a good deal of merit in the argument submitted by the leader of the opposition, and perhaps I would go a little further than he did, that in the recognition of these postal workers you are not merely compensating them for what they have done, but you are recognizing a principle which I do not think any government can afford to recognize, namely, that employees of the state should have the right to strike. If I say that the police, or the army or the navy, have not the right to strike, the same principle must apply also to these postal workers. I do submit that in the circumstances of the strike, more especially as has been admitted by my hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre the men had no grievance—those were his words—but because they happened to be affiliated with the Trades and Labour Council—

Mr. THORSON: I do not admit that they had no grievance.

Mr. GLEN: I took a note of my hon. friend's words, and Hansard will correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. THORSON: I am correcting my hon. friend now.

Mr. GLEN: It is only a small point. You say they had some grievance. But at all events it was a sympathetic strike with others affiliated with the Trades and Labour Council. I cannot for many reasons support this re-

solution. I take the position that no government can afford to deal lightly or negligently with the tremendous principle involved, namely, the question of the public service. I realized when in Manitoba how throughout the country we were all affected by this strike. The whole of the postal service was disorganized, and, in the country of which I can speak, they were entirely hostile to all the principles involved in that strike. Having experienced the effects of the strike, and coming now to the question of settlement, there is not a man either in this house or elsewhere who would not wish that these postal strikers should be sympathetically dealt with. But unfortunately individuals must suffer in the general application of law; for no law ever was evolved whereby everyone benefits: in the application of the law some hardship is suffered by individuals. Now these individuals took upon themselves to enter a strike and they have been penalized. I am not going to deal at any length with all that has been said by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) or by my hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Thorson), but I take this postion: In view of the fact that these men had twice an opportunity to go back, which opportunity was not accepted; that they then had a meeting with the Hon. Gideon Robertson; that a memorandum was submitted to the government of the day admitting that they had seen the gravity of their offence, and that when the reinstatement took place they entered into a contract wherein they undertook to perform the services which they had formerly rendered on the condition laid down in the Civil Service Act, namely, that they were really new entrants into the postal service—a contract which they knew at the time carried only that minimum wage of the lower grade—and that they were satisfied to go back into the service on these terms, I must take the ground that, having done so, they must now suffer the consequences. Like the leader of the opposition however, and for the sake of compromise in the settlement of what is a very vexed question throughout the west and in Manitoba particularly, I think the bill might be amended so that these men who are receiving benefits to-day should also receive that seniority which would entitle them to further benefits. That would be a gracious act. I know it is in the very spirit of compromise. Of course, we cannot always be strictly logical in these matters, and I am glad to see the leader of the opposition taking that point of view, although the other night he was not so keen for it. I do think, however, that in this case a compromise might be accepted by the postal workers in Winnipeg, recognizing them in the position they now occupy. The heat and passionate feeling in relation to that strike have to a large extent evaporated. No one wishes to revive those feelings. On the other hand, certainly no one wishes to create a precedent which will enable persons in the service in the future to come to parliament and say, "You did this for the strikers of 1919; you reinstated them, recompensing them for the loss of wages. And now we wish also to have that precedent considered as a basis for a similar claim in our behalf". If a precedent were created, strikers in the future would feel entitled to come to parliament and seek to have that precedent invoked to their advantage. I think it might be well for the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) to take into consideration the proposal that has been put forward. Certainly if the matter goes through in the form intended I shall vote against it.

Mr. McGIBBON: Like others who have spoken with reference to this bill, I am sympathetic so far as certain parts of it are concerned. I too think that the time is coming, in fact it is here, when, in the words of Lord Robert Cecil, we must get away from the war mind. No doubt until this time a great many members of this house would have opposed this bill in its entirety, and the fact that the leader of the opposition and many others on this side of the house have gone as far as they have is, I think, evidence on the part of the people of this country that, more or less, bygones should be bygones and that as far as possible peace and harmony should be restored.

At the same time I must agree with the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Glen) and the leader of the opposition. The leader of the opposition has gone a great way in compromising to the extent he has; because, try as we may, we cannot dissociate this question from the cause of the Winnipeg strike. It is all very well for any hon. member to say he will not discuss the merits of the strike, that he does not wish to discuss it, that he does not wish either to justify or to condemn it. So say we all; we do not even like to raise the question. But when you are wiping out the penalty entirely as we are here doing, and putting these men back in the status they would have had if they had never gone on strike, we are by that very act justifying their course in striking; we are saying that what they did in 1919 was right and that the conditions laid down by parliament and in the order in council which has been read here were wrong. We are saying that parliament

made a mistake, that the people who condemned the strikers at that time were mistaken, and that the strikers were justified in all they did. That is an attitude which I do not think this country will take; I do not think we can afford to take it.

I agree with the hon. member for Marquette that there are certain services in this country the employees in which we cannot allow at any time to take the position that they can strike even if they have grievances. And the postal service is one of these. The business of the country must go on, and employees in this particular branch of the government service, if they have grievances, must seek a remedy by some other method than strikes. Consequently I, with others, should like to appeal to the Prime Minister (Mr. MacKenzie King) to accept the suggestion which has come from the leader of the opposition. Many of us believe that we have gone a considerable distance in the direction of compromise, and I think the government might meet the wishes of those on this side of the house and at the same time remove the question for all time from the sphere of politics. If the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) is right in what he says—and I have no doubt he is—that he has been informed that the men will be quite satisfied with such a compromise, surely there can be no objection to parliament unanimously adopting it. As one who is always very sympathetic with labour but yet feels that he must uphold justice in this country and the actions of parliament, as well as respect for the laws of the land, I again appeal to the Prime Minister and his cabinet to accept the suggestion of the leader of the opposition and to withdraw the matter from the political realm.

Mr. HOWDEN: There has been a rumour recently that some of the men in Winnipeg have a different attitude towards the situation of the postal employees of that city from that which they entertained a little while ago. I merely wish to say that when this matter was before the house last year I was entirely in support of it and I have not had occasion to change my attitude in the least. I am heartily in favour of this bill. I do not believe my support of this measure will bring any particular advantage to myself; I know it is criticized quite severely in Manitoba, nevertheless I think it eminently fair that these men should be paid for the work they did, and I am entirely in favour of seeing them so paid. I believe these men of whom we are speaking now are the only men connected with that strike or with any other strikes which have taken place since who have not been fully reinstated. I do not see why we should discriminate against these post office employees in Winnipeg and for that reason, without delaying the house further, I repeat that I am heartily in support of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not desire to delay this measure, but on the other hand we are entitled to definite, positive information as to what is involved in dollars and cents. I want to know how many employees were affected and when they came back into the service. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre seems to know more about this question than the Postmaster General, and he says there are 79 men in Winnipeg. How many are there at other points?

Mr. VENIOT: There are 96 all told.

Mr. BENNETT: Where are they?

Mr. VENIOT: Calgary, and I think Saskatoon.

Mr. BENNETT: There was a case in Calgary to which I should like to direct the attention of the committee. There was a man who served in the South African war and who later became an employee in the Calgary post office; he was a letter sorter, I believe, and supported his wife and small family. He went out on the sympathetic strike and then had to leave the country, because there were no vacancies and he could not get a job. He went to California, but before leaving he saw me and explained the situation. He had purchased some property; they placed a mortgage on that property and as far as I know they have not returned to Canada, unless they have done so within the last few months. That man lost his job because he went out on the sympathetic strike, and there were no vacancies which he could fill. The result is that so far as the public service is concerned he is done for; he is getting old and his eyesight is failing.

On the other hand the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre referred to a man in Winnipeg who was re-employed by the Post Office department more than a year after the strike, I believe sometime in the fall of 1920. A vacancy occurred; he passed the examination, was selected for the position and entered the service at a certain rate of pay. There is a fact which it seems to me must not be overlooked; that man need not have re-entered the service at that rate of pay had he not desired to do so. Being twenty-one years of age and a man of experience, without the least coercion being applied he agreed

to accept that position. We are told by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre that before the strike this man was receiving $1,830 with the bonus, and I should like to know what salary he received at the time he left the service, exclusive of the bonus.

Mr. THORSON: I think the bonus amounted to $430.

Mr. BENNETT: Then he would be receiving $1,400, and he re-entered the service at $1,020.

Mr. THORSON: I believe the wages of a postal helper were about $85 per month.

Mr. VENIOT: I think the rate was $720, without the bonus.

Mr. BENNETT: Then when he went back in 1920, what did he get? I understand that there were 79 cases in Winnipeg, one or two cases in Calgary and some in Saskatoon, making a total of 96. Now I want to know when these men being over twenty-one years of age went to work under a definite contract with the state, a contract which they made freely and voluntarily, without threat, without duress, without misrepresentation and without coercion; a contract under which they agreed to work for so many dollars a month. I want to know the dates when they went back to work, how many increases they have received since that time, and how many of these men are now receiving the maximum salaries of their classes. That is, how many of these men have had their services recognized according to the provisions of the Civil Service Act so that they have reached the maximum of their class? That is important, because if they have been promoted that shows a recognition of their meritorious services, and there is nothing to indicate that those promotions were not based upon their efficiency in the light of their experience. In other words, we do not want to do this thing twice. These promotions have been obtained on the certificate of their superior officer, who certifies upon his honour, without regard to political or other considerations that such and such a man has rendered meritorious service and is entitled to his increase. I want to know how many of these men have reached their maximums and are receiving what they would have received had they never terminated their employment with the state. In my opinion it is important that we have this information.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask the hon. gentleman if the prospect of starvation for a man and his wife and family is not a species of duress?

Mr. BENNETT: The answer to that question is that in this country, where it is alleged that unemployment is unknown—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Does the hon. gentleman believe that?

Mr. BENNETT: No, I do not, but I say that allegation is made. I see no reason for believing that any man, by reason of fear of starvation for himself and his family, would be driven to a particular kind of work unless he were willing to do that work; before going back to work he must have taken into consideration all these factors which have been mentioned. Then there is a further answer which suggests itself, and which is very simple: Why did he not think of that when he refused to go back to work? He had two chances to return but he refused them both; he had not one but two opportunities for repentance but he did not avail himself of either.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Possibly he thought he was standing out for a fundamental principle.

Mr. BENNETT: Even assuming that to be so, he must suffer the consequences of so standing out, and one consequence was that he went back to work under this new contract.

There is just one observation which I cannot permit to pass unchallenged. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre keeps dwelling upon the fact that a man should receive compensation in proportion to the service rendered, but let me put another proposition to this house. Take the case of a new man standing by, doing his job without complaint; he had broken no contract and had dislocated no service. Perhaps he was a returned soldier, since many of the employees taken on at that time were returned men. Then another man reenters the service; he had broken his contract with the state; he had dislocated the service, and now he stands side by side with that other man, as a beginner under a contract into which he entered freely and voluntarily. So we have two beginners, A and B; one had broken no contract, had participated in no sympathetic strike and had done nothing to disturb the service of the country. They worked together, and it is said that one could and did do more work than the other, but they were both paid at the same rate. I know of no place in the world, in any kind of employment, where that condition is not found. There is always one man who does a little more, and he is the man who usually emerges as superintendent, as foreman or perhaps as president of the organization. But now we are told that we are to make a new contract for

one man but not for the other, regardless of the services which have been rendered by this other new man, who is ambitious, who has been toiling hard and who wants to get on in the world; we are to make a new contract with the other man while we do nothing for the man to whom I have referred.

In the absence of any evidence to show how many there are, I would like to have some particulars, perhaps in the form of a schedule —I do not care about the names, they can be numbered 1, 2, and so on—which would show what number are involved. One man went to work last year and one the year before, and I should like to know what is going to be done about them. Three men came in during last three years; is one man to get an increase of pay for nine years, another man for one year, another for two years and another for three years; is that the idea?

Mr. VENIOT: He could not get any increase in pay if he had not worked.

Mr. BENNETT: We are going to make a new contract to increase the pay of a man who went to work in 1920 regardless of the fact that during that nine years his meritorious service has been certified to by his superior officer according to the provisions of the Civil Service Act. The Postmaster General knows the provision of the certificate, which is, "I certify on my honour, regardless of political considerations, that this man"—giving the name—"has rendered meritorious service which entitles him to receive this added pay." Those certificates exist with relation to a large number of the men, but I want to know how many. We cannot follow what is involved in this resolution unless we have some idea of what it means with respect to individuals and pay. The Postmaster General says that the sum involved is small and that the proper place to discuss this resolution is in committee, on the bill, but once we give a second reading to the bill we have committed ourselves to the principle of it, and that principle is the payment of a sum of money. I want to know how much money the treasury will have to pay to carry out a new contract which will be made by the Dominion of Canada with ninety-six of its employees.

Every service for the state is either by an implied or by an express contract. In an express contract the terms are mentioned; in an implied contract one is enabled to recover on a quantum meruit. We had an illustration of that in connection with a dredging contract with the Public Works department under which certain services were rendered. It was said that the classification was entirely different from that under which the tender had been made and therefore that the contractor was entitled to a further sum of money because of the services rendered. We are now making a new contract on a quantum where there is an express contract outstanding, and I should like to know under what principle we are justified in making that new contract. I should like to have these particulars from the Postmaster General before I give my further assent on division to this resolution going up.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BENNETT: I was asking the minister for information. He has just shown me a portion of a schedule which I have not had time to analyse, and he has not a copy of it.

Mr. VENIOT: This is the original. I can let the hon. gentleman have it.

Mr. BENNETT: The point is this and I cannot make it too clear: these men were employed at a given salary. The salary which they received prior to their dismissal by reason of their going on a sympathetic strike, was in some instances a smaller salary than that which they received when they went back. I noticed on the list which the minister showed me, the case of a man who had been receiving $704 and who was reappointed at a salary of $780.

Mr. THORSON: I think that list, of which I had a copy, does not show the salary of the postal employee at the time of his re-entry into the service.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, it does.

Mr. THORSON: It shows his present salary.

Mr. BENNETT: No, it shows his salary on reappointment and not his present salary. The information I seek is this: what is his present salary? By what amount has it been increased since he joined the service. In making that increase did his superior officer not have regard to his meritorious service during the period of his employment, and by reason of his wider experience did not receive a higher recommendation for meritorious service than he otherwise would, so that he is now receiving a salary based upon meritorious service regard being had for the years he served and no attention being paid to the fact that he was reengaged in what-

ever year it was after he had gone out on strike and applied for reemployment? That is vital to the whole question. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre will realize that. If the situation is as I suggest it is in that particular case, the man is not entitled to anything. The minister has under his hand a schedule which shows that one man is entitled to $1,937. That man is to get $1,937 and he has stood side by side with a man who came in with him who gets nothing at all except the statutory increase. That man gets $1,937 for going on strike. That is the principle to which this parliament is giving its approval.

Mr. VENIOT: That man was a postal clerk, class 2A, $1,400. When he came back after the strike his salary was reduced to $840. He came in about the first of the year, 1921. From that date to the end of March he received $11,666. He was doing the same work as prior to the strike, and had there been no change, he would have received $13,806. That makes a difference, allowing for arrears of bonus for the months of April and May, of $1,937.22 that he would get under this measure. I have under my hand as complete a list as I have been able to get—and I think it is complete, especially in regard to the Winnipeg employees—of every individual that went out on strike and came back, the date he came back, the salary he was receiving when he went out, the salary he received when he came back, and the amount that he will now receive according to this bill. The amount ranges from a maximum of $1,937.22 to a minimum of $250.

Mr. BENNETT: What would it be in the case of an employee who went back to work last year? The employee who went back last year is going to get $200 more than the man who came in last year.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, but do not lose sight of this fact. That man is doing high grade work—

Mr. BENNETT: But he has not done it for seven or eight years.

Mr. VENIOT: But he passed the examination and qualified and is put at high class work, although he is only being paid for low grade work. He is qualified for the higher grade.

Mr. BENNETT: Could anything more clearly illustrate the iniquity—if I might use the term?—of this thing. Here are two men who joined the postal service in Winnipeg last year. One of them eight years ago went on strike and he has not been working for eight years in the postal service, but having passed an examination he goes back and is reengaged. So is the other man who had never been in the postal service at all. They go in together, and one gets $200 handed to him by this parliament; the other gets nothing, and the man who gets the $200 is the man who went on strike, the man who abandoned the postal service and left the people of Winnipeg without postal conveniences. He had a contract. Now the government is going to make a new one with him because nine years ago he worked for the government.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Will they both be doing the same work?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. McINTOSH: They would not have the same experience.

Mr. BENNETT: No, and that is the only argument that can be used. One is a new man, and the other has had some experience —some experience in striking, my hon. friend from Fort William says. That is the reason I want this information.

Mr. BANCROFT: The other man may have struck for another purpose.

Mr. BENNETT: He struck the trail if that is what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. VENIOT: That first man is now drawing his maximum of $1,740.

Mr. BENNETT: Before we get away from that—I am coming back to the maximum—I trust that this house realizes how serious the situation is. Here are two men who go into the service last year, in 1927 or 1928—last year, the minister says—and now one is going to get handed to him $200, less legal expenses.

Mr. POWER: I would like to ask the hon. leader of the opposition a question for information, for I frankly admit that I have not understood this thing yet. Take the case cited by the hon. leader of the opposition, where two men come into the postal service say a year ago to-day. One had never been in the postal service in his life, and the other had been a striker. The striker gets the same salary as the other man, but if I understand the position taken by the Postmaster General, he is placed in a much higher position; he does work which under other circumstances would entitle him to receive, we will say, $1,800 instead of $720. If those are the facts I can form some judgment, but if I am wrong I do not understand any more about it than I did when we started.

Mr. VENIOT: May I be allowed to give an example? A new man comes in as a porter. His job is to carry bags, empty them out, prepare the mail for those who do the more advanced work. He gets a salary of $780. The striker who comes in at the same time, say a year or two ago, gets the same, $780 or $840, whatever the figure may be, but the striker does not empty the bags or carry them. He goes to a more advanced position, that of sorter, one of the most important positions, because when he was there before that is the work he did, and for that work he was getting a great deal more salary than the helper.

Mr. BENNETT: But is that this case?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: I want the facts. The man who joined last year—

Mr. VENIOT: He went to a higher position—

Mr. BENNETT: What position did he go to?

Mr. VENIOT: He would likely go—

Mr. BENNETT: Not likely, what did he do? We are talking about actualities, not theory. What did he do, that one man?

Mr. VENIOT: If my hon. friend will name one—

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre said that one joined last year, one the year before, and one in 1926. Is that correct?

Mr. THORSON: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Those names are there on the record; I do not know them. One joined in 1926, one in 1927, one in 1928. Their pay was so-and-so. I want to know what work these men actually did and what they were classified as, not in theory, but in real practice—their names and what they did. Then I can form some judgment.

Mr. POWER: I think the house is entitled to that information.

Mr. BENNETT: And yet one of those men is going to get $200 presented to him. I want to know what it is for.

Mr. THORSON: I think I can perhaps give some information. I do not know these three particular individuals by name, but the three men in question would each go back and be graded as postal helpers. That was the only grade in which they could get back into the service.

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. POWER: Then he got the pay of his grade.

Mr. THORSON: No, that is the point. He did not get the pay of his grade. The official grade that he occupied was that of postal helper, no matter what he was doing. I know of one case where a man who was an ex-striker had supervision over four or five other persons, all of whom were getting higher salaries than he was, but he was graded as a postal helper because that was the only grade into which he could be admitted.

Mr. POWER: That supervisory position must have been classified somewhere under the act.

Mr. THORSON: No. He was doing the work of a superviser, but his official grade under the civil service appointment was that of postal helper.

Mr. POWER: If he is classified, he should get the salary of his classification.

Mr. THORSON: He was graded as a postal helper, but he might be doing all sorts of work demanding higher qualifications.

Mr. VENIOT: Take a clerk who is classified as a mail clerk. He arrives at the point where he may be supervising five or six other clerks under him, and yet he does not get the salary of a supervising clerk. He is placing himself in a position where he may be promoted to the position of supervising clerk. While that is the name of the position he is occupying, he has not the salary of a supervising clerk.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend says that he may be classified as a supervising clerk. He does not say he was.

Mr. VENIOT: He has the opportunity of promotion to that position.

Mr. MANION: What I am trying to get at is this. The strike was in 1919. A man who has been out of the service for nine years goes back. In that time, might he not have so completely forgotten the work that he would have to start in the same position as a beginner?

Mr. VENIOT: I have a case in point, that of a man going into the service in 1926. There was a vacancy for the position of clerk. This man passed the examination and had the qualifications just the same as the position called for in 1919. He classified for the position by passing the examination. That was Samuel Woolson. He was receiving $1,630 before, and is now receiving $1,320.

Mr. MANION: Receiving a salary of $1,320 with what classification? Is that the salary of the position for which he passed the examination?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, it is in this case.

Mr. BENNETT: What is he going to get out of this fund?

Mr. VENIOT: $1,336. But he has been in now going on four years. The minimum since he went out has been increased in that lower class.

Mr. BENNETT: In 1926 there was a vacancy in the Winnipeg post office. It was advertised. Among the applicants for that position was one who seven years before had been employed in the post office, namely, in 1919. He was awarded the position, and now he is going to be given by this parliament $1,336. At the same time there was another vacancy, which was filled by another applicant who had not formerly been employed in the post office service. That applicant has received his statutory increases, but will get nothing more.

Mr. VENIOT: He is not in such a high grade.

Mr. BENNETT: That is exactly what we ask the minister. He has given the name of the man. What work was he doing?

Mr. VENIOT: Mail clerk.

Mr. BENNETT: What was the other man? There were other vacancies for mail clerks in 1926.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not see any.

Mr. BENNETT: There were in other parts of the country—we will put it that way. Then we say, because a man seven years ago worked at a job in the post office, he is now to get $1,300 out of the people of Canada by reason of the fact that seven years ago when he was working he went on strike. That is what parliament is doing.

Mr. THORSON: If he is capable of doing the same work that he was doing in 1919, why should he not be so paid?

Mr. BENNETT: But he passed the examination. The Civil Service have given him his rating, in accordance with the examination on the application for the job.

Mr. THORSON: As postal helper. That was the only thing he could get.

Mr. BENNETT: As mail clerk in the post office.

Mr. THORSON: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Pardon me. Will the minister say what salary he got?

Mr. THORSON: I have this man's name here.

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the house will quite agree that I must look to the minister for this information, much as I should like to get assistance from my hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre. Coming events may cast their shadows behind, not before.

Mr. VENIOT: I might say to my hon. friend that while this is quite complicated,—

Mr. BENNETT: It is not complicated.

Mr. VENIOT: —I cannot see that he is making any point, comparing this man coming in with his previous experience of eight or nine years in the service with the new man coming in under examination, because no new man comes in under a grade of that kind. He must come in as a postal helper, and consequently can only be graded as such. He begins at the bottom of the ladder and works up, whereas the other man has to pass an examination as to whether he is fit for the class he was in before. But he does not get the salary of that class. He gets four hundred dollars less.

Mr. BENNETT: We are not going to take generalities, but actualities. We are going to take this case of 1926. The man's name was?

Mr. VENIOT: Samuel Woolson.

Mr. BENNETT: There was a vacant position, I understand, and he applied for it. Did he write on the examination?

Mr. THORSON: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Thank you.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Having written on the examination, he was appointed to the position was he?

Mr. POWER: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Wait a minute.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. VENIOT: He was appointed at the minimum salary of $1,080.

Mr. BENNETT: But what examination did he pass?

Mr. VENIOT: He passed the examination for postal clerk, because they put him at that work.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not the point. What examination did he pass?

Mr. VENIOT: The civil service examination.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly. The same as any other applicant for a position in the service?

Mr. VENIOT: The only difference was the age limit.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. What position was advertised?

Mr. VENIOT: Postal clerk—no, postal helper.

Mr. BENNETT: Were there several applicants?

Mr. VENIOT: I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT: We will have to know. We are going to get down to the reason. The Prime Minister was not in when I began to deal with this case.

Mr. VENIOT: There would be several applicants.

Mr. BENNETT: Seven years after the strike there was a vacancy. It was advertised. One of the applicants was Samuel Woolson, one of the striking employees of 1919. To him the position was awarded. He received $1,080 as a starter. That was the salary stated in the advertisement for the class of position vacant when the civil service asked for applicants. According to the minister, that man in this year of grace, 1928, will receive some $1,300; whereas any other person that passed the same examination, and might have been appointed to the same position, would get nothing but the statutory increase. In other words, seven years ago, Woolson had experience, now he has none.

Mr. VENIOT: Oh, yes, he has.

Mr. BENNETT: He had seven years of no experience.

Mr. VENIOT: No.

Mr. BENNETT: He had seven years without experience.

Mr. VENIOT: Without working. It does not follow that he would have forgotten all his past experience.

Mr. BENNETT: He had seven years in which he had not worked as a postal clerk.

Mr. THORSON: May I ask the hon. member a question? If he drops out of legal practice for seven years is he going to forget all his law?

Mr. BENNETT: I know some gentlemen who are very emphatic in saying that in much less than seven years a man forgets a great deal of his legal education. I think most lawyers will say that if they retired from the practice of law for seven years they would not care to resume it without a good deal of study.

Mr. THORSON: Would not such a man be better than a law student?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, but not as good as a new student at law.

Mr. BANCROFT: Would he charge less for his services?

Mr. BENNETT: He might and he might not. It has been published in the newspapers in Winnipeg that 20 per cent of this sum is going to the lawyers.

Mr. HEAPS: That is the trade union rate.

Mr. BENNETT: Among lawyers?

Mr. HEAPS: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: I am bound to say that has not been my experience. I would be much better off if it had been. Let me proceed. I trust the minister realizes where this leads to. A given number of men all pass the same examination. One, because seven years ago he was at that job, is a little more proficient in it than somebody else.

Mr. THORSON: Therefore worth more.

Mr. BENNETT: And, my hon. frend says, therefore worth more. The notice was posted up showing what the salary would be. His contract with the civil service was, just as the minister mentioned, $1,080. Now this parliament is going to make a new contract and give that man $1,300; but, the man who went into similar service in some other part of Canada, a man who was not a striker, a man of as good education as Woolson, is not going to get anything extra.

Mr. VENIOT: My hon. friend is losing sight of the fact that, although Woolson passed the examination and went in at the minimum salary of $1,080, he was not put to do the work of that class, but the work of a postal clerk. His experience before the strike qualified him for that higher grade and although, as the agreement said, he had to go in as a beginner, he took the examination and went in at $1,080 a year. But knowing that he was classified for this higher grade they put him to do that work although he did not receive the salary of the higher grade. And he has continued to do such work during the last four and a half years. That is how the difference is made up as between the work he did and the salary he got.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes; but when the minister says he did the work he must go further than that. Now, Sam Woolson reported for duty. What did he do?

Mr. VENIOT: They put him in as a clerk and—

Mr. BENNETT: What did he start at?

Mr. VENIOT: He started as a postal helper; he graded as a postal helper.

Mr. BENNETT: When he reported for duty what did he do?

Mr. VENIOT: He started on sortation work and that is one of the important duties But he did not get paid at all for sortation work.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the minister say that of his own knowledge—that that man started sorting the day he went to work?

Mr. VENIOT: I do not say it of my own knowledge but from information given me by the officials.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the record show that?

Mr. VENIOT: I do not know whether it does or not.

Mr. BENNETT: Then the minister must not say that, because he is assuming a case which the record does not show. That is why I have asked the minister with reference to this particular case, which is in point. Sam Woolson answered the advertisement. The salary was $1,080. Sam went to work at that salary of $1,080 and then he received the statutory increases. The minister says the postmaster put him at other work than that which ordinarily a clerk would do. Well, I want to know what he reported for; what he did; when he was changed; in other words, I want the history of that man's job up to this year; because it is proposed to give him $1,300, more than that given the man who stood at the desk beside him and who came in the same day.

Mr. VENIOT: That man did not stand at the desk beside him but in a lower class or grade.

Mr. BENNETT: What evidence have you of that?

Mr. VENIOT: He was not entitled to stand at that desk.

Mr. BENNETT: Once more the minister is building a case on what he says should be. I want to know what is.

Mr. VENIOT: I will tell you what is: A man going in entirely new could not stand beside this man who, although going in anew, carried with him his past experience. They were in different classes, working in different sections of the building.

Mr. BENNETT: But the minister has no evidence; he is speaking of what is going to be.

Mr. VENIOT: That is what took place, and I know it.

Mr. BENNETT: We can easily send a telegram and satisfy the minister. The minister's story is that Sam Woolson, in response to an advertisement by the Civil Service Commission, passed an examination successfully and was awarded a position in the Winnipeg post office. Is that right?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: What was the position, may I ask, to which Sam Woolson was appointed?

Mr. VENIOT: To be positively sure we should have to look at the record.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course, and that is what I want to know; because it makes all the difference in the world. What did Sam do when he went to work?

Mr. VENIOT: From what I see in the record he would start on sortation.

Mr. BENNETT: This is really so important that the facts should be before us. Before the house resumed the minister showed me the documents containing the list of these employees and I had just time enough to look down the page. However, I have taken one case, in 1926, and I am now asking to what work this man was put after he was appointed to the position. The minister says he reported for duty but he cannot be certain what the man went to work to do. I want to know: What did he do when he reported? How long did he remain in that position? What did he next do? When was he appointed to a different position? When did he attain to the position which the minister says, had he never left the service, would have enabled him to receive $1,300—more than someone else is getting. These are the questions I should like to have answered and I do not think they will be considered unfair.

Mr. POWER: I have no knowledge of what happened in Winnipeg, but to my misfortune I do know something of the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission, and I know that no man may enter the employ of the Post Office Department now except

as a postal helper. In the old days there were examinations for mail clerks and clerks grade 1, grade 2, grade 3 and so forth—examinations open to the public. At the present time these examinations are open only to those who wish to apply for the position of postal helper. Consequently every one of these men, as he returned to the employ of the Post Office Department, became a postal helper; he answered the advertisement for the position of postal helper, carrying a salary of $1,080. As these men entered the post office it was found by the postmaster or by their superior officers that they might, with advtantage and with a view to efficient service, be placed in one of the higher grades, say that of mail clerk, sortation clerk, clerk of grade 1, 2 or 3, and so forth, to none of which positions they could apply through the Civil Service Commission by examination; they had to go in by the lowest grade, so to speak. So that when their superior officers found that they could actually do that work—if the information I have gathered from this discussion is correct—they were placed in these positions—let us say in the position of sortation clerk which would carry with it a salary of say $1,500 or $1,600. So that for the past three or four years, as the case may be, these men although they entered the service at $1,080, with whatever statutory increases they received, presumably $60, have been doing work which under other circumstances would be carried on by men earning $1,600. And the purpose of this bill, if my information is correct, is to give to every such man the salary which he actually earned. My hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Thorson) made that argument this afternoon, the argument based on the quantum meruit, and if I may say so quite frankly to him and to the Postmaster General, that is the only argument that is worth anything in this case; any appeals to sympathy for these men is to my mind hardly worth considering. But I wish to direct the attention of the committee to this point: that the resolution does not seem to say just what the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and the Postmaster General have in mind. The resolution states:

> That it is expedient to provide for the readjustment of the salaries of certain postal employees in western Canada who were dismissed in 1919 and subsequently re-employed, to give them the benefit of salary they would have received had they re-entered the service in the class equivalent to the one they were in when dismissed.

I do not favour that proposition at all. As I understand it, the proposition made by the Postmaster General and laid down by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre was to pay the men for the work they have actually done during that time and not to pay them on the basis of the salary they might have received had they gone back and done that work. For instance, the case was put to us to-day of one man who had been earning $1,800 before the strike. He went on strike and came back, starting at say $1,080. If that man was doing $1,800 worth of work I am prepared to pay him accordingly, but I am not prepared to say that we should give him the equivalent of his salary when he went on strike. I am not prepared to give him that money unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General and of the officers of the department that he actually was doing work which under other circumstances would have given him this money. I should not be prepared to go even so far.

Mr. McGIBBON: Does not the hon. gentleman think that a big favour is done these men to take them back at all?

Mr. POWER: That is the point I was coming to. In the first place, I am not sure that I should ever have taken them back. But now that we have taken them back we cannot forever keep hanging over their heads as a punishment this prospect: "You may work as hard as you please, and give the best service you can to the country, but because you made that one fatal mistake we shall never reward you for your efforts."

Mr. MANION: That is exactly the attitude we take.

Mr. POWER: I want to get this clear. If I understand my hon. friend's attitude now it is that for the rest of their lives these men must be punished for the action they took in 1919.

Mr. MANION: No, our attitude is exactly the same as that taken by my hon. friend, that from this day on we will make the past something to be forgotten and pay them for the work they are doing.

Mr. POWER: Then we are not so far apart after all in principle; there is very little difference between us. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that from to-day everything is to be forgotten and that these men will be paid the salary actually earned at the work they are actually doing now.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, that is it.

Mr. POWER: My hon. friends agree that from to-day we should pay these men the salaries which are carried by the positions

they are actually occupying; that is to say, though they may have gone in as postal helpers last year and immediately become sortation clerks because they were able to do that work, from to-day we should start to pay those men $200 or $300 more.

Mr. MANION: That is my understanding.

Mr. POWER: Then the only difference between us is that hon. gentlemen opposite are starting a year later than we on this side. The same principle applies and it is only a question of quantum.

Mr. MANION: There is this difference in principle: We take the attitude that the man who started last year was, as my hon. friend admitted, lucky to be taken back at all in view of the fact that he went out on a sympathetic strike. From the time he began again until the present he has received perhaps a lower salary than he was really earning according to the work he was doing, but that was his punishment for going out on that strike. From to-day on we say "Let bygones be bygones, and we will pay you for the work you are doing, as certified by the postmaster."

Mr. POWER: So the principle is this, that in 1920 the government of the day, out of the goodness of its heart and not because there was an election coming on, which would not have been fair; out of the kindness of its heart in 1920, a year before the election of 1921, the government said to these men, "Come back; all is forgiven."

Mr. MANION: The strike occurred only two years before that; we could not do it very much sooner.

Mr. POWER: Probably that is quite right, but nine years later the members of that same party say, "If you come back you must put in one whole year without getting the salary which you earn." Supposing a man comes back to-morrow, after we pass this bill, where are we going to put him? Are we to put him to work as a sortation clerk and give him $200 a year extra because he happens to come back the day after this bill is passed?

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend has not stated the position quite correctly. The government of that day said, "We will take you back on certain conditions" and those conditions have been lived up to by the government. We think those conditions should continue to apply.

Mr. POWER: I am not familiar with the conditions except from what I heard this afternoon. I understand that these men were to be taken back subject to certain conditions, which simply amounted to the men saying they were very sorry and would not do it again. Another condition, which was in their favour, was to the effect that these men, going up for their examinations, need not be within the age limit. Those were the only two conditions I heard mentioned.

Mr. BENNETT: And they retained their pension and superannuation rights.

Mr. POWER: That is correct, but there was no condition as to what their salaries should be and I submit that for us to come before this country to-day and say "We forgave you nine years ago but to-day we are not going to pay you the salary you earn" is a ridiculous position to take.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sorry my hon. friend from Quebec South has not followed the debate as carefully as he usually does. The four conditions mentioned by the Postmaster General this afternoon, which were referred to in the order in council which permitted the old employees to be re-employed —not reinstated—were first the approval of the governor in council; secondly, the passing of that examination, waiving the age limit, and thirdly, the fact that these men came to the department as new employees and, coming as such they received the pay payable to new employees. That was the contract, and now we are substituting a parliamentary contract for the one which was made between the state and the individual.

Mr. POWER: They were to receive the pay of new employees while they were doing the work of new employees.

Mr. BENNETT: I am coming to that. My hon. friend at once took the point which, as a lawyer, I expected he would take; he submitted that to put forth the principle mentioned in that resolution would be destructive of the civil service of Canada. There is no question about that; the hon. gentleman saw that point at once, but he said he was in favour of every man being paid what he was worth. Once more we are left in the cloudland of conjecture and doubt as to who is to determine what a man's worth may be.

Mr. POWER: That should be determined by the work he does.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly, and it was because of that point that I endeavoured to extract from the Postmaster General the information I am now trying to secure. I took the Woolson case because I thought it might be typical. Let it be observed first that these

men come in as though they were unknown to the state; they make application in response to an advertisement issued by the Civil Service Commission. We will say three men apply, and we might designate them as A, B and C, B having been employed in the Winnipeg post office seven years previously. They write their examinations and B gets the position; he is appointed to the position called for by the advertisement, as the hon. member for Quebec South admitted.

Mr. POWER: There is only one position, that of postal helper.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly. B gets that position, and having been appointed to that position he cannot be promoted at once; that is a matter for the Civil Service Commission and the Post Office Department, through its officials. As I pointed out this afternoon, when a competent superior officer reports that this employee has performed meritorious service entitling him to a raise in pay, he receives the statutory increase and therefore obtains added compensation.

Now, every man in a post office who is a helper is looking forward to doing something better, and the postmaster tries him at another job just a little better than the one he previously held. According to the argument now being advanced and the principle favoured, we are to say hereafter that if during the year the postmaster of a post office puts a man at a little different job from that for which he was hired under the Civil Service Commission, that man is going to ask for more pay.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the position carries it.

Mr. BENNETT: Every job which is a little better than the job formerly held by a man carries with it a little higher pay; that is why men strive to obtain better jobs. That is the reason the ambitious man is always willing to try his hand at a little more difficult task, in order ultimately to obtain a little more pay.

Mr. POWER: But there is a vast difference between a man who has obtained a position as postal helper and a man who is a sortation clerk, we will say. There is a difference in salary of perhaps $600, and if it is true that some of these men were brought in as postal helpers and immediately made to do sortation work I think they should be paid accordingly.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. BENNETT: That is the information I have been trying to secure from the Postmaster General. I am advised that not a man was told to do anything which he formerly did after he went back to work as a postal helper; later, having worked as a postal helper, he got another job because he was better fitted for it or because he was more ambitious. I will say this; a young, ambitious man of twenty-five, making up his mind to get on—and remember, they waived the age limit—is going to get on to the next job as quickly as the man who has been out of the service for seven years, if not more quickly. I know the observation of my hon. friend will be that that is the reason there is an age limit.

Mr. POWER: What may have happened and what is likely to have happened is that the postmaster or the superior officer at Winnipeg took the older man who had been out seven years and gave him the higher position, or rather gave him the more important work to do.

Mr. BENNETT: Let us ask ourselves this question: What benefits have been conferred upon the striking employee, apart from the financial benefits sought to be given to him? First, the age limit was withdrawn, and that was a tremendous concession. What is the second concession? He still has his rights under the superannuation and pensions acts. He is deprived of his claim to seniority because you cannot overcome time and say that a man who went to work in 1925 is going to rank senior to a man who went to work in 1918; that is one of the things he is deprived of. What else is he deprived of? Nothing. He comes in as a new employee and he carries with his position the salary of a new employee, but if he does—and this is where it is so essential to get an answer from the Postmaster General—work of a higher class, which carried with it in the days gone by a higher pay, he shall be treated as though there had been continuity in his service, notwithstanding that he is seven years older and has been out during that time.

Mr. POWER: That is the resolution.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the resolution, yes. That is the resolution which I understand the hon. gentleman says he cannot give his support to. There is no play of words about this. May I say to the right hon. the Prime Minister that in one instance he is being

compensated as though there were continuity of service and in the other instance there is the statement made, as the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) has said, "I want this man paid for the class of work he does."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is all the government want; that is our understanding of the resolution.

Mr. BENNETT: Assuming that that is what the government want to do then I submit that that is not what the resolution says. Leaving that for the moment, the difference between us seems to be very simple. We are willing to have the Post Office Department consider it in the light of service rendered but not make it retroactive; the government desire to make it retroactive.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If he has been employed right along.

Mr. BENNETT: As the hon. member for Quebec South has pointed out, the question is: How are we going to determine with exactness that the man did the work of a higher class? I saw the Postmaster General's schedule and all he does to arrive at the sum is this:

Appointment: at such and such a time.
Salary: such and such an amount.
Salary when he left the service seven years ago: so much.
Amount received during the years he has been employed: so much.
Amount he would have received had he continued on at the pay he was getting when he left: so much.
Difference he is entitled to: so much, less adjustments.

As I understand the right hon. the Prime Minister and the member for Quebec South, that is exactly what we do not want to do.

Mr. POWER: We do not want that.

Mr. BENNETT: In fairness to the other employees there is only one way in which it can be dealt with, and that is not to make it retroactive.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There has been a discussion as to the principles which should govern in this matter. The first principle mentioned was that underlying reinstatement, and the second was the principle underlying remuneration. We on this side of the house say that the application of the principle of reinstatement was settled by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in office; that the principle of reinstatement as being applicable was settled at the time of the strike. The question of whether or not the men should be taken back after the strike was decided by the government of the day. The government of the day did not decide that question of reinstatement in the manner in which we are attempting to decide the present one of remuneration, namely by an act of parliament, but decided it by an order in council under the War Measures Act. I have nothing to say about their method of procedure beyond observing that I do not think it was right; the government apparently took advantage of the act to say that these men were to be reinstated. When the government took that position they made it perfectly plain that they were prepared to reinstate the men notwithstanding the part they had taken in the strike.

In order to obtain any position the men had to pass a civil service examination which admitted them only to the lowest position in the service. They were admitted to the service in that manner, but, having been admitted, they were, in view of acquired skill and previous training, given work which required a degree of experience and skill very much greater than that to which the examination related and which would have been required of men going into the service for the first time. We say that these men where they have been put into positions requiring a greater degree of skill and experience should be paid for the service which they are or have been rendering, notwithstanding the fact that they agreed to come back as though they were entering the service for the first time. In other words, the principle governing remuneration is that of paying what the service rendered is worth. I am prepared to leave to the government of the day the question as to whether the men should have been reinstated or not. That question was settled in 1920, but once men enter the government service then I say that there is only one principle which should govern in the matter of remuneration, and that is the value of the service which is being rendered. If these men are performing services which are worth more than they are being paid and which they would be receiving but for having participated in the strike, if they are filling positions which carry higher salaries than those which they are receiving, then I think they should be given the difference between what they are being paid and what they would have been paid for the particular class of work they are or have been performing. As I understand it, that is the purpose of the bill based on the present resolution. If the measure goes farther than that, if it attempts to pay to any man an additional sum of money, notwithstanding the fact that the work which he

has been performing does not carry that salary, then I am with my hon. friends opposite in agreeing that such an amount should not be paid.

If hon. members will pardon me, as evidencing that what I am now saying is not a newly formed conviction, I should like to refer to a statement of principle in matters of remuneration, as I had stated it before this strike ever took place, and which appears in a volume entitled Industry and Humanity, published in 1918, which volume is a study in the principles underlying industrial reconstruction. It appears in a chapter entitled Principles Underlying Work, at page 272 of the volume, and is as follows:

> What labour is really concerned about as regards remuneration, is adequate reward of the effort put forth. What capital and management are really concerned about is adequate reward for their investments and services. What the community is really concerned about is adequate value in services and commodities for purchasing power. The method of remuneration of labour which helps most to secure adequacy of returns all round is the method which is likely to prove the most productive of efficiency, and, in the long run, the most advantageous to labour.
>
> What is earned, rather than what is received, or paid, is the fundamental consideration. Men should get what they earn, and should earn what they get.

As I understand it, that is the whole principle underlying the present resolution. What is earned, rather than what is received or paid, is the fundamental consideration on the part of labour, and that principle should govern, particularly in the matter of government employment. Once these men came back into the employ of the state they should have been paid what their services were worth, in other words, the amounts corresponding to the classification in which their services fall. If they are performing the services of sorters they should be paid the wages which are due to sorters, not the wages which would be paid to men in the lower grades. That is the whole purpose of this measure.

I think the purpose of both sides of the house is much the same. Our purpose certainly is the same as that which actuated hon. gentlemen opposite when they passed the order in council to permit these men to return to the service. It is that of bringing about industrial peace, and industrial peace cannot be brought about effectively so long as you leave a sense of injustice rankling in the mind of any man as to the terms of his employment and the service he is rendering to the community and his employer. Hon. gentlemen opposite thought that they were helping the cause of industrial peace, when, under the War Measures Act, they passed an order in council permitting men, who had participated in a very serious strike, to return to the service of the state on certain terms and conditions. We feel that in so doing they went a considerable length towards restoring and maintaining industral peace, not only as concerns the few individuals most affected, but as affecting labour generally throughout the country. But since that time, ten years have gone by; certain men in the post office at Winnipeg have been rendering specific services to the state, and during all that time those of their number who went out on strike in 1919 have been receiving less pay than they would otherwise have received for the services which they have been rendering. We say that so long as that is continued, a sense of injustice will remain. Hon. gentlemen opposite meet us in this way; they say: we will agree with you and we will discontinue that discrimination to-night because we believe that it is an injustice. If that is true to-night, it was equally true a year ago, two years ago. It was equally true as each man began to perform a service that is worth more than he was being paid for. We ask that that sense of injustice shall be removed so that not only this particular group of men but labour generally, may feel that the government of the country as an employer, is not seeking to profit by the necessity of any man, whether the necessity arises out of a particular part taken in an industrial dispute or otherwise.

Once the question of a dispute is settled and reinstatement is permitted, the state as a model employer, should be prepared to pay and allow payment of the remuneration which properly attaches to particular positions. That is as far as the government is prepared to go in sanctioning the resolution before the house. It is our understanding of the bill to be based on the resolution, and if in any particular the resolution goes further than that, it might as well be made apparent at the moment that the government will not sanction the introduction of any bill which goes beyond that point. That far we feel we should go. We believe hon. gentlemen in what they have said to-day are somewhat of that opinion in view of the change of feeling that has come with the passing of time. We, at all events, have come to the conclusion that if men have suffered a severe measure of punishment through eight or ten years of suspense as to what would be their future lot, in losing throughout that time the opportunity to invest the little moneys they might otherwise have received, and in the permanent loss of their seniority rights, we, as a government seeking to bring about, so far as

possible, good will in all relations, international and industrial, can well afford to go the length this resolution goes to-night.

Mr. BENNETT: The right hon. gentleman has used a word— and I cannot but think he has done it unintentionally—which is exactly a negation of the fact. He used the word, "reinstated." The order in council does not reinstate anyone. That is the whole trouble. The order in council permits re-employment, but it reinstates no one and yet during his speech my right hon. friend used the word, "reinstatement" continuously. Reinstatement means just what its derivation is —put him back in the state in which he was. This order in council permitted no such thing. It said distinctly: first, your employment has been terminated; second, you went out on a sympathetic strike and that terminated your employment, and, third, you now admit that you are conscious of the gravity of the offence that you committed against the state. You are now allowed to be re-employed in the public service although the original order in council debarred you from re-employment in any capacity. There never was a question of reinstatement. It has never even been suggested that there should be reinstatement. The word is forgotten. The proper word is "re-employment", and re-employment was predicated upon conforming to certain conditions. Those conditions were enumerated this afternoon and I will not repeat them. But when the applicant for a position complied with those conditions he had a position. That position was under a contract between him and the state. It was no longer a matter of implication; it was a matter of exact and express contract. There is no clearer rule than this: that the terms of an express contract between parties govern and no extraneous matters can be introduced to vary, alter or change the terms of that contract unless under certain circumstances which do not exist in this case. Therefore we have an express contract of employment at a given salary. The resolution before the house supports a principle that the Prime Minister says he is not in favour of, but which in terms states that if the re-employed, discharged employees were employed in a given capacity before the strike they shall, when re-employed, receive the salary of that position regardless of the fact that they did the work of their former jobs continuously or only part time. In other words, the money that is to be paid is predicated upon what they received and what they would have received.

Mr. VENIOT: What they earned.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend says, "what they earned." But his sheet of paper shows what they would have received.

Mr. VENIOT: In the class equivalent.

Mr. BENNETT: In the class equivalent when they left the service.

Mr. VENIOT: Provided they were engaged in that class.

Mr. BENNETT: But for how long?

Mr. VENIOT: They would be paid only for the number of days, weeks, months or years that they worked.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not what the resolution says and not what those figures show. The hon. gentleman showed me a sheet of paper and it gives the date of appointment with the salary at that date. Then it gives the man's former salary, what he received during the time he was employed and what he would have received if there had been no break in his service. One is deducted from the other and that is what he is entitled, subject to some adjustments, to receive. That is not what the Prime Minister said.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I must thank my hon. friend for suggesting that perhaps I had not made myself clear, or rather had expressed what was not in my mind when I drew a distinction between reinstatement and re-employment. When I referred to reinstatement I was referring to a man going back to work in the place in which he had been previously engaged. I meant that he was going back to his former work—the word is derived from the Latin "status" meaning place —that is, he was going back into his place when he was going back into the position of a postal employee. That was settled by hon. gentlemen opposite when they passed their order in council. But I will drop the word "reinstatement" altogether. I will speak only of re-employment.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the word.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says, "that is the word." We will stick to that. Hon. gentlemen opposite and not this government decided that certain men were to be re-employed.

Mr. BENNETT: No, might be.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, might be, and the largest number of them were re-employed by hon. gentlemen opposite by an order in council which they put through. At any rate they settled the principle that men who had been out on strike could be re-employed in the postal service of Can-

ada. We are in agreement in regard to the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite settled the principle of re-employment. Now comes the question as to the basis of re-employment, the principle that shall govern in matters of re-employment. This is where the difference comes in. We on this side of the house say that if these men are to be employed, the principle which shall govern in the matter of remuneration is that of services rendered, and that that principle alone should govern. We say that no government has any right to make contracts with men to perform services and to pay a less amount than is normally paid for those services in accordance with the general regulations of the department by which they are employed. Hon. gentlemen opposite want these men who are re-employed to be paid at a lower rate than their particular employment is recognized as commanding. We say that is contrary to the whole practice of maintaining a standard of wages as followed by employers throughout the country generally. We say that a certain quantity of labour and a certain quality of labour should carry a certain remuneration, and what we propose by this measure is to say that men who were re-employed under an order in council which hon. gentlemen opposite passed shall be paid now as though they had been re-employed on terms which would admit them to receive as remuneration the amounts of money which attach to the particular classes of work they were doing; not to go any further than that. May I make it clear to my hon. friends that if the resolution of the Postmaster General means anything more than that, the government will not sanction his bringing in, and will not ask this house to pass, any bill which goes further than that. If the bill which my hon. friend the Postmaster General introduces is not specific enough in its terms, we can amend it. The intention of the government is simply to fix the method of remuneration and the amount of remuneration in accordance with that attaching to the classes of work actually performed, letting bygones be bygones in the case of remuneration just as hon. gentlemen opposite did in the matter of re-employment.

Mr. VENIOT: That is my understanding of the effect of the resolution. If it meant anything else I never would have introduced it. Let me say here that the difference between these salaries is based on the nature of the work performed, and that would be determined by the reports throughout the number of years made by the office at Winnipeg. No fairer way could be adopted than taking the weekly and monthly and quarterly reports, the yearly reports, if you like, together with the case examinations of all these officials in the different classes or grades they occupy, and basing the remuneration upon those reports according to the class of work performed.

Mr. MANION: The Prime Minister has mentioned a number of times the order in council and the principle we established in passing it; I mean the government of 1920, of which I was not a member. I hold the order in council in my hand. It was loaned to me by the Postmaster General. I am going to read two or three clauses that are pertinent, and if hon. gentlemen desire it, I will read it all, although it is somewhat lengthy. I do not agree with the Prime Minister that we established the principle of taking these men back and giving them remuneration equal to that which they were previously receiving, for that is what the Prime Minister implied.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, I say you did not do that, but that you should have done so. That is where you made your mistake. You either should have said: these men will not be re-employed; we cannot sanction the principle of re-employing men who go out on strike in a great public service like the postal service; or you should have said: there are circumstances which permit their re-employment. Then if you re-employed them you should have said: we will re-employ them on the basis of paying them for the actual services performed.

Mr. MANION: We did not need to take a hard and fast position. We can occasionally take the middle road, just as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister does frequently, and I am not criticising him for that. In 1920 the government of that day took what I consider was the middle of the road. Let me quote from the order in council, dated June 4 1920. It says in respect to taking on these men:

> In accordance with the understanding arrived at by the government, as embodied in a memorandum forwarded to the Civil Service Commission by Senator Robertson on the 7th January, 1920, ex-postal employees are to be considered eligible for appointment to positions in the civil service, subject to certain conditions therein mentioned.

Then on the other side is the memorandum giving the canditions. Again I will quote the pertinent clauses:

> The gravity of their offence against the state being now realized, the government has given consideration to the possibility of removing the bar to their application through the Civil Service Commission for re-employment in the public service, and His Excellency the Governor

in Council is disposed to exercise clemency so far as reasonably consistent with necessary discipline.

Ex-postal employees may therefore be considered as eligible to be appointed to positions in the civil service for which they make application as vacancies occur, and to which, in the opinion of the commission, they are justly entitled under the regulations.

All right; they were appointed to the positions for which they made application. That is all the government of 1920 agreed to, to re-appoint them to the positions for which they made application. These men, I understand after listening to the debate, applied to be appointed as postal helpers.

Mr. DUNNING: Under the regulation they could not apply for anything else.

Mr. MANION: The agreement distinctly states that they would be appointed to the positions for which they made application.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend misses the significance of the words he has just read —"under the regulations." The regulations would not permit them to apply for any other position.

Mr. MANION: I cannot help that. They applied for the position of postal helper. The order in council with the memorandum attached says that they may be appointed as vacancies occur to positions to which in the opinion of the Civil Service Commission they are justly entitled under the regulations. The Civil Service Commission considered that they were entitled to be appointed as postal helpers, and they were appointed as such, and they received the pay of postal helpers. It is true that some of them—I would not say all of them—did work of a higher grade, just as in ordinary business, as the leader of the opposition has pointed out, you will find one out of three or four men in the same concern who is much more able and does much more work and better work than the others, although all are getting exactly the same pay. Some of these men, having had previous experience, may have done a better class of work.

So far as we on this side of the house are concerned, we are ready to let bygones be bygones. We say that probably these men have received sufficient punishment, and that in the future we are willing that they should receive the wages attached to the positions for which they are certified.

The Prime Minister made another point. Reading from his own book he enunciated the axiom that men should get paid for the work they do. We all agree with that, but he was not dealing in his book just at that point with men who had gone on strike from a great public service. He was merely speaking in general.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was dealing with the principles underlying industrial peace.

Mr. MANION: He was not dealing with men who had gone on strike from the public service. I do not know the context of the passage quoted, but at any rate it seems to me that the attitude taken by hon. gentlemen on this side of the house lives up entirely to the order in council of 1920, which was passed, as was expressly stated, as an act of clemency. We take the position now, that for the sake of national unity and harmony in this country in the future these men should receive the wages of the positions for which they are fitted.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say just a word about the order in council which my hon. friend has just read? I asked the hon. leader of the opposition this afternoon just where the authority came from to pass that particular order in council. We have heard a good deal in parliament this session about the powers given by parliament to the Civil Service Commission. The law governing employment in the civil service states that civil servants of the class we are considering, must receive their employment through the Civil Service Commission under the terms which the commission lays down. These men were not re-employed under the terms of the Civil Service Act. That was the first breach. If hon. gentlemen had been concerned about the observance and enforcement of the Civil Service Act and what it demanded of an administration, not one of these men could have been taken back under the terms of the order in council.

May I say further that the Civil Service Commission to-day or any other day would not think of bargaining with men to go into the public service and to accept work there on lower terms than the standards which govern in the particular classes of employment for which they were to be engaged. We might well realize at this time that what parliament is now passing upon is the principle of what men shall be paid for services rendered. Parliament was not passing on that particular principle when this order in council was passed. The government of the day was then laying down certain conditions with regard to re-employing certain public servants. My own view is that these men should never have been re-employed except by act of parliament; that proceeding under the War Measures Act and in disregard of the Civil Service Act was not a correct method of

procedure but, certain former employees having been re-employed, parliament is now asked to say on what basis of remuneration they shall be paid. Shall they be paid a rate of remuneration in accordance with the services they have actually rendered, or shall there be some compromise in that particular? In the matter of remuneration I submit that parliament cannot take any other ground than that of paying men for the actual services they have rendered.

Mr. BENNETT: Once more the right hon. Prime Minister, I think, has either not wholly grasped the situation as it has been presented by the documents, or else he attributes a meaning to the order in council that I cannot read into it. The War Measures Act, I assumed—I said I was not certain—was the only authority for the order in council.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend is right.

Sir EUGENE FISET: Are the words "War Measures Act" contained in the order in council?

Mr. BENNETT: In answer to my hon. friend from Rimouski, I have looked at the order in council for the first time—it is handed to me by the hon. Postmaster General—and it does not indicate on the face of it anything with regard to the War Measures Act.

Mr. DUNNING: Does it indicate any parliamentary authority at all?

Mr. BENNETT: No. It is merely a report. I think I had better read it. This is the order in council:

> The committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 31st May, 1920, from the Secretary of State, submitting that the Civil Service Commission has recently received applications for positions in the civil service from ex-postal employees who participated in the sympathetic strike in western Canada in the spring of 1919.
>
> In accordance with the understanding arrived at by the government, as embodied in a memorandum forwarded to the Civil Service Commission by Senator Robertson on the 7th January, 1920, ex-postal employees are to be considered eligible for appointment to positions in the civil service, subject to certain conditions therein mentioned.
>
> The ex-postal employees mentioned in the attached list have complied with the conditions of this memorandum.
>
> The minister, therefore, recommends that authority be granted for the appointment of these candidates to positions for which they are eligible.
>
> The committee advise that the requisite authority be granted accordingly.
>
> (Signed) Rodolphe Boudreau,
> Clerk of the Privy Council.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

The memorandum my hon. friend from Fort William has just read. The Postmaster General read it this afternoon. But may I point out, I cannot think the right hon. Prime Minister intends to go as far as his observation would lead one to conclude. The state has never been able, nor has any private employer, ever been able to calculate—shall I say?—the kilowatts of work that the human machine can render in any particular place. I recall the general manager of one of the great banks of this country endeavoured to determine the capacity of each of the employees by fixing a standard that would be the measure of his work. If he exceeded that standard, then he was ranked accordingly; and if he fell below that standard he usually sought other employment. Now, we cannot do that with respect to each individual in the post office. That is clear is it not?

Mr. POWER: No, we actually do it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is done by the classification in the civil service.

Mr. BENNETT: That is in the mass. That is just the point I am making. Being unable to determine what each individual may render in the way of quantum of work, we have endeavoured to classify civil servants, and the classification is arbitrary. For instance, the great railway corporations have schedules classifying their employees according to the work they do. Those schedules cover section foremen, machinists, engineers, firemen, conductors, brakemen, wipers, hostlers, and so on. In this case we are endeavouring to correct what the Prime Minister thinks is unfairness to a group of people by arbitrarily saying: We will pay them what they would have got if they had never quit. That is wherein I say this measure—

Mr. POWER: That is what the resolution says.

Mr. BENNETT: No doubt.

Mr. POWER: But that is not what the Prime Minister has said, or what the member from Quebec has said. That is another point.

Mr. BENNETT: It is not what the Prime Minister says at all. This resolution is the exact negation of what he says. This resolution arbitrarily says that John Smith, who in 1919 was classified as A 1 and getting $1,500 a year, and in 1925 was appointed to a position which carried with it only $1,000, can now draw at the rate of $1,500 a year from the date of appointment to his present position because when he was formerly in the service of the crown he got $1,500 a year.

That is the resolution if English means anything. I do submit that under these circumstances perhaps the end that we all have in our minds will be served if this committee rise and report progress on the resolution. I suggest to the Prime Minister that the Postmaster General take this course, so that the law officers may have an opportunity to look at the resolution and the bill to be founded on it. And, further, that the Postmaster General furnish us with a list of the employees, and the way in which they are being dealt with under the measure, so that we may be able to establish that the principle on which the government is proceeding is the principle which I have just mentioned. The principle of the measure is not what the Postmaster General now says; his figures are quite the opposite. They take an arbitrary sum that somebody received when he was dismissed, and they apply that to somebody's salary from the time that he was re-employed. It is not intended to do this at all, unless, as the Prime Minister says, Smith, we will say did that work; and there is no evidence that he did the work. As my hon. friend from Lunenberg has remarked, there should be a fact-finding commission. And that is where the principle is all wrong, because if you are going to apply it to these men you should apply it to any man who in the course of his employment is desirous of doing more work than his position calls for. No man ever got anywhere by looking at the clock and seeing how little he could do and retain his position. Men now are going to be penalized who have not done that, but have endeavoured to do something more than their duty called for. Under these circumstances I think the only way in which the committee can ever make real headway is to rise and report progress on the resolution and ask leave to sit again. This will afford the government an opportunity to look into the measure, especially having regard to the terms of the resolution and the bill to be founded on it, so we may at least know, without endeavouring to amend the bill, what we are voting about and what principle we are giving effect to by enacting the legislation.

Mr. THORSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take up too much of the time of the house, but there seems to be a possibility of agreement in principle between those who sit on the other side of the house and those who sit on this side. The leader of the opposition referred to a memorandum by Senator Robertson, accepted by the government of the day and made the basis of the order in council which provided for the re-employment of these men. Now, that order in council set forth two conditions only, the first being that the approval of council must be given in the case of every man who was taken back into the service; the second being that satisfactory assurances must be given that there would be no repetition of the offence. Those are the only two conditions. Then there is a third proviso which waives the age limit. There were two other conditions that became attached to the re-employment of these men by reason of the state of the law as it existed then and as it exists now. These further conditions, which are not referred to anywhere in the memorandum or the order in council, are these; first, the ex-striker must pass the ordinary civil service examination; secondly, he can come in only at the foot of the service. These two latter conditions are attached to the re-employment by reason of the fact that the Civil Service Act in itself does not provide for a situation such as this.

The leader of the opposition stated, I think quite pertinently, that it was impossible to assess the value of the persons who are in the government service. Under the conditions that were laid down in 1920 it was not possible to give recognition to the principle which the Prime Minister has enunciated and which the leader of the opposition appears to accept, namely, that employees of the government should be paid according to the value of the services they have rendered.

Mr. ERNST: Were not these conditions punitive in their nature?

Mr. THORSON: No; the two latter conditions of which I speak followed as a natural consequence from the fact that there is no provision in the Civil Service Act for reinstatement even when an injustice has been done, or for the reemployment of a man who has left the service. I know of one case. It is known in the service here. A civil servant in Ottawa left a position in which he had attained a certain salary. He resigned in order to take a position with a firm in one of the larger cities. That firm failed. The man was desirous of returning to the position in the civil service from which he had resigned, and the authorities in the department under which he had served were desirous of obtaining his services again. Under the Civil Service Act however it was not possible for him to resume that position with the salary which he had formerly received. There were no other applicants for the position, yet he had to come in at the bottom of that particular classification. The Civil Service Act is defective in that it does not permit the application of the principle which the Prime Minister and the

leader of the opposition are both agreed upon, and therefore it is necessary to have amended legislation to do full justice in this case.

I quite agree that it is impossible to assess in terms of money with any degree of nicety or accuracy the value of human qualities. But we have one criterion to which we might quite easily appeal in this case. Take for instance the men who were taken back in 1920 and 1921. It is not a very difficult matter to assess these men according to the value of their services to the public: in 1919 when they were in the service we recognized the value of their services by paying them a certain sum of money. That was the standard we applied to all the employees of the Dominion government. Is it not a reasonable standard to apply in this case? Is it not reasonable therefore to say that in the great majority of these cases justice will be done if we say to these men: "We will pay you as from the date of your reemployment in the service the salary which you would have received had you been taken back into the service at the same salary you were receiving when you were dismissed." That is the value which the government itself placed on services of these men prior to their dismissal, and that is the standard of value that can be applied to these men now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has made a suggestion which, in the light of the discussion up to the present moment, is one which the committee might well consider. Before, however, the Postmaster General moves that the committee rise and report progress, I want to make tolerably sure that we are in agreement on an essential point. I have said that so far as the government are concerned our view is that any payment to be made under the bill to be brought in must be payment for services actually rendered. That is the essence of the position we take, and it is, I understand, on that point that my hon. friend opposite has taken exception to the resolution as drafted. When the committee resumes, the resolution will have to be amended in accordance with the line I have indicated, and I should like to ask my hon. friend whether some such amendment as the one I shall now suggest would meet the situation so far as his point is concerned. Of course, I realize that hon. gentlemen opposite may be opposed to the resolution generally.

Mr. BENNETT: To the retroactive feature.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On the other hand, there is less liability of a difference between us if we confine the resolution to payment for services actually rendered and in accordance with what would be the recognized rate of payment for those services were there no other consideration, apart from the services themselves, to be taken into account. The resolution, then, will be somewhat to this effect:

> That it is expedient to provide for the readjustment of the salaries of certain postal employees in western Canada who were dismissed in 1919 and subsequently reemployed, to give them—

And these or similar words will be inserted:

> —in so far as the services performed by them will justify—

And then the words which follow in the resolution:

> —the benefit of salary they would have received had they reentered the service in the class equivalent to the one they were in when dismissed, and of subsequent salary revisions.

Mr. BENNETT: Without discussing the question of difference between us with respect to retroactive legislation of this kind, I may observe that if the right hon. gentleman proposes to give effect to the contentions as he has submitted them to the committee, I think that language somewhat similar to that which he has read will entirely serve the purpose. But there is one difficulty which must be present in the right hon. gentleman's mind: How is that to be ascertained?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We shall have to satisfy the committee on that point.

Mr. BENNETT: The right hon. gentleman sees the difficulty.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Surely.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not want to be tedious, but I should like to point this out. When the applicant for the position went to work he obviously must have worked in that position which was awarded to him. It becomes then a question of determining how long at what pay, and so forth. When you begin to discuss that phase of the question you are met with this further difficulty: that at the end of each year recommendations were made as to the meritorious services of each employee, and when that recommendation was made the officer making it obviously considered the character of the work done and took into consideration the fact that the employee had done work which was beyond the narrow confines of the precise position to which he had been appointed. Therefore to the extent to which his meritorious services warranted an increase he has already had it by recommendations made from year to year. That is a factor that must be kept in mind in dealing with this matter, and it is because of

its complexity in that regard that I have asked the minister to furnish us with particulars. Perhaps the minister in the interim will give us the schedule, adding thereto something which does not now appear in it, namely, the salaries individuals are now receiving.

Mr. VENIOT: It is not on this list but we have the information.

Mr. McGIBBON: I presume it is a fact that these men after they re-entered the service got promotion.

Mr. VENIOT: Some did; we have a record of all.

Mr. McGIBBON: How many steps of promotion would there be?

Mr. VENIOT: Offhand I could not say, but the records of examinations, promotions and so forth are available. They are at Winnipeg and a good many of them are here in our office and we can get the information.

Mr. McGIBBON: It seems to me that an interminable task lies ahead of the minister. A man is re-employed and works probably at the lowest grade; then he is promoted after a certain length of service, probably receiving a second or a third promotion. When you compare that with what he would have done if he had not left the service, how are you to determine the steps of promotion he might have climebd had there not been a strike? It seems to me absolutely impossible.

Mr. VENIOT: It can be worked out. I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. ADSHEAD: How many returned soldiers were reinstated?

Mr. VENIOT: Twenty-one.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 131, page 36. When we were last considering this resolution we had passed an amount of $6,000 for South Bay, Ingonish.

Public Works—harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia—Sydney—wharf, $16,500.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Is this the final payment to complete this wharf?

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): It is proposed to sheet pipe the south wall for a distance of ninety feet, place about 4,000 tons of filling and construct a warehouse 40 feet wide and 150 feet long. The work is to be done by day labour.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Is the other contract completed?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is now being completed.

Item agreed to.

West Green Harbour—wharf, $1,100.

Mr. CANTLEY: What provision is being made for repairs to the wharf at Trenton?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is nothing in these estimates providing for Trenton.

Mr. CANTLEY: I think the minister will remember that matter being brought to his attention both last year and the year before. The situation at this point is serious; no repairs at all have been made to the wharf for a number of years, and I submit that it is most unfair that no work has been done as far as the East river is concerned either at New Glasgow, Abercrombie or Trenton. The situation there is intolerable; public property is being destroyed simply because the government will not make the absolutely necessary repairs.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What my hon. friend has said with regard to this matter having been brought to the attention of the department is quite correct, and it is also correct that nothing appears in the estimates for this work, but the matter is receiving consideration. At the moment neither myself nor my deputy can recall the amount of money necessary to repair this wharf. If the amount required is not over $1,000, of course the work can be done under the general vote if it is one of the very urgent cases, but I am rather under the impression that more than that amount will be required.

Mr. CANTLEY: I am quite aware that there is nothing in the estimates for this work, and I am bringing up the matter now in order that the minister may make provision for these repairs in the supplementary estimates. I can tell him that $1,000 will not provide for this work, but I think $5,000 would cover it, and I do submit that at least that amount should be provided in the supplementary estimates and expended in order to save this property from ruin and in order

to make it available to the large number of people living in that locality. There are from 4,000 to 5,000 people in that vicinity, all of whom find use for that wharf at different seasons of the year.

Item agreed to.

Yarmouth Harbour—dredging, $25,100.

Mr. SHORT: As this is the last item in this list I have a few words to say in connection with the unfair distribution of the $750,000 which is to be spent on harbours and rivers in Nova Scotia. I find of that amount about $150,000 is to be expended in the constituency of my hon. friend the Minister of National Defence, which adjoins my own constituency. I have no fault to find with that; I am glad he has obtained that amount of money, but I want to call the attention of the minister to the fact that he has shown great partiality. My constituency contains more breakwaters than does the constituency of the minister, but the appropriation for the constituency of Digby-Annapolis is only $47,500 as compared with the $150,000 for the constituency of Yarmouth-Shelburne. I want to ask the minister if he thinks that is a fair distribution of the public moneys of this country. Are not the people in my constituency just as much entitled to receive appropriations in order to put their breakwaters and harbours into a condition which will permit them to earn their living as the people in the constituency of my hon. friend? He cannot go on doing business in this way and expect the people to be satisfied and not criticize the estimates.

I want to point out further that of this amount of $47,500, $33,000 is devoted to the Digby pier. This is not an appropriation for the benefit of the people in the community; it is for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they are paying the government 7 per cent.

Last year I brought to the attention of the minister a very much needed extension which was required to the breakwater at Westport, Nova Scotia, one of the largest fishing centres we have in the bay of Fundy. This place has more fishermen and produces more fish than does the village of Port Maitland, for which $50,000 was appropriated and another $50,000 is being asked for this year. I want to ask the minister if he thinks that is either fair or just to the fishermen of Nova Scotia, especially in view of what the government say they are trying to do for the fishing industry of the maritime provinces. They are spending a large portion of the public moneys in the constituencies represented by the hon. Minister of National Defence and the member for Antigonish-Guysborough. As I said before, the constituency of Digby-Annapolis is just as important a fishing constituency as is Shelburne-Yarmouth or Antigonish-Guysborough, but the government are neglecting the public works there to the great disadvantage of the district. I wanted to call this matter to the attention of the minister before the item passed, and I hope he will see his way clear to put a sufficient amount in the supplementary estimates to cover the extension of the breakwater at Westport and the necessary dredging and repairs required for the other breakwaters in my constituency.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will say to my hon. friend that I recall the plea he made a year ago on behalf of these various places, but I must say that I thought I was doing very well to obtain from the men from whom I have to get this money the amount of $47,000 for the hon. member's riding.

Mr. SHORT: You are getting a return on $33,000 of that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I hope these are all good investments.

Mr. SHORT: The government is getting that directly.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is the intention with which it is made. I am not quarrelling with my hon. friend when he says that there are a number of places in his riding which require further improvement, but if he makes as much progress within the next year as he has in the last I do not think he will have any complaints to offer next session.

Mr. SHORT: I will not be satisfied at all unless I can make a good deal more progress than I have made in the last year or two. There are only a very few of the numerous breakwaters in my constituency which you have looked after, and many of these are in urgent need of repair at the present moment. It would be a good investment on the part of the Minister of Public Works and would conduce to the welfare of the people of this country to keep these breakwaters in better repair, because if you do not do it this year it will have to be done at perhaps double the cost next year.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): I would like to ask the hon. minister why he

earmarks an item of $3,000 for breakwater repairs at Yarmouth bar and an item of $25,100 for dredging at Yarmouth harbour and does not include them in the vote which covers general dredging.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The hon. member will notice that they are quite considerable sums and I think we would have met with objections from my hon. friends if we took to ourselves the right to apportion such large amounts without having given the house an opportunity of considering them.

Mr. BENNETT: There is one observation I would like to make without further trespassing upon the time of the committee. During quite a storm last summer I drove up along the coast in the county which the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis represents. I saw a large number of these breakwaters to which he has referred, and the small fishing vessels were seeking shelter behind them. The very word "breakwater" implies the reason for their being constructed, and some of them were certainly in ill repair. It occurs to me that if we are going to protect the lives of the fishermen and expand the export business in fish—we are endeavouring to do that because if I recall correctly the exports last year were something like $34,000,000—we can only do it by keeping these breakwaters in repair. It would not take a very large sum of money to keep them in reasonable repair, and that should be done for the two reasons. The first reason is the preservation of the lives of the men who go down to the sea for the purpose of engaging in the fishing business, and the second is that they may be able to carry on their vocation under as favourable conditions as possible and thereby expand our business and carry the fish of Canada into the markets of the world. If the engineers of the department will look into this matter I am quite satisfied that they will report that many of these breakwaters should be repaired. This is a matter which should be beyond the reach of patronage; it is not a matter which the minister can deal with himself because he has to listen to what is presented to him by the ministers from the provinces and dispose of the money he is granted to the best advantage, but for the reasons I have given, I suggest that this should be beyond patronage. It is a question of life, and as far as possible the matter of safety and endeavour should be looked after by the government regardless of any other consideration. I thought I would mention this matter in view of what I saw with my own eyes last summer as I drove up along the Digby shore.

Mr. RALSTON: Following the argument of the hon. leader of the opposition, I know the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis will agree with me that the very purpose of the Port Maitland work was the purpose referred to by the hon. leader of the opposition. The hon. member knows that the Port Maitland breakwater constitutes practically the only safe shelter from Yarmouth up to St. Mary's bay on a very open coast where there is a great deal of fishing. When the men return to shore they meet with a difficult situation unless they have some sort of shelter, and that is why that work is being conducted. I know it has been a long time in process, as the first length of it was done two years ago and the contract for another length was let only last fall. It is just for the reason the leader of the opposition has mentioned that that has been done. I suppose everybody appreciates receiving credit for what he gets in his constituency; but if my hon. friend will look up the amount which goes to Shelburne-Yarmouth, he will find that there is a revote from last year of $67,000, money that was not spent, and the other votes are small. I only wish they were bigger. My hon. friend knows that the county of Shelburne-Yarmouth is a shore county going right around the whole nose of Nova Scotia from Port Maitland to Sable River. There are breakwaters and wharves and there is need for many more. These things can be done only gradually, and my hon. friend knows the pressure that is brought to bear in connection with them. I am endeavouring to serve my county as best I can, and I am only sorry I cannot get more.

Mr. SHORT: I have no fault to find with the hon. gentleman for getting this amount for his constituency; indeed I congratulate him on getting it. I have no fault to find with the government in that regard. I believe the breakwater at Port Maitland will be of great benefit to the whole St. Mary's bay. What I am pointing out is that the minister has given my constituency very little, although the need is very great.

Mr. RALSTON: I suppose some of it was taken to give to the constituency of my hon. friend from Queens-Lunenburg, who has an appropriation of $30,000 for dredging in Liverpool, and to the constituency of my hon. friend from Richmond-West Cape Breton, who has an appropriation of $75,000 at Fourchu.

Mr. SHORT: The Minister of National Defence says that $67,000 of his appropriation

of $150,000 is a revote. I may say that $33,000 of my appropriation of $47,000 is a revote, so that I can go him one better and a good deal more.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): I wish to urge upon the minister the necessity of keeping these breakwaters in repair. There is in my constituency a breakwater at Port Morien that has been allowed to fall into disrepair. About two hundred feet on the inside of the breakwater has been allowed to collapse. I have called the attention of the minister to that, but nothing has been done. Will he make a note of it and have the engineers look it up for next year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have made a note of it and it will be looked up for next year, but I hope my hon. friends will bear in mind that the disrepair about which they complain—I think the leader of the opposition referred to the matter as allowing these wharves to get out of repair—is the result of several years. We are gradually getting back into repair those that got out of repair during the years of the war. We are, I think, making fair progress along that line with the amount of money that is being spent. I am sure nobody is complaining that any money is being spent that should not be spent. The only complaint is that there are many other places—and I quite agree with that—where there is need of further repairs. We are doing these repairs gradually and I hope my hon. friends will feel that a fair attempt is being made to meet the most urgent cases.

Mr. CANTLEY: What has been done in connection with the wharf at Pictou Landing? There is nothing for it in the estimates this year. I think there was something in the supplementary estimates of last year, and I believe some work was done. But I should like to know what it was and who did it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is nothing in these estimates specially for Pictou Landing. My hon. friend knows that we are repairing the railway wharf at Pictou. The matter to which he refers is one for future consideration.

Mr. CANTLEY: I am not referring to the railway wharf at Pictou; I am talking about the wharf at Pictou Landing, for which a small amount was, I think, included in the supplementary estimates of last year, and some work was done. I should like to know how much work was done, by whom it was done and on whose recommendation.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be glad to look into the matter.

Mr. CANTLEY: When.

[Mr. Short.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: Right away.

Mr. CANTLEY: Does the minister mean to-night?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think my hon. friend will expect me to do that to-night.

Mr. CANTLEY: I will now refer the minister to another question which I asked the other evening in reference to Mr. McColl. I I think the minister will recall that he promised to give me some information on that subject. Mr. McColl appears to direct the work of the minister's department in Pictou county. He recommended a man who proved unsatisfactory and whom the resident engineer dismissed. He was then allowed to recommend a successor. Apparently the work carried on in the county of Pictou to-day by the Public Works department is done on the suggestion of Mr. McColl. Now Mr. McColl is not the defeated candidate; he never was a candidate for the federal house, and I should like to know what his influence with the minister is based on, and why orders from him are taken by the minister or his officials in the department or his officials in the county. Perhaps the minister will be good enough to give me that information now.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think I said to my hon. friend the other night when this matter was under discussion that I did not particularly remember Mr. McColl, whether I had ever seen him or not. The name is familiar. I was under the impression, I think I told my hon. friend, that Mr. McColl had been the defeated Liberal candidate. That is all I can say about him. The engineer apparently makes the recommendations as to the work he thinks should be done in the various sections that come under his jurisdiction. Mr. McColl has been consulted, I have no doubt, but I have no personal knowledge of him.

Mr. CANTLEY: When this matter was up before, I asked the information of the minister, and I understood him to say—and I do not think on reflection he will deny it—that he promised to look the matter up and give me the information. Apparently he has not done so, and is not in a position to give me the information now. It is of some importance to me and more so to the people of the county of Pictou. I have not said much by way of criticism of Mr. McColl personally, and I am not going to do so now. The defeated candidate has not interfered, but Mr. McColl has interfered and not to the advantage of the Public Works depart-

ment or of the work being carried on by the department in the county of Pictou. I should like to know why it is that he directs and has directed the work there. There must be some reason and I submit the minister should be able to give it to me.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am sorry that I cannot say anything more in regard to the reason why Mr. McColl was consulted. He is evidently a man whose judgment is regarded highly by the officials of the department and by the local engineer. I cannot say anything personally further than that. I hope my hon. friend does not think I am holding back any information which I promised to give. I had at least half a dozen requests for information with regard to Port Maitland and other places, and I thought I had given, just as promptly as it could be obtained, all the information that I promised the other night to give. I looked into the question of the contract referred to by my hon. friend where apparently the foreman had not turned out satisfactorily, and the very fact that he was discharged as soon as he was found not to be doing his job well is the best evidence that he did not have any particular pull with the department. Another man was put on the job, and I do not think my hon. friend will complain that the work was not well done eventually and that the new foreman did not efficiently perform his duties.

Mr. CANTLEY: Let us try to clear this matter up. The fact is that Mr. McColl recommended a Mr. McLean for the job at Bailey's Brook, and upon his recommendation Mr. McLean was appointed by the resident engineer at Halifax, Mr. Locke. The engineer who visited the work while it was in progress reported that it was the worst piece of work he had ever seen done. Mr. Locke also called attention to an inaccuracy in his accounts, that he had put in time for work that was not done, and the outcome was that he was dismissed. Now this man was appointed on the recommendation of Mr. McColl, and his successor was also appointed upon the recommendation of the same Mr. McColl, notwithstanding that the first man he had recommended had been dismissed for cause. I find that in regard to the work on the Pictou wharves, he recommended that it should be done by day labour and not by contract, and that was done, now I admitted the other day when this matter was up that I thought the minister was perhaps justified in that case. So far as the work at Pictou landing is concerned, Mr. McColl interfered there as well. I asked the minister some time ago to give me the information, but I have not got it yet. I absolve the minister for not supplying me with the information in regard to Mr. McColl, because I do not think that he failed intentionally; I think he simply forgot in the press of other matters. The matter, however, was discussed fairly fully the other evening, and I hope I am impressing on the minister sufficiently now the fact that I do want the information in regard to Mr. McColl, and I trust that he will not forget it, and that before the week is out he will be good enough to give me the information for which I am asking.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have no knowledge of any information in the department regarding Mr. McColl further than I have given, but I shall make inquiries, and if there is anything available which will be of interest to my hon. friend I shall be glad to give it to him, but of course I cannot give him something that I have not got.

Mr. CANTLEY: The minister said the other evening that he had not the information, and I accepted his word, but I think he undertook to get me the information.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think Hansard will bear me out when I say that I furnished all the information I undertook to furnish.

Mr. CANTLEY: We will waive that. I submit that the matter is of importance to the minister, or ought to be, because this man's recommendation had led the department into error, and has resulted in a disgraceful job and in the expenditure of money in a way in which it should not have been expended. These are or should be matters of concern to the minister, and I think it would be well worth his while making the fullest inquiry in regard to the matter to which I am now referring. I will expect him after inquiry to give me the information and let me know why this man has had, and has to-day, control of the expenditure of public works money in the county of Pictou.

Mr. SHORT: I would ask if the minister has yet made up his mind with reference to giving instructions for much needed dredging in Digby harbour. When I asked the minister the other evening whether he had received an application for dredging in Digby harbour, he was not sure whether he had or not. Since then I have been given to understand that application has been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which operates a line of steamers from St. John to Digby, and which is now building a very much larger steamer for that route. I understand from the files that the Canadian Pacific have already

drawn the department's attention to the necessity of doing some dredging for the accommodation of the boat that is used on that route at present. I would impress on the minister that in order to prepare for the increased traffic that is coming across the bay of Fundy between St. John and Digby, especially with the building of this very much larger steamer, it is absolutely necessary that a large amount of dredging be done in Digby harbour. Will an amount be placed in the supplementary estimates for that purpose, or will the work be done out of the $600,000 vote in the main estimates for dredging generally? I would also ask if the work will be done this summer.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be glad to give my hon. friend all the information I have. There has been some correspondence with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but my recollection is that there has been nothing definite since they have decided upon their new boat. So far as my information goes, they have not taken up with the department the amount of dredging that will be necessary to accommodate the new boat. I do not think they have themselves very definitely settled just what that boat is to be.

Mr. SHORT: They have definitely settled that it will be 340 feet long. The boat at present in the service is about 200 feet long, so the minister can readily understand that the channel at low water must be considerably enlarged to accommodate a boat that is 140 feet longer.

Mr ELLIOTT: That may be. I think, however, it is only fair to say to my hon. friend there is nothing in the general vote for harbours and rivers noted for that particular work. The request for the work not having reached the department, my hon. friend will quite understand that the examination necessary has not been made, and I can say nothing now as to what may be in the supplementary estimates. The matter, however, will receive every consideration.

Mr. SHORT: A request has been made by the Canadian Pacific for dredging to accommodate the boat that is now running on that service. Will that work be done this summer?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I understand that the requirements of the present boat of which we have been notified, can be taken care of out of the general vote, but the dredging that will be necessary for a boat 340 feet long would require a further vote. That is my information.

[Mr. Short.]

Mr. SHORT: Will the minister provide that in the supplementary estimates?

Mr. ELLIOTT: In the first place, I cannot say how much the amount would be, and in the second place, I cannot say whether on our information I shall be able to recommend the expenditure. Even then it is impossible for me to say whether I could get what I recommend through the treasury board and council, but I will give the matter the best consideration I can.

Mr. SHORT: A large amount is being provided in the estimates for other places in Nova Scotia. I see there is $25,000 for Yarmouth, $30,000 for Liverpool, and the county of Antigonish-Guysborough gets quite a number of appropriations. We have at Digby, one of the most valuable harbours and piers in Nova Scotia, but no dredging has been done therefor the last eight or ten years. It is absolutely necessary that the harbour should be looked after. I have no doubt that $25,000 is urgently needed at Yarmouth, but we also urgently need dredging at Digby, and I think it is the minister's duty to see that these public works which are owned by the government and which bring in a good revenue to the country are looked after, so that the steamers on the service can dock at these wharves. If the minister will give me his assurance that the necessary dredging will be done there I shall be glad.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know that my hon. friend will not press me further for an assurance, because that is something that I cannot give him. But I do know that Digby is one of the places that is entitled to great consideration, and the best endeavours possible will be made to do whatever is necssary. That is as far as I can go.

Mr. SHORT: I am very glad to get that statement from the minister, and I have no doubt if he will use the same words in council he will have no trouble in getting a sufficient amount placed in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am afraid my hon. friend has never had to appear before council for the purpose or he would appreciate the difficulty.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): In looking over the public works estimates for various constituencies in Nova Scotia I find that the constituency of Halifax, which has about 140 miles of Atlantic coast, with a large number of harbours, necessitating a great many breakwaters as a protection for fishermen's boats, has allotted to it the large sum of $13,600. Of that amount something over $5,000 is voted

for private property, that is at Lawlor's Island —a quarantine station and a wharf. Those works are absolutely not in the public interest, but are part and parcel of the equipment of that institution. Deducting the $5,000 from the $13,600, we have a balance of less than $9,000 to take care of the breakwaters on 140 miles of Atlantic coast. I was pleased indeed to hear the minister say that he is rapidly overtaking the repairs necessary to the breakwaters along the Nova Scotia coast. I would suggest to him, and I hope the suggestion may be adopted, that in the supplementary estimates he endeavour to provide a few thousand dollars for the necessary repairs to the breakwaters in the constituency of Halifax; and if he cannot do so, that in the coming year he will allot a substantial amount for the purpose. The repairs are sadly needed and should be attended to. This I think is only fair when one considers that even my friend from Digby-Annapolis has $50,000 for his constituency as against less than $9,000 for the county of Halifax, to say nothing of the very large amounts that have been provided for the constituencies of my friend from Antigonish-Guysborough and the Minister of National Defence. It is not fair to set aside only $9,000 for public works in the county of Halifax.

Mr. CANTLEY: Could the minister let me know how much money was expended on Pictou Landing wharf last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have not the information here. Unless there is an amount in the estimates we do not have any information ready to hand. It seems to be about all we can do to have a reasonable amount of information available on each of the many hundred items contained in the estimates. I shall be glad to look into the matter and let my hon. friend have the information.

Mr. CANTLEY: I assumed the minister had the information because I think some money was spent there. When may I expect to get that information?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think I can give it to my hon. friend to-morrow.

Item agreed to.

Port Maitland—breakwater extension, $50,000.

The CHAIRMAN: This amount was allowed to stand.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, I was to furnish some particulars to my hon. friend, which I did the day after the item was under consideration.

Item agreed to.

New Brunswick—harbours and rivers—Anderson's Hollow (Waterside)—breakwater repairs, $5,000.

Mr. BELL (St. John): Will the minister let us have particulars of this amount?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is asked to be provided to repair the outer end of the breakwater and partly to reconstruct the approach to same. The ultimate scheme, which would consist of completely rebuilding and repairing the destroyed sections of the breakwater, is estimated to cost $15,000. The district engineer reports that with an expenditure of $5,000 the immediately necessary work can be performed.

Item agreed to.

Beaver Harbour—wharf reconstruction, $15,000.

Mr. GRIMMER: Would the minister kindly give information in regard to this?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount of $15,000 is asked to be provided towards the reconstruction of the wharf, which is reported to be in an unsafe condition, owing to the action of the limnoria and general decayed condition of the structure. The proposed work is asked for by the district engineer who reports that during 1928 the business transacted over the wharf amounted to $130,000. The fishing trade was valued at $78,000, and imports received for the four stores amounted to $50,000.

Mr. GRIMMER: In looking over the estimates for the province of New Brunswick I am pleased to note that the county I have the honour to represent is not wholly overlooked. During the past seven sessions I have brought to the attention of the minister the necessity for making the extension to the breakwater at Seal Cove and Woodward's Cove, Grand Manan, and also an extension to the wharf at Beaver Harbour. I am very glad that the minister at last has recognized the great need for these works, and has placed an amount in the estmiates to carry to completion the extension to the breakwater that was started many years ago in the interests of the fishing industry. I am also very glad that there is an amount for the dredging and the breakwater at White Head. I wish to assure the minister that it will be appreciated by the people of that little island out in the bay of Fundy. But I desire to call the attention of the minister to one portion of the island of Grand Manan that has been overlooked and neglected for many years, more particularly since 1921. This is the most exposed place of the island of Grand Manan, which without doubt is in the most exposed position along the whole of the

bay of Fundy. I refer to the village of Castalia. During the election campaign of 1921, and again in 1925 and 1926, it was definitely promised by the Liberal candidates and by those who were working in the interests of the Liberal party, that if this government were returned to power a breakwater would be constructed of the village of Castalia. It is needless for me to tell the minister that the people loyally carried out their program and have been waiting patiently for the government to implement that promise. I wish to say to the minister that no portion of Grand Manan should receive greater consideration at the hands of this administration than the village to which I have referred, in view of the support the people have given them. The village of Castalia was at one time a prosperous fishing community, but like many other places along the coast it has suffered from the tides and winds of the bay of Fundy and from the waves beating on the shore, so that the waterfront and buildings have been destroyed. There is no protection whatever. And in the event of storms the fishermen have to moor their boats two miles from home which entails another hardship. Under such conditions it is impossible to get young men to remain in the place and carry on their vocation. The older men are compelled to stay, but many of the young men have left and gone to the United States where they are following their occupation under more favourable conditions. It is generally believed by the people of Castalia that if some consideration were given them by the government many of these young men who have left would return and take up their occupation, while those who are there at the present time would have some inducement to remain. By the expenditure of a small amount of money we may retain the young men in the fishing industry in Castalia and bring back many of those that have left, and this is surely a proposition which the government ought to take seriously into consideration. In my opinion it is a good immigration policy which should be adopted by the government. A few moments ago the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) said that we were anxious to claim credit for anything that was obtained for the county. Let me assure the hon. gentleman that if the government will build this breakwater which was promised the people of Castalia I am prepared to give them all the credit, because it is a necessity and is in the interests of the fishing business.

I regret to see that there is nothing in the supplementary estimates for the island of Campobello or Deer island in Passamaquoddy bay. The population of each of these islands depends upon the fishing industry and I submit that they should receive as much consideration as other fishing centres. The government have at the present time a report from the engineers in their department who have recommended that a wharf be built below Welchpool on the island of Campobello. One of the government supporters from that district was here a short time ago and interviewed the minister and went home with a favourable impression, and I do hope that when the supplementary estimates come down he will not be disappointed. The wharf at Stewarttown is one that should be provided in the interests of the fishing industry of that place. In these two places, Welchpool and Stewarttown, the people are carrying on the fishing industry just as they did fifty years ago. There are no facilities for them to unload or load their boats and they are bound to follow the old fashioned method of anchoring their boats to keep them afloat and then wading ashore. Now you cannot expect young men to remain in the place if they are obliged to work under such conditions, and I strongly urge the minister, therefore, to bring down in his supplementary estimates provision for the breakwater at Castalia, for the wharf below Welchpool and for the wharf at Stewarttown, all of which are small undertakings. If he does so he will find a more contented people in that fishing centre. The fishermen as a class should receive every consideration at the hands of the government and we should do everything in our power to help the industry. I notice in the reports of the fisheries department that in our county alone last year there was a decrease in the fishing business of $430,000; and taking the whole province of New Brunswick the record is a million dollars less than it was in 1926. It is incumbent upon the government to give this matter the most serious consideration, because fishing is one of the largest industries in the county. I cannot over-emphasize the fact that if you want to keep young men at work in that industry, if you want to prevent the place from deteriorating at the rate it has done in the last year or two, it is absolutely necessary to carry out these undertakings. I have urged upon the minister building wharves and breakwaters and making extensions wherever necessary. If this is done we shall serve the interests not only of the people of the county but of the province of New Brunswick.

There is one other matter to which I wish to refer, and that is the wharf at Digdeguash basin. That wharf will be greatly appreciated

by the people of that district who have many dealings with the residents of the islands. I wish to impress upon the minister, before I conclude, the importance of keeping in mind the wharves I have mentioned. I trust that when he brings down his supplementary estimates they will contain an amount to cover these various items. He must not lose sight of the importance of the breakwater at Castalia, where nature has formed a splendid foundation of solid rock in the most suitable place along the shore. All that is necessary now is for the government to carry the work to completion. If they will do so they will implement the promises they made in 1921 and 1926 and it will mean a great deal to the fishing industry of that locality.

Item agreed to.

Blue Cove—breakwater, $1,100.

Mr. GRIMMER: Where is Blue Cove?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Blue Cove is in the county of Gloucester. This amount is required to complete payments for work performed under contract with Mr. Charles L. Comeau of Caraquet, New Brunswick.

Item agreed to.

Black's harbour—wharf extension, $5,000.

Mr. GRIMMER: That wharf is owned by the government?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes; I do not think there is any doubt about that. The original wharf, consisting of a pile work structure 106 feet long by 20 feet wide, was built by the provincial government and transferred to the federal government by order in council dated May 25, 1917.

Mr. MacLAREN: It is a public wharf.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Brantville—wharf, $11,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: Where is that?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is situated on the gulf of St. Lawrence near the northeast extremity of Miramichi bay and about six miles northeast of Tabusintac. It is in the constituency of Northumberland. I am not as familiar with the geography of that province as I hope to be.

Item agreed to.

Burnt Church—wharf repairs, $5,000.

Mr. GRIMMER: In what part of the province is that?

Mr. ELLIOTT: In Northumberland.

Item agreed to.

Cape Bald—breakwater repairs, $5,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: Where is Cape Bald?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is in the county of Westmorland.

Item agreed to.

Cape Bald—breakwater extension and dredging, $10,000.

Mr. GRIMMER: One item provides for breakwater repairs and the other for a breakwater extension. Is that the same breakwater?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Dipper Harbour—breakwater repairs, $5,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: Might we have the details of the repairs at Dipper Harbour?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required to provide for general repairs to the breakwater in order to maintain it in serviceable condition. The proposed work is asked for by the district engineer, who reports that the annual business transacted over the breakwater is estimated at $75,000, and the fishing trade is valued at $50,000 yearly. There are 26 motor boats and a number of smaller boats operating there.

Item agreed to.

Eel River Bridge—wharf, to complete, $1,500.

Mr. GRIMMER: In what county is that?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is in Northumberland county.

Item agreed to.

Escuminac—breakwater extension, $40,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: Will this amount complete the work at Escuminac?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. MacLAREN: I notice, Mr. Chairman, that the votes in those portions of the province lying along the north shore, so-called, are in those constituencies represented in this house by hon. gentlemen opposite. Perhaps the minister would tell me whether that is an accident or a coincidence. At all events it is a fact that the votes for the northern sec-

tion of this province are pretty well concentrated in those constituencies represented by members who support the government. If the minister looks over the list he will find that undoubtedly that is the case.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will just call my hon. friend's attention to two or three others which occur to me.

Mr. MacLAREN: Of course there are always exceptions.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In his own riding there is Anderson's Hollow, Dipper Harbour—

Mr. MacLAREN: That is all, I think.

Mr. ELLIOTT: St. John river was marked here as being in that riding also.

Mr. MacLAREN: It is not in my riding.

Item agreed to.

Grande Anse—extension to breakwater and pier, $12,000.

Mr. GRIMMER: In what county is that?

Mr. VENIOT: It is in Gloucester county.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $60,000.

Mr. BELL (St. John): I would like the minister to give us the details in connection with this item?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required to make provision for repairs and improvements to harbour and river works under the control of the department in New Brunswick which are reported by the district engineer to involve an estimated expenditure of less than $1,000, and for similar works which must be attended to immediately as necessity arises therefore. This also takes care of the expenses of the district engineer's office, and so on, for the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. BELL (St. John): I would like to ask whether included in the estimates of the resident engineer there is any provision for repairs to the wharf at Chance Harbour. I had the opportunity of inspecting that wharf and I found it very badly in need of covering, and some of the side timbers also need replacement. That work would seem absolutely necessary in order to preserve the wharf in good condition, and I think it could be made good for a considerable time by a very small expenditure. Otherwise the heavy seas which come in there at various seasons of the year are likely to wreck great havoc with the structure as it now exists. I was wondering if this item of $60,000 included any provision for repairs to that wharf.

Mr. ELLIOTT: All I can say to my hon. friend is that this item is to cover urgent requirements which, as a general rule, do not cost more than $1,000. It is possible that the work to which he refers may be included in this amount.

Item agreed to.

Lameque—wharf extension, $59,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: This is a large item, and perhaps we might have some explanation. In what county is it?

Mr. VENIOT: It is in Gloucester county, and corresponds roughly to the vote of $60,000 in my hon. friend's constituency. He did not raise any fuss about that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is to provide for work now under contract. There is a revote of $20,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: We are back to the north shore again. Perhaps I might take this opportunity to direct the attention of the minister once more to Lorneville, which does not figure in the estimates this year. Lorneville is a very prosperous village of fishermen. It is an important fishing centre; it has valuable salmon and lobster fisheries. Last year the minister almost accomplished something, a thing which his predecessors had failed to do, although urged repeatedly to meet the necessities of the case. He put in sufficient vote to do the work, but it has been imperfectly and unsatisfactorily carried out. I believe there was something like $15,000 voted for dredging and if that amount had been expended I think it would have been sufficient to accomplish the desired results. But, as I have told the minister, and as my colleague has told him, the result has been that there are two faults: the boats cannot lie near enough to the pier because the dredging does not extend that far, and secondly, there are large hillocks and if the vessels should rest upon these when anchored at low tide it may be dangerous for them. Has the minister the engineer's report on these conditions?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have not that report with me. I believe between $7,000 and $8,000 was spent last year, but I do not recall the engineer's report on this particular work.

Mr. MacLAREN: Could we have it tomorrow?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. MacLAREN: If the minister would read the report of the engineer to-morrow I think it would bear out what I am stating. My argument is based on the statements of the fishermen who live there, whose lives are spent largely on the water. They are a fine lot of people and I accept what they say as being correct. It is a great pity to spoil this work when the expenditure of a few more dollars would complete it. The dredging could be evened on the bottom and also extended so as to permit the vessels to lie in close to the breakwater or the pier.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be very glad to look into the engineer's report.

Mr. MacLAREN: And we may have it to-morrow? If the minister would do this he would make the people very happy. They were quite excited when they heard that the minister was going to do this work but when they saw the result there was a great reaction. I would like to have that feeling removed, and it would be removed if the work were completed.

Item agreed to.

St. John river—improvements, $2,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: That seems to be a very small amount for improvements on the St. John river.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the Hudson of Canada.

Mr. MacLAREN: There are many wharves upon this river and many boats passing up and down all the time; what is intended to be done with the $2,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT: To provide for the removal of boulders and ledges in the St. John river, chiefly in the eight mile section between Perth and Baker's Ferry, Victoria county.

Mr. MacLAREN: That is a long way up.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is where the repairs are needed.

Mr. MacLAREN: I cannot claim that to be near my constituency.

Item agreed to.

St. Stephen—wharf repairs, $4,500.

Mr. GRIMMER: Is this to be done by day labour or by contract?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is intended to be done by day labour.

Mr. GRIMMER: I think it would be wise for the department to look into the matter of day labour in repairing the wharf; I think money could be saved.

Item agreed to.

Seal Cove—breakwater extension, $18,000.

Mr. GRIMMER: Will that be by contract or by day labour?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That will be by contract.

Item agreed to.

Stonehaven—breakwater repairs, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Is that not a closed port now? Have they not stopped doing business at Stonehaven?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is for general repairs to the main breakwater which has been damaged by storms and ice. The proposed work is asked for by the district engineer who reports that the breakwater at Stonehaven provides the only protected harbour for schooners and fishing vessels between Caraquet and Bathurst, a distance of forty miles.

Item agreed to.

Tabucintac—wharf extension—$3,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: I think it might be well to leave a few items so that we can take up the matter of Lorneville to-morrow.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would call the hon. member's attention to the fact that Lorneville is not on the list.

Mr. MacLAREN: I want to get it on the list.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be very glad to supply my hon. friend with the information regarding that place.

Mr. MacLAREN: There is the general dredging vote for about $600,000, and if the minister would agree that, say, $5,000 or $6,000 would be set aside for Lorneville, that would be quite satisfactory.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will look into the matter and do the best I can.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, May 7, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Seventh report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.—Mr. Parent.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (Cartier) presented the third report of the select standing committee on public accounts, requesting that the committee be given leave to sit while the house is in session.

He said: With the unanimous consent of the house, Mr. Speaker, I move that the report just presented be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the house.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 177, for the relief of Claude Frederick Burgin.—Mr. Geary (for Mr. Lennox).

Bill No. 181, for the relief of Mary Addie Linton.—Mr. Geary (for Mr. Lennox).

Bill No. 188, for the relief of Marie Rose Beffre Baer.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 195, for the relief of Jeanie Mathieson Howell.—Mr. Hepburn (for Mr. Edwards, Ottawa).

Bill No. 199, for the relief of Gordon Asher True.—Mr. Hepburn (for Mr. Edwards, Ottawa).

Bill No. 201, for the relief of Ethel Evelyn Farrow.—Mr. Geary (for Mr. Lennox).

Bill No. 210, for the relief of John Alfred Neary.—Mr. Geary (for Mr. Lennox).

Bill No. 211, for the relief of Charles Storey.—Mr. Geary (for Mr. Lennox).

PEACE RIVER RAILWAY OUTLET

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (Peace River): I should like to ask the Minister of Railways if in the near future he can table the report of the engineers who made various surveys last year of the passes between the Peace River country and the Pacific coast; also the correspondence between the government and the Canadian National Railways in connection with the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway; also the correspondence in connection with the Pacific Great Eastern railway, for which an order passed the house some time ago.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways): Mr. Speaker, I will have these various returns checked up. In connection with one of them, about which my hon. friend spoke to me the other day, that is, the correspondence with respect to the acquisition of the Northern Alberta Railway by the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National, I am advised that the delay arises through certain correspondence between the presidents of the two railways having been marked "personal" and the necessary permission required to produce it. I do not think there will be any difficulty; it will be merely a matter of delay. In connection with the others, I will have the necessary inquiries made.

CANADA'S GOLD RESERVE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Finance in a position to throw any light upon the state of our gold reserve?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): No, I have not had any report from the department yet. I can assure my hon. friend that we are quite safe.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I presume there will be enough to provide for the indemnity of the hon. gentleman who has inquired so often recently in regard to our gold reserve.

WAR MEMORIALS BUILDING

On the orders of the day:

Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Argenteuil): May I ask the Prime Minister if anything has been done in the way of providing a building for the housing and caring of our war memorials? The matter was up last session. As I explained at the time, Canada has a wonderful collection of war memorials, in fact I think a collection larger and more important than that possessed by any other country. The Prime Minister then said:

> Up to the present time we have felt that there were other demands more imperative than the demand for a building for the purpose of housing these works of art. I think, however, we must not lose sight of the fact that the collection is a national possession, a very valuable possession, and one which as speedily as possible should be properly housed.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been much disappointed to find no provision in the estimates for a building for this purpose. The government seems to be able to spend a lot of money for other buildings in Ottawa. It strikes me that a building to house our war memorials is more necessary than some other buildings for which provision is being made. I wish the Prime Minister would be good enough to tell us when he will be able to do something towards providing a suitable building.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend has just said, our collection of national war memorial paintings is without doubt one of the finest that any country possesses, and certainly, I assume, the best collection anywhere of paintings in relation to the recent war. After my hon. friend brought the matter up last session the government did carefully look into the question of the housing of the paintings. We found, as has been represented by my hon. friend, that they were stored, in considerable part, in what is now the basement of the National Museum and Art Gallery. We also discovered that it was not a suitable place for storage, and that it was necessary, if the paintings were to be properly preserved, that they should be stored in a dry atmosphere and in a better environment generally. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) and his officers went carefully into the available accommodation in the city and were fortunate in being able to obtain some space in a part of the large Auditorium building. This part the government has leased for storing the paintings. The building is suited admirably for the purpose. It is fireproof, it has a southern exposure, is quite dry, and an even temperature can be readily maintained. From what the director of the art gallery says, I believe it will serve to keep the pictures in perfect condition. So much for the storage.

As for the exhibition of the paintings, that is another matter. Up to the present time the government has not felt it would be justified in asking parliament to appropriate money for an art gallery. There are many public buildings urgently needed. One of them was referred to by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) only a day or two ago—a building for the Supreme Court of Canada. There are other buildings necessary for departmental purposes, and we feel we should consider meeting these requirements before undertaking a building for the exhibition of paintings. However, personally, I am not without hope that some public-spirited citizen will be found who one of these days will present the country with a national art gallery.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE

OPTIONAL CLAUSE—PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

Miss AGNES C. MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Citizen the Prime Minister is reported as saying that Canada will not sign the optional clause until the mother country and the other dominions are ready to do so. I should like to know if he is correctly reported?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I saw the report, Mr. Speaker, to which my hon. friend has just referred. I am afraid I have to say it is inaccurate. I remember being asked yesterday if I had anything further to add to the statement I made in the house a day or two ago as to Canada's position with respect to the optional cause, and I replied that the statement I had made in the house was all I had to say on the matter. The statement, I think, will bear out that all I said was that Canada was prepared to sign the optional clause, but did not intend doing so without conference with other parts of the British Empire, as had been promised at the time of the last Imperial conference; I made no statement to the effect that we would not sign the optional clause unless all parts of the empire agreed. Our view is that there should be a conference in the first place. After the conference it will be for us to say whether we shall sign alone, or whether it will be possible for all parts of the empire to sign at the same time.

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): I understood the right hon. Prime Minister to say that the statement in the House of Lords was correct, that Canada was willing to sign the optional clause immediately.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, I said so far as we are concerned we are quite prepared to sign the optional clause. However, we gave an undertaking at the last Imperial conference that we would not take that step until there had been an opportunity for all parts of the empire to confer together. That

opportunity will come, I assume, at the next Imperial conference. It may come before, but until it does come I should not like to say that Canada will take any action on its own.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Is it not true that the Prime Minister definitely stated in the House of Commons that we would not wait until the next Imperial conference before action would be taken.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is quite possible that the matter may be arranged by correspondence. I desire to be on the safe side and make a statement that I can be sure will be implemented.

BANK STATEMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) whether there has been any alteration in the method of preparing bank statements in the last three years?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): Not that I am aware of—no material alteration. I shall inquire from the inspector of banks, and if there has been any material alteration I shall let my hon. friend know.

MONTREAY RAILWAL TERMINAL FACILITIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. G. BELL (St. Antoine): May I ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) a question in regard to the proposed terminal facilities at Montreal? The Palmer report has been submitted to the various public bodies of Montreal. Has the minister any statement for the house as to their views in regard to the report?

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways): No, I have nothing to say along that line. I have no evidence as to their views. I have a number of individual representations of one kind or another, but I do not recollect any specific expressions of views by any public body. Shortly there will be before the house a proposal with respect to authorizing the Canadian National Railways to undertake certain expenditure in the city of Montreal, and at that time, I presume, the matter will be considered in all its bearings by the railway committee, on which occasion public bodies and individuals will have an opportunity to appear and make any representations they may desire.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Customs tariff—438b. Automobiles for conveying passengers only, n.o.p., valued at retail at place of production, when new, with standard equipment complete, at not more than twelve hundred dollars each; motor cars or motor trucks (not for railways or tramways) for carrying goods only; motorcycles or side cars therefor; chassis for motor vehicles specified in this item: British preferential tariff, 12½ per cent; intermediate tariff, 17½ per cent; general tariff, 20 per cent.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): The committee will observe that the only change in this item is the addition of the words "or side cars therefor." It is asked for by the Wheelmen's Association and the matter was considered before the tariff board, where there was no opposition.

Mr. COOTE: When this item was last before the committee on April 12, the question of the removal of the excise tax on automobiles was brought to the attention of the minister and he promised to investigate the whole matter. Has he any further information to offer now?

Mr. ROBB: I have a number of letters in reply from the automobile dealers and have instructed the tariff board to go into the whole matter carefully, with a view to determining not only the percentage manufactured in Canada but whether the requirements of the act are being complied with. Until the tariff board goes into the question thoroughly I do not care to make any further statement. I can assure the committee that the board have instructions to make a thorough inquiry and it is possible they will have an auditor go into the whole matter. Later on we may have public hearings if necessary.

Mr. COOTE: Will the minister make it clear whether the board have been instructed to report to him as to whether the manufacturers of automobiles are or are not taking advantage of the situation—whether they are living up to their agreement made with the minister some years ago. Is it clear that the board are to report to the minister?

Mr. ROBB: That is the absolute understanding. I have not before me the letter to the board, but those are their instructions; they have been asked to go into the matter

most carefully. I may say to my hon. friend that from the correspondence I am satisfied that most of the manufacturers are living up to the agreement, although there are some who have not been doing so.

Mr. COOTE: If the board should report to the minister that some of the manufacturers are not living up to the agreement will the minister promise us that he will take off the excise tax from all cars?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend must not ask me to commit myself in relation to what we may do in that regard in the next budget. Such a statement can be made properly only after approval on the part of the Governor General. However, my hon. friend may safely leave the matter in our hands. We have a pretty clear mind as to what should be done and it is just possible that the question may be considered in relation to the tariff inquiry now going on in connection with steel and materials required in the manufacture of cars.

Mr. COOTE: I wish we could feel better satisfied to leave the matter in the minister's hands. We have done so for the last three years and some of us feel that for two years at any rate the manufacturers have been taking advantage of the elimination of the tax. The minister has been asleep at the switch and has allowed them to get away with it, to use a common expression. I do not think, therefore, that we should leave it to the minister until next session. Personally I should like to see the matter dealt with before this session is over. I wonder whether the minister would make the reference to the board wide enough so that they may report to him next year as to whether the customs tariff should not be further reduced on all motor trucks, which are coming into such general use to-day. As a matter of fact, to many farmers at any rate, the motor truck to-day takes the place which the wagon held some years ago. I would ask the minister to instruct the board to take up that question at the same time; the two matters could be considered together.

Mr. McGIBBON: When this resolution was last before the committee I asked the minister for a statement as to how the Canadian content was estimated. Supposing in the cheaper cars the Canadian content comprised 70 or 80 per cent: would that excess be applied to the higher priced cars with a Canadian content of say, 40 per cent?

Mr. ROBB: That is a matter that belongs to the Department of National Revenue, but I have given instructions to the tariff board to look carefully into it also.

Mr. McGIBBON: What has been the practice in the past?

Mr. ROBB: As I say, that matter is administered by the Department of National Revenue; they check up on the percentage of Canadian material going into the manufacture of cars.

Mr. McGIBBON: But that does not afford me any information.

Mr. ROBB: No. I have sent for my colleague the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler).

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am not disposed to leave the minister in the position of evasion in which he has placed himself. Consciously or unconsciously he has been guilty of a breach of faith with the members in this corner of the house. When he appealed to us, in that memorable year, to permit him to relieve the automobile manufacturers in Canada to the extent of the removal of the excise duty he promised us absolutely, definitely and unquestionably that he would undertake to see that the manufacturers lived up to their agreement, which was to pass back to the consumers the saving which would result from the exclusion of the excise tax. The minister has now clearly shown in his answers to questions asked him that he has not checked up the manufacturers, but has relied on casual letters which he has received from them, and that even at this moment he is not in a position to state whether in his opinion they have or have not lived up to their promise. Let me repeat the promise made by the Minister of Finance in 1926. He said:

> We have, however, the right to reduce taxation, and if they do not live up fairly to this agreement we have the right to reduce the excise tax to all the trade of the world.

The hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) then asked:

> Will that be inserted in the bill?
> Mr. Robb: It is not necessary.

It was not necessary, according to the minister, to insert it in the bill. The minister left the impression that he was prepared to remove the excise duty on imported cars if the manufacturers in Canada did not live up to their promise, and in the three years that have elapsed he has made no investigation whatever; he has undertaken no check whatever of the situation. He has relied solely upon opinions expressed in letters, and

now he attempts to evade his responsibility by stating to the hon. member for Macleod that he cannot give any promise as to what may be done, that the decision will have to be made in some future budget. The minister knows very well that this question of the excise duty can be dealt with by order in council, according to my information, if he desires to treat it in that way.

I do not think the Minister of Finance should leave himself or the house in that position. Certainly he never has given me the impression that he was a man who would deliberately break faith, but consciously or unconsciously he has broken faith in this case and I ask him now to reinstate himself in our confidence and in the confidence of the people who have trusted him up to this time.

Mr. ROBB: I do not recall the date when we had this matter under consideration previously, but I think it must have been about April 14.

Mr. COOTE: April 12.

Mr. ROBB: On April 15 I signed the following letter, addressed to Mr. Moore of the tariff board:

My Dear Mr. Moore:

It has been stated in parliament that certain Canadian manufacturers of automobiles have been and are now taking full price advantage of an exemption of excise taxes provided under the budget legislation of 1926. Attached is copy of correspondence with Canadian automobile manufacturers relative to this matter.

I desire also to direct your attention to the debate when in committee, June 7, 1926, Hansard pages 4124-4137; March 30, 1928, Hansard pages 1858-1859 and April 12, 1929, Hansard pages 1601-1613, and would request that you at once start an inquiry into the relative prices in Canada and the United States, as well as an inquiry into the percentage of content Canadian material and labour used in each of the several models upon which exemption from excise tax is now claimed. The Department of National Revenue may have available helpful information. I specially desire inquiry into charges that certain companies have not given their customers the reduction promised.

I would draw to your attention that various companies in their replies to me last year offered to open their books for the inspection of anyone whom I would care to name. This will be your authority to have an inspection made in accordance with their offer.

It is important that this inquiry be conducted without delay and be as comprehensive as possible.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) James A. Robb.

I cannot do more.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No, but the minister could have done more if he had wished to keep faith; he could have started this inquiry at the outset, as he should have done and as it was his duty to do. During that session the situation as far as the administration was concerned was particularly strained, and to relieve the administration from a mighty ticklish position, to help the Minister of Finance, who is now pleased to smile about it, in one of the most critical moments in his career, and to meet his earnest request hon. members in this corner consented to modify their principles in this matter. Surely there devolved upon him then not only the duty but the positive obligation of undertaking and continuing an investigation in order to see that his promises were lived up to.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that there was a barter between hon. members in that corner and the Minister of Finance?

Mr. IRVINE: I hope the hon. member for Bow River and all hon. members in this corner of the house will learn a much needed lesson in political economy and in political matters generally from the question now before the house. It is generally understood that an Irishman is a pretty good man when dealing with pigs; he does not usually buy a pig in a poke, but this time he did so. The next time he makes a bargain I hope he will know exactly what he is getting, and see to it that he gets exactly what he should. Meanwhile we can only congratulate the Minister of Finance upon being a little more clever than some of the hon. members in this corner.

Mr. BENNETT: I wonder if the minister realizes that a moment ago he said that this was a matter for the Minister of National Revenue, in spite of the fact that it was the Minister of Finance who sent a letter to the tariff board requesting them to deal with this matter, although it has to do with the collection of revenue. Why is it that our questions must go unanswered because the Minister of National Revenue is not here, while at the same time the Minister of Finance says, "Look what I have done; I have written to the chairman of the tariff board, who is a prospective Liberal candidate in a constituency which contains the largest automobile manufacturing industry in Canada, asking him to ascertain some of these things for us." That is what the minister wants this house to believe, and this gentleman to whom the letter was written is the gentleman who, in his annual report as chairman of that board, states that he has established intimate relations with the manufacturers of this country. I may tell the minister that I propose to ask, before he gets through his resolutions, the names of the establishments

visited by that gentleman during the last twelve months, as mentioned in his report. We are going to ask for that information because we have a right to obtain it, and then we may find out exactly what are these intimate relations which have been established in this particular constituency between the largest manufacturers of automobiles in Canada and the chairman of the tariff board, a prospective Liberal candidate.

Does the minister think for a moment that the people of Canada will tolerate that sort of thing? Does he think that they will be deceived by it and that they will be made sport of in this way? A perfectly legitimate and proper question was asked in an endeavour to secure certain information, but the only reply we received was that the minister was referring the question to "dear Mr. Moore." The minister said to him, "You seek to represent a constituency in which is situated the largest automobile manufacturing business in Canada. Please go out and see how their prices compare with the prices paid in the United States, and if you cannot do that, take a look at their books. Here is your authority to do so," but a moment ago it was the Minister of National Revenue who had to deal with this matter, rather than the Minister of Finance. To use the classical language which was indulged in by one of the members of the government the other day, you cannot play both ends against the middle in that way very long, so let us get down to brass tacks in connection with this matter. Did the minister say to Mr. Moore that last year Canada imported about $102,000,000 worth of automobiles and automobile parts? Did he observe that of that amount $55,000,000 represented automobile parts and the balance automobiles imported largely from the United States? Did he observe that our exports were sent to countries enjoying a preference under different treaties? Surely the minister must have observed these things; the questions asked are quite reasonable and I desire to associate myself with those who desire to have these questions answered. I do not like this bunkum of saying, "I passed it on to Mr. Moore," who wants to represent the constituency containing the largest automobile industry in Canada. It may get him some votes if he makes the right kind of a report.

Mr. GOTT: Not many.

Mr. BENNETT: We will leave it at that.

Mr. IRVINE: Louder.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister and I were simply carrying on a little private conversation across the floor; he said I was getting information from another quarter, and I said I did not think so. At any rate, that is the question we would like answered; it is not unreasonable. On the question of content, surely the minister who came back from Keith's theatre with his courage still undaunted, but who yielded exactly one week later, the minister who put on this excise tax and then took it off, and who continues to play with it in the manner of the old shell game—now you see it and now you don't—surely he can do better than that. Now an hon. gentleman wants to know what is meant by it and I associate myself with his question.

Mr. ROBB: There seems to be a misapprehension as to the question asked by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon). He inquired as to the method of determining the content, whether an average was taken for the whole shop or whether each machine was dealt with separately. I am not in a position to give him that information; I do not administer that regulation, but I instructed the tariff board to inquire fully into that question and report, and I may say frankly that I have in mind that before this matter is concluded the automobile manufacturers will have to come into the open and have a public hearing in connection with this question.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Then I would like to ask if this hearing will have to take its turn and, if so, about what time we may expect it to be held.

Mr. ROBB: They are at work on it now.

Mr. BENNETT: Will that be a private or public hearing?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Three years after a definite pledge is given to the house by the minister he says, "I will take the matter up with the tariff board and have an investigation made." It was the duty of the minister to have one of his own investigators make an investigation and not wait for the tariff board to inquire into this matter. The minister has the power to put a qualified man on the job to-day if he wants to do it. It is his duty to do that and not wait for the tariff board. It was his duty to have done that two years ago; it was his duty to have seen that this saving was passed on to the consumers as he promised it would be passed on, and the only way he could be sure that that was done was by having a man from his department on the job from the day the

promise was made. In failing to do that he has broken faith with us and with the country. He has failed in his duty when he is unable to answer the very simple question: Have they passed the saving back to the consumer? He was not able to answer that question and cannot answer it because he has no authoritative information. It was his duty as Minister of Finance, as an hon. member of the government and as one of the responsible ministers of the crown not only to keep the promise he made but to secure accurate information that the promise has been kept.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member forgets that it has not been established that they did not carry out their agreement. It is true that certain price lists were quoted from magazines showing a difference in price in Canada and in the United States. The hon. member will recall that when this was up last year I stated that I had written to all the automobile manufacturers reminding them of the promise. Replies came in from most of them claiming that they were passing along this excise tax to their customers. I think there were two companies from which I did not receive replies. It happened that an official of one of those companies was either the president or secretary of the Automotive Association, and when I directed his attention to this fact he brought down my original letter acknowledging his reply. He had replied but the letter had been mislaid in the department, and it has not been found yet. He brought down a copy of the letter which he had sent and in that letter made the statement that he was passing this saving on.

Mr. RYCKMAN: And he also stated that the books were open to inspection at any time.

Mr. ROBB: Yes. The Ford Motor Company had not replied at that time but their business was very much disturbed, as everyone knows. They have since claimed that eighty per cent, or nearly eighty per cent of the contents of their car is Canadian and they also claimed that they are passing the saving on. There are the statements which they make to be put up against the statements which have been made that they are not passing it on. In justice to the public I have instructed the tariff board to go into this matter carefully, to put auditors into the companies where they consider it necessary, and I told the chairman only the other day that in the public interest it would be better to have a public hearing. I am not disposed to condemn these men before they have been properly heard.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

Mr. COOTE: I have no fault to find with the minister for asking the advisory tariff board to examine very thoroughly into this matter. My criticism is that when this matter was brought to his attention he satisfied himself by writing letters to these automobile manufacturers. On April 12, 1928, the minister was asked by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner):

> Is that all the minister has done?
> Mr. Robb: That is all.
> Mr. Gardiner: That is nothing.

It seems to me that nothing has been done in this case. I am very glad to hear the minister state that this matter will be made the subject of a public hearing and I presume the evidence will come before the members of the house. I am forced to express my regret that the minister has not seen fit to state to the house that if the case is proven that some of the automobile manufacturers have been taking advantage of this tax and have not passed the reduction on to the consumer, the government would remove the excise tax from all cars. I do not see in what other light the statements made to the house in 1926 can be viewed. In answer to a question by the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) the minister said:

> We have, however, the right to reduce taxation, and if they do not live up fairly to this agreement we have the right to reduce the excise tax to all the trade of the world.
> Mr. Evans: Will that be inserted in the bill?
> Mr. Robb: It is not necessary.

I do not know what other interpretation can be put upon the words of the minister. If he can give the house any other explanation of the remarks he made at that time I am sure we will be pleased to hear it.

If the minister will not remove by order in council the tax upon these cars which are being imported, when the case should be proved, I can only suppose that next year he intends to introduce another of those popular Robb budgets and is saving this change to make his budget popular. The budget which was described in the election campaign of 1926 as the popular Robb budget contained a reduction in the tariff on automobiles, and I am quite satisfied that that was preeminently the one change which made that budget so popular. If that is the case, so far as the popularity of that budget is concerned, the success should not be ascribed to the Minister of Finance, it should be credited to the members in this corner of the house who persisted in keeping that matter before parliament and finally persuaded the minister, perhaps against his own inclinations, to reduce the tariff on cars.

I suggest to the minister that the inquiry by the tariff board should be a very thorough one and should go carefully into the whole question of the prices which are being charged the consumers of automobiles in Canada. I have before me a price list of the Ford Motor Company as issued to their agents from their St. John, N.B. agency. I will give the particulars of one model only because it is typical of all the rest. The price on one model is as follows:

Ford phaeton	$510 00
Spare tire	15 00
Bumper and bumperettes	20 00
Tax	12 27
Freight	84 00
Delivery charges	10 00
Price delivered at Glace Bay, N.S.	651 27

I draw the attention of the minister to this fact, the list factory price which is quoted by the Ford Motor Company does not include spare tires, bumper or bumperettes, and the price of $510 is the price which I used on April 12 last in making a comparison of the prices of the Ford car in Canada and the United States. Some hon. members of the house have said that there is more equipment on the Canadian car than on the American car, but I would like to know where it is because this price list shows very clearly that the spare tire, bumper and bumperettes are not included. I would like to draw the attention of the minister to this further fact; they are charging the consumers of automobiles in the maritime provinces—I am satisfied they are doing the same thing in other parts of Canada—with a freight rate which is more than twice what the Ford Company or their agents pay on these cars, and in addition they include a delivery charge of $10. I have in my hand a couple of invoices for Ford cars which were sent to an agent at Glace Bay. The agent informed me that in every case the freight was less than $40 per car and yet the consumers in the maritime provinces are being charged $84 for freight and in addition to that they are being charged $10 for delivery charges. It may be argued that they are not contravening any statute of Canada when they do that, but if they are penalizing the consumer in the distant portions of Canada, for instance in the maritimes and the western provinces, with a freight charge which is more than twice what they are actually paying, it is time we carefully considered the question whether we should further protect this company from competition from other countries or not. To say the least, the practice is a most questionable one. When this question was debated on the floor of the house on April 12, one hon. member at least, seemed quite concerned for fear the minister might remove this excise tax from imported cars, and subject Canadian manufacturers to a little more competition. He mentioned the fact that the Ford Company sustained a loss last year. In a letter which I have under my hand from an agent of the Ford Company, he says:

> The company, as would be expected, did not pay a dividend last year, but, a few years back they were generous in the extreme. In addition to a 100 per cent cash dividend in 1911, they also paid 500 per cent in stock and followed this with a 600 per cent stock dividend in 1916. In 1924, when net earnings amounted to $53.13 a share, they paid 10 per cent, 20 per cent in 1925, 10 per cent in 1926, 15 per cent in 1927 and nothing in 1928 as would be expected.

He makes that statement because he knew they were reorganizing their factory at that time. He goes on:

> However, if you will refer to ad., of the Canadian General Securities Corporation, appearing in all the daily papers in Canada on April 1 or 2, you will note that Mr. W. R. Campbell, president and treasurer, is quoted as stating that for January and February of this year, operations, "show net profits, after depreciation, in excess of $1,500,000—net profits for the month of March will be equally satisfactory—further it is estimated that the net profits after depreciation for the year 1929 will be in excess of any previous year."

That is the quotation which he gives. He suggests that it will be $10,000,000 at least. I do not think there is any occasion for the house or the minister to worry about the financial position of these companies. As a matter of fact, I think it is really important that the Minister of Finance should take some means of assuring the house that he will make good the promise which he made in 1926. I do not want to be unreasonable at all. If the minister thinks the case is not proven, I am quite willing that the matter should be investigated by the advisory tariff board. If we are to have an advisory tariff board in this country, perhaps it is the proper body to investigate this question. But I hope the minister will make a positive statement as to what he will do if the case is proven that these manufacturers have taken advantage of the remission of the excise tax and that he will assure the house that the tariff advisory board will be instructed to have brought out fully just what is the practice of these automobile corporations in setting the price which they charge to consumers in distant parts of Canada as related to their advertised list price at the factory, the price on which the excise tax and sales tax which they pay is based.

Mr. KAISER: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Let us have an answer from the minister.

Mr. ROBB: An answer to what?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): To the question asked by the hon. member for Macleod whether the minister would keep his promise in the event of the companies not giving the saving to the consumer.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friends are making a great deal of their statement that I broke faith with them in 1925 or 1926. That is sufficient reason for me to make no promises until I have all the facts before me.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Are we to understand then that these words are now dead and to be forgotten? The minister, when speaking in the house in 1926, used these words:

> I serve notice on them now, in the presence of my friends, that if they do not live up to that agreement we will find means of placing them in a position where they will have to do so, or meet competition of the world.

Has the minister forgotten that promise?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is the minister going to live up to that promise?

Mr. MANION: May I ask my hon. friend a question? He has a very acute mind. Does he remember any promise which this government has ever kept?

Mr. KAISER: I am not going to endeavour to get the Minister of Finance out of any trouble—

Mr. ROBB: I am not in any trouble.

Mr. KAISER: —but I should like my hon. friends to my left to explain to me how they know whether the manufacturers passed the excise reduction on to the consumer or not. I am going to submit a few outstanding facts in regard to the automobile business. My claim is that the government made a blunder as regards Canada when they undertook to tamper with the tariff on automobiles in 1926. This was detrimental to the industry as a whole and to the consumers of Canada as well.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. KAISER: All right. Take the price of any automobile in 1926 when the government undertook to do something in regard to the tariff on automobiles; then go back three years and take the price of a similar automobile during that period and observe the drift of things. See what was going on in this country. Canadian manufacturers were grappling with a great industry and in those three years they reduced the prices of automobiles to Canadian consumers by nearly 40 per cent. How? By virtue of their own genius, by virtue of mass production and by virtue of internal economic administration they were endeavouring to give Canada a cheap automobile and they reduced the price by from 33⅓ to 40 per cent in those three years. If the automobile business had been left alone, what would have happened? Economics were being studied; genius was being developed; mass production was increasing, and the manufacturers were endeavouring to run their factories as many months in the year as possible. Immediately after this change the number of months of operation in the automobile business yearly was reduced and in our city for three or four months at a time when men were absolutely out of employment; whereas, if they had been at work all the year round they could, by thus reducing the yearly overhead costs, have produced automobiles at a more rapid pace and at a more reasonable price. In 1926, the government of Canada disturbed this wonderful industry. It listened to the croakers who were saying: Give us automobiles as cheap as they have them in the United States; reduce the price to the consumer. And my hon. friends think they have accomplished something. What have they done? The same type of automobile, the price of which was reduced between 30 and 40 per cent in those three years previous to 1926 has been manufactured and sold by the same people in Canada and the reduction in price has been less than 9 per cent in the last three years. If the government had left this industry alone, I have not the slightest doubt that the reduction in price would have been 20 or 25 per cent instead of 9. Because of the number of months in the year these people would have been employed, and because of the increase in mass production, the manufacturers could have reduced the price of their automobiles more rapidly than they have been able to do under present circumstances. I see smiles on the faces of some hon. gentlemen. Evidently they think I am saying something that is absurd. I say to you gentlemen who are smiling that you desire to drive these industries out of Canada, but you will have another thought coming, and probably you will get it inside of a week's time. The consumers of farm products in this country mean more to the farmers of Canada than do the consumers of any other country in the world. What has happened, for instance, in

the matter of automobile importations? Do hon. gentlemen smile at the fact that since the Minister of Finance made the change affecting automobiles in 1926 there has been an increase in the importation of the finished article amounting to over 260 per cent? Automobiles have been coming into this country in ever-increasing numbers, while the manufacturers in our own land could have manufactured right here at home every automobile that is used in Canada to-day, and in addition, they could have reduced the price by 20 per cent if they had been given a fair chance and were not continually assailed by people who think that our automobile manufacturers and manufacturers of every other article used in Canada should be exposed to the competition of the whole world. I believe that we can make in Canada, and that we should make in Canada, everything that the people of Canada need, and if our industrial centres were left alone we would produce most of these goods just as cheaply as they are produced in the United States or anywhere else, but we cannot do it if our manufacturers are to be eternally disturbed by these absurd theorists. Our manufacturers cannot go on and develop industries in Canada if they are always to be assailed by people who believe that these goods should not be made in this country, but in some foreign land. Why should there have been this increase of 260 per cent in the importation of automobiles when our own manufacturers could make every automobile that is used in Canada. If this 260 per cent increase in automobile importations were not coming into this country, our factories would be able to run for one month longer in the year than they do at present. The theory that these articles should be manufactured in foreign countries instead of at home will not hold up against the facts; it will not even hold up against the consumers' idea of cheapness, because if we had been manufacturing all these automobiles in Canada we could have produced them almost as cheaply as in the United States or anywhere else in the world. How can we ever develop into a great country when such absurd trade theories are put into effect as those expounded by certain hon. gentlemen in this house?

Mr. COOTE: I shall not attempt to deal with the rash statements which have just been made by the hon. member for Ontario, but he did ask for information. He asked what led us to believe that the manufacturers of automobiles were taking advantage of the excise tax.

Mr. KAISER: How do you know that the manufacturers are not passing this 5 per cent on to the consumer?

Mr. COOTE: If the hon. member would only keep his seat warm, I would try and tell him.

Mr. KAISER: How do you know they do not pass it on?

Mr. COOTE: I just got up to tell my hon. friend how I knew. If he would take the trouble to read the statement I placed on Hansard on April 12 last, he would see that the retail factory price of a Ford car in Canada is 29.1 per cent higher in the case of a coupe, 29.3 per cent higher in the case of a tudor sedan, and 29.8 per cent higher in the case of a fordor sedan.

Mr. GOTT: Higher than what?

Mr. COOTE: Higher than the price of the same car in the United States.

Mr. GOTT: There is no comparison between the two cars. The Canadian car is a much better car than the United States car.

Mr. COOTE: The customs tariff which these men enjoy is 20 per cent. Now if the tariff is 20 per cent and the price in Canada is 29.1 per cent higher than in the United States, it seems to me that we have furnished enough proof to the Minister of Finance for at least an investigation to be made to determine whether or not these manufacturers have taken advantage of the excise tax.

Mr. GOTT: There is no possible way of comparing the American Ford car with the Canadian, because the Canadian Ford car is so much better than the other.

An hon. MEMBER: In what way?

Mr. GOTT: It is better built and better in every way.

Mr. COOTE: The tariff board could make a very thorough inquiry into this question. They could get the advice of mechanical engineers and ascertain just how much more expensive the Canadian Ford is than the American. May I point out to the hon. member from Oshawa (Mr. Kaiser) that in my statement in regard to this matter a year ago I said that apparently General Motors had lived up to this agreement. I had no proof to the contrary, and so I exempted them. I would say to the Finance minister that I cannot see why he is so anxious to continue to protect the automobile manufacturers, particularly at what might seem to be his own expense, because in every case when election time comes around these manufacturers cer-

tainly do not vote for the party of which my hon. friend is so prominent a member. The hon. member for Ontario should thank the Minister of Finance for what he did for the automobile manufacturers, instead of belabouring him so hard, because as a matter of fact, after the Minister of Finance reduced the tariff in 1926, General Motors greatly increased their plant at Oshawa. I am perfectly unable to understand the attitude of the hon. member for Ontario. I think he should thank the Minister of Finance for his attitude if he is really sincere.

Mr. EVANS: I feel that this matter should not rest where it is. When this bargain was made, a definite and absolute promise was given to us here that the Minister of Finance at any time could exact the duty on these cars if he found that the reduction was not being passed on to the consumer. I feel that this action on the part of the automobile manufacturers is connived at by the government, and it is absolutely dishonest in the face of the whole country. The government is to-day conniving at the way in which these companies are putting it over the consumer. There is absolutely no necessity for any duty at all on cars entering Canada, because our Canadian manufacturers can compete with any part of the world. I listened a few days ago to a man from India who told us that the Canadian car was very much favoured there because of its cheapness, and it was generally underselling the American car. Why is this? Is the Canadian consumer paying the Canadian manufacturer a duty so that he can dump his cars in other parts of the world? Is all the export trade of Canada to be everlastingly carried on at the expense of the Canadian consumer? Manufacturing to-day is being done cheaper in Canada in many cases than in the United States. I know of agricultural implements that are made in the city of Hamilton and sold in North Dakota, and our farmers can go across the boundary from Saskatchewan and buy a Hamilton drill in North Dakota, bring it back across the line, pay the duty, and save $30 by so doing.

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. EVANS: I know that my hon. friend disputed this statement last year, but he has only to write to the research department of the United Farmers of Canada to get the facts. Drills made in Hamilton, Canada, are sold cheaper in the United States than they are in this country, and our farmers in Saskatchewan can go across there, buy one of these drills, bring it back across the line, pay the duty, and save about $30 on the machine.

[Mr. Coote.]

I say again that it is the Canadian consumer who is paying; he has to stand the burden of the whole export business of Canada. Our Finance minister put this over us three years ago when we from this corner demanded that the benefit of that excise tax be passed on to the consumer.

Now, why is it that this has got to be left so indefinite again for another two or three years, when there is absolutely no excuse at all for imposing a duty on the Canadian consumer? Have the politics of our country come down to this state, that anything can be done that they can get away with? Is there no moral side to these questions at all? In my city, if there is one crime to-day more prevalent than another it is that young people are stealing cars for the sake of getting joy rides around the country. Afterwards they abandon the cars in a damaged condition. These young people show a spirit of utter irresponsibility. I want to ask the house to-day, where does that irresponsibility start? It starts right here on the treasury benches of this house; that is where it begins. It is not easy to say these things, but when a trick like that is put over us here, I cannot help saying that such a state of affairs should come to an end, and we should have something definite, particularly with regard to this matter. I do not intend to let these things go along as they have in the past.

Mr. McGIBBON: Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to say anything in this debate, but I think statements such as the hon. member has just made should not be uttered in this house unless some proof is offered in support. Such statements do this country a lot of harm. Statements such as the hon. member made in a letter to the Montreal Gazette a week or two ago were a reflection on this whole house. Now I for one, want to protest against these allegations. Too often statements are made in this house that are absolutely ridiculous, and not a word of proof is given for them. The statements which the hon. member has just made are not new. I hold no brief for any manufacturer or any other person, but similar statements have been made from time to time for the last twenty years. What proofs have ever been submitted in support? The only proof that I know of was supplied to this house, and it is on Hansard to-day. It was supplied by a former Finance minister, Sir Thomas White, who in answer to charges of this kind sent an officer of his department twice across this continent, once through the United States and then back through Canada, to get the market prices of agricultural im-

plements at different points in the two countries. He did so, and after making due allowance for difference in freight charges—I am speaking from memory, it was a good many years ago—it was found there was very little difference between the prices in the United States and in Canada. Those figures are a matter of record of this house. And they are authoritative, because they were made by a responsible officer of the government. That report is no doubt in the Finance department. In addition to that, we have statements by the manufacturers themselves, for instance, by the late general manager of the Massey-Harris company, absolutely contradicting the allegation and stating that never had they on any occasion sold their goods cheaper outside this country than inside. In face of that declaration we have men like the member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) getting up and making absurd, wild statements that, I submit, should not be made in any legislature in the world without proof. I say it is time that all this reckless talk upon any subject was stopped unless proof be submitted in support.

Mr. WARD: Hear, hear. I think the hon. member might take a little of that to himself.

Mr. McGIBBON: I suppose we have the last word now from the hon. member. But let me say that I can substantiate every statement I ever made in this house, which is more than members sitting opposite my hon. friend can do. I hold no brief for the manufacturers or for any other class in this country, but I do have some respect for the honesty of our manufacturers and of our people generally. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, this wild talk should cease unless some proof is forthcoming.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—448. Spraying machines, fruit or vegetable grading machines, apparatus specially designed for sterilizing bulbs, pressure testing apparatus for determining maturity of fruit, incubators for hatching eggs, brooders for rearing young fowl, pruning hooks, pruning shears, hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm or field rollers, post hole diggers, snaths, milking machines, milking machine attachments; centrifugal machines for testing butter fat, milk or cream; pasteurizers for dairying purposes; equipment for generating electric power for farm purposes only, viz: engine, generator, storage battery and switchboard; stumping machines, and other agricultural implements, n.o.p.; and complete parts of articles specified in this tariff item: British preferential tariff, 5 per cent; intermediate tariff, 10 per cent; general tariff, 10 per cent.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The house understood the Minister of Finance was going to propose some alteration in the wording to make provision for certain agricultural machinery.

Mr. ROBB: That will be later on. I have a suggestion after these items are disposed of. That is for the "combination"?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes. A special item?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, I provide for that in a special item.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—453c. Ore crushers, rock crushers, stamp mills, rock drills, percussion coal cutters, coal augers, rotary coal drills, n.o.p., and complete parts of all articles mentioned in this item, when for use exclusively in mining or quarrying operations: British preferential tariff, 10 per cent; intermediate tariff, 15 per cent; general tariff, 20 per cent.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Is that a reduction?

Mr. ROBB: The only change in the item is the addition of the letters "n.o.p." and of the words "or quarrying." It extends the item to quarrying operations.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—453e. Engines and complete parts thereof, to be used exclusively in the propulsion of boats or in hoisting nets and lines used in such boats bona fide owned by individual fishermen for their own use in the fisheries, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of National Revenue: British preferential tariff, 10 per cent; intermediate tariff, 12½ per cent; general tariff, 15 per cent.

Mr. ROBB: The only change in this is the addition of the words "or in hoisting nets and lines used in such boats." It appears the department ruled that if the engine was used for hoisting nets they had to come in under the higher rates. This is to clarify the matter.

Mr. KAISER: Are these industries in Canada now manufacturing these articles?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—453g. Machinery, n.o.p., for the concentration of ores, metals or minerals, viz.: flotation machines, flotation cells, pumps, vibrating and impact screens, jigs, magnetic separators and filters, when for use in the concentration or separation of ores, metals or minerals, and integral parts of all articles mentioned in this item: British preferential tariff, 10 per cent; intermediate tariff, 15 per cent; general tariff, 20 per cent.

Mr. ROBB: The only change is the addition of the words "flotation cells" as requested by the Ontario Mining Association.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—453j. Ozone generators or airifiers of a class or kind not made in Canada, for use in ventilating garages or automotive work shops: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 5 per cent; general tariff, 10 per cent.

Mr. BENNETT: How much of that is new?

Mr. ROBB: This is a new item covering safety appliances for removing carbon monoxide gas. Application for it was made by the Calgary board of trade and the automobile dealers of Calgary. There is no separate classification of imports. The reduction of taxation will not be very large.

Mr. CANTLEY: What does the apparatus cost per unit?

Mr. ROBB: I do not know.

Mr. CANTLEY: No information?

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Dixon, who appeared for the applicants, represented that under the laws of Alberta operators of garages were compelled to provide suitable equipment to remove or destroy carbon monoxide gas. He further stated that the most satisfactory machine for the purpose was obtained outside of Canada. So far as he could learn from inquiries made of the Canadian General Electric Company, the Ottawa Electric Company and officials of the Customs department, machines for the purpose were not manufactured in this country.

Mr. GARDINER: Under what item did these machines come in before?

Mr. ROBB: Under 453.

Mr. GARDINER: There is a reduction?

Mr. ROBB: Yes. The previous rates were 15, 25 and 27½; the proposed rates are free, 5 per cent and 10 per cent.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—460. Sundry articles of metal as follows, when for use exclusively in mining or metallurgical operations, viz.: diamond drills, not including the motive power; electrically operated rotary coal drills of a class or kind not made in Canada; coal cutting machines, n.o.p.; coal heading machines; core drills; electric or magnetic machines for separating or concentrating iron ores; furnaces for smelting of copper, zinc and nickel ores; converting apparatus for metallurgical processes in metals; copper plates, plated or not; machinery for extraction of precious metals by the chlorination or cyanide processes; amalgam safes; automatic ore samplers; automatic feeders; retorts; mercury pumps; pyrometers; bullion furnaces; amalgam cleaners; blast furnace blowing engines; and integral parts of all machinery mentioned in this item: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. ROBB: The only change is the addition of the words: "electrically operated rotary coal drills of a class or kind not made in Canada; coal cutting machines, n.o.p." These items were formerly free and they remain so.

Mr. KAISER: There are some articles excluded from this item. Do these remain in the free list or are they dutiable? If dutiable, under what heading do they come?

Mr. ROBB: Under 460e.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—460e. Miners' acetylene lamps and parts thereof; miners' safety lamps and parts thereof; accessories for cleaning, filling, charging, opening and testing miners' safety lamps, battery renewal preparations for miners' electric safety lamps; all to be used exclusively in mines: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the change?

Mr. ROBB: The proposed new item covers all miners' lamps including miners' acetylene lamps, formerly dutiable under 435 at 20, 27½ and 30. There was no separate classification of imports, so that we cannot tell the difference.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—460f. Face loading machines, shaker trough or belt trough conveyors, air engines, flame proof enclosed driving motors for air engines, and integral parts of all motive power or machinery mentioned in this item, to be used exclusively in mining operations: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 10 per cent; general tariff, 12½ per cent.

Mr. ROBB: I wish to amend this item to read:

Coal face loading machines, shaker trough or belt trough conveyors.

And so forth. The word "coal" is added.

Mr. ADSHEAD: These were not machines of a class or kind made in Canada?

Mr. ROBB: The item did not apply to coal face loading machines.

Mr. McPHERSON: Would not the effect of the item as amended be to restrict it to coal mining machinery?

Mr. ROBB: No; the intention is to enlarge the item.

Mr. McPHERSON: But under the language now proposed it does not cover all machinery.

Mr. ROBB: It is intended to extend the item to include machinery used in coal mining.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): This item 460f is new.

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): As it reads in the original resolution, it calls for a duty of 10 per cent under the intermediate and 12½ per cent under the general tariff, being free under the British preferential, and it applies to all face loading machines, shaker trough or belt trough conveyors, air engines and so forth. As I read that item in the original it struck me as an excellent form of encouragement to the mining industry and I thought the minister was making a real attempt to promote the development of mining particularly in the areas that have been recently opened up.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The coal areas?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No, all mining areas. Now I find, according to the amendment the minister is proposing that the provision will be restricted to face loading machines for coal. What was the duty on face loading machines generally prior to the submission of this new item?

Mr. ROBB: The rates were 15, 25 and 27½ per cent.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And those rates will stand so far as machinery generally is concerned; they will apply to all the machinery mentioned in this item except when used in coal mining.

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In other words, the amendment is a serious restriction of the original resolution. Is that right?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am sorry to see that. The minister has already seriously hampered mining development by the tax imposed upon companies issuing stocks of small value and now he proposes this further impediment, continuing a very high rate of duty on machinery used in the development of mines. I am not a miner, and I do not know to what extent face loading machines and such other implements as are mentioned here are used in the development of nickel, silver, gold, copper and other mines. If we could have some information as to the value to these mines of the reductions which were proposed in the original item we should be in a position further to criticise the minister or otherwise.

Mr. ROBB: We shall discuss the mining tax when we come to it. So far as this change is concerned, I am advised that it was arrived at after a conference with representatives of the mining association and of the coal industry. It was the coal industry who asked for this.

Mr. BENNETT: Asked for which—the original resolution or the amendment?

Mr. ROBB: The new item. I may say that it is satisfactory to the mining association; I fancy they would prefer to have the item a little wider. However, I propose to let the matter stand until after dinner.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Before we pass from this item I want to congratulate the minister sincerely on his original resolution, which I regarded as a splendid attempt on his part. I like to congratulate him when I find a rare opportunity for doing so. The new resolution will be of immeasurable benefit to the coal industry but I should like to have an explanation as to why it is being restricted as now proposed.

Mr. ROBB: Let it stand.

Mr. CANTLEY: There is no doubt the resolution refers entirely to coal loading machinery to be used in connection with long wall mines; it describes practically the whole type of loading machinery used in those mines. The minister has made the item free under the British preferential, with 10 per cent and 12½ per cent under the intermediate and general tariffs respectively. I am led to wonder why he bothered with the matter at all. Why not bring it all under the free list? There is none of that material coming from the old country. This is made almost entirely in the United States or in our own country.

Mr. ROBB: I was just looking up the notes, and the representations I have before me as made by the Mining Association of Nova Scotia state that this machinery is not manufactured in Canada. That is why I am asking that the item stand; I want to look into it.

Mr. CANTLEY: Some of the component parts of this machinery have been made in Canada, but I do not know of any of this material coming in from the old country today. I do not think this change will have any effect at all; it seems more of a gesture than a reality.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Did I understand the minister to amend this clause not only by adding the word "coal" before the word "conveyors," but also by adding the words "of a class or kind not made in Canada"?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. ADSHEAD: That still further restricts the advantage of any reduction; formerly all kinds of this machinery came in free but now free entry is restricted to coal conveyors of a kind not made in Canada.

Item stands.

Customs tariff—468a. Machinery of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada for use in the manufacture of nets or netting for the fisheries, when imported by manufacturers for use in the making of such nets or netting in their own factories, but not for use in making nets or netting commonly used for sportsmen's purposes: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 5 per cent; general tariff, 10 per cent.

Mr. EVANS: I have a further word to say with regard to machinery. A few moments ago I made the statement that machinery could be made in Canada just as cheaply as in the United States, and for the benefit of any hon. gentleman who did not believe that statement I would like to read the following deposition:

This is to certify that I, Joseph Hill, of North Portal, farmer and reeve of municipality (rural) No. 4, did accompany George F. Edwards when securing information in connection with the price of farm machinery on the Canadian side of the international boundary at North Portal and on the American side at Portal, and that we visited farms on the Canadian side and also on the American side of the line where the owners of the farms had bought twenty-eight run double disc International Harvester Company seed drills, made in Hamilton, Ontario; the drills having "Made in Canada" stamped on at least thirty places, so that there was no doubt that the drills both on the Canadian and American side were made in Canada.

All of the drills, above mentioned, were purchased from the same implement dealer, whose place of business is in Portal, North Dakota. The price paid for the drills by the Canadian farmers, who bought in Portal, North Dakota, was $325, including the duty, while the price on the Canadian side of the line at Estevan, the nearest point at which these drills are sold in Canada is $355, the difference in favour of Portal and other adjacent points, with the duty paid of $30 for the same machines made in the same factory at Hamilton, Ontario.

The price quoted by dealers on other farm machinery showed the same discrepancy, and I, personally, bought a binder in Portal, North Dakota last fall, the price of the binder being $250, which with duty at 6 per cent cost me $265, while the same make of binder was selling on the Canadian side at $283 a difference of $18.

[Mr. Cantley.]

We were informed by the dealer who does business on both the American and Canadian sides of the line, that it is contrary to the law of the United States, for the implement companies to fix a price at which binders must be sold by their agents, but that the agents are allowed freedom of action in regard to the profit they take for themselves and the price at which they sell their binders, while the price of the machines manufactured in Canada, and sold through the agents is fixed by the head office of the various companies and there is no discretion allowed as to the price that will be charged.

This statement is signed by Joseph Hill, reeve of rural municipality No. 4 and witnessed by G. S. Richardson. Mr. Hill accompanied George Edwards of the research department of the United Farmers of Canada on his trip to North Dakota.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): There is just one question I would like to ask the minister in connection with this item. Why is he restricting the reduction, because I presume it is a reduction, to machinery of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada?

Mr. ROBB: That is part of the policy. If an article is manufactured in Canada in commercial quantities I imagine another rate might prevail.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is very much of this machinery manufactured in Canada?

Mr. ROBB: No, I do not think so. There is no separate classification of imports, and the estimated reduction in taxation is not very large. This proposed new item is designed to assist in the development in Canada of the manufacture of fish-net making machinery. At present these machines are imported from Great Britain and France, particularly the latter, and are of a class or kind not made in Canada.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—478a. Iron or steel bands, strips or sheets, number fourteen gauge or thinner, coated, polished or not, and rolled iron or steel sections, not being ordinary square, flat or round bars, whether forged and punched or not, unfinished, when imported by the manufacturers of saddlery hardware and hames for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Just what particular part of the hame or of the harness or the saddlery will this constitute?

Mr. ROBB: As my hon. friend knows, a hame may be strapped with brass or something looking like brass, or with iron. The

explanation is that the making of hames in Canada is now almost entirely in the hands of one company, which for many years has been able to import its hame straps from the United States free of duty. The chief source of supply was the United States Steel Company, but they have now discontinued the manufacture of hame straps. The only remaining possible source of supply on the continent is the United States Hame Company of Buffalo, which not only rolls the straps but does the punching and so on in one continuous operation. The only change is the addition of the words "whether forged and punched or not, unfinished."

Mr. GEARY: Who made the application for the change?

Mr. ROBB: I imagine it was the manufacturers of this article. I am not sure whether or not it was B. F. Ackerman and Son, of Peterborough.

Mr. GEARY: Did they first apply for an increase in duty on their finished product?

Mr. ROBB: I am not sure of that.

Mr. CANTLEY: This is clearly a case of greed. Formerly this class of material, hames for all sorts of team and farm work, was made in several places in Canada; McFarlane's of Fredericton made a very large quantity but they were finally forced out of business by the concern to which the minister refers. Formerly iron and steel backings for reinforcing the wooden part of the hame were made in Canada; they were made in New Glasgow and elsewhere, but now there is practically only one firm in this business. In all fairness I do not see why these people, who now virtually have a monopoly of this business in Canada, should be allowed to bring in their materials free and at the same time have ample protection on their finished article. If we are to have protection, in which I believe, it should be fairly divided among all the people who make the component parts of an article of this kind. I protest against this item being put on the free list for the benefit of one particular concern.

Mr. ROBB: They have always been allowed to come in free, but we are now allowing them to come in free after they are punched.

Mr. CANTLEY: They have not always been free; I know that because I have rolled hundreds of tons of hame strap steel.

Mr. ROBB: The memorandum I have is that hame straps come in free under item 478a, but if punched they come under item 454 at 20, 27½ and 30.

Mr. CANTLEY: That may be so now but it was not always the case and it should not be the case to-day.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): This is really a concession to the manufacturer of hames?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, I should think so.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The straps now come in free, ready for him to attach to the wood.

Mr. CANTLEY: All he does is to rivet the straps on.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I doubt very much whether it will have any effect on the price to the consumer; the amount is small but at the same time it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. ROBB: Before the item passes I would like to say that I am following the excellent example of Sir Thomas White in 1914. He placed these hame straps on the free list but did not provide for their entry when they were punched.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Does this item take into consideration the all steel hames? A lot of manufacturers put out hames which are entirely steel, but this item apparently applies only to hames which are manufactured of steel and wood.

Mr. ROBB: The hame straps.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—523g. Woven fabrics of cotton, or of cotton and wool, whether coated or not coated with rubber, when imported by manufacturers of card clothing for textile machinery, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such card clothing in their own factories: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would like to ask the minister about a promise he made to the house last year but which he has not carried out. The minister proposed a regulation in his budget of last year and announced at the time that it would foster inter-imperial trade, but it was pointed out later that it would have the very opposite effect. The Minister of Railways, speaking with the authority of the Minister of Finance, made some very definite commitments at that time. I would

like to ask the minister if he proposes to modify or amend that regulation in any way in order to make it more workable than it is at the present time.

Mr. ROBB: I will answer the last question first. It is the 50 per cent clause the hon. member is referring to?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes.

Mr. ROBB: The 50 per cent requirement of British labour and material. We have discussed this matter with the British board of trade and I think they are quite satisfied with the arrangement. There is a member of the Canadian customs staff in England at the present time and if they desire to have this 50 per cent clause checked up he is available to do that work and we would consider the matter on his report. So far nothing has been brought before us to indicate that any companies are having trouble coming within this regulation. The broad general statement has been made that some of them could not come under it, but as yet there has been nothing submitted to us. With reference to the item I would state that it is to correct one of my own mistakes of last year. These commodities were removed from the free list in the revision of 1928.

Mr. BENNETT: What is card clothing?

Mr. ROBB: It is used in woollen mills; this item will restore these articles to the free list.

Mr. GEARY: Are these fabrics for the textile machinery or clothing for the textile machinery?

Mr. ROBB: It is clothing for equipping the textile machinery.

Mr. GEARY: Has it not been put in the wrong place in drafting the item?

Mr. ROBB: The item was submitted by the customs department.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is this not just a further concession to the manufacturers of cotton clothing in Canada?

Mr. ROBB: These items had been removed from the free list and we are restoring them.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It is simply another concession in addition to the innumerable concessions already made.

Mr. ROBB: It is pretty hard to convince them of that.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I will be satisfied if the minister will do his best to see that cotton goods in Canada are made a little cheaper. They are certainly too expensive now compared with the prices either in England or in the United States. The unfortunate consumer is certainly being taxed more than he ought to be asked to bear in connection with the cotton industry of this country.

Mr. ROBB: This item applies more to woollen mills.

Mr. CAMPBELL: If I understood the minister correctly, he said that the British authorities were satisfied with the 50 per cent regulation?

Mr. ROBB: We have heard no complaints.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Probably they have not complained because they found it would be useless. They have been complaining for a long time, in fact ever since this regulation was incorporated in the budget of last year. I have in my hand sessional paper No. 172, and I would like to read some of the correspondence to show the attitude of the British High Commissioner and of the British federation of industry. The first letter I would like to read is dated at London, December 6, 1928, and addressed to the Minister of Customs, Ottawa, and reads as follows:

I write to confirm a cablegram which I sent to you on the 3rd inst. and in the following terms:—

"Reference recent alteration tariff basis to 50 per cent; very anxious know if list raw material exceptions is being issued; please cable reply."

I should like to thank you very much indeed for a cable you have been kind enough to send in reply, which reads as follows: "No list raw material exceptions from amended regulations."

Your reply informs me that there is no list of raw materials in existence at the moment. This federation would be grateful if in reply to this letter you would be good enough to advise it as to whether any list of this nature is in contemplation. This federation is very sensible of the value of the reason given by the government of the Dominion of Canada for the alteration in the basis of the tariff of from 25 to 50 per cent. At the same time it trusts that the Dominion authorities will appreciate that there are many raw materials used in manufacture totally unprocurable in the United Kingdom, and that if no exceptions be contemplated, many cases are bound to arise where the alteration of from 25 to 50 per cent, so far from benefiting the British manufacturer in question, may have exactly the reverse effect.

This federation has no doubt that this question is one which must have received or is now receiving your careful consideration, and as stated it will very much appreciate such information as you may be good enough to pass to it on this matter.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) J. Moir Mackenzie,
Head.
Overseas Organization.

I would like to read a cablegram dated London, January 18, 1929, and addressed to Hon. James Robb, Minister of Finance, Ottawa, as follows:

In view continued uncertainty here position on entry into Canada under British preferential rate or otherwise of certain British manufacturers inevitably composed of raw or semi-manufactured raw material not procurable commercially in British countries. Federation British Industries respectfully urges postponement of application of new customs tariff basis ruling from first February to first May to allow that full consideration of general principle and specific cases which federation has suggested by letter Stop if order comes into force February first serious dislocation trade many lines will result.

Mackenzie.

This is another letter from the same gentleman:

London, January 2, 1929.

The Hon. J. A. Robb,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Robb,—

I think I can do no better than attach to this letter as I do copy of one which I addressed on the 6th December to the Minister of Customs. I have just received a reply from the Commissioner of Customs, in which he states that he is not in a position to add anything to the reply sent to the cablegram referred to in the attached letter, except to suggest that it might be as well to communicate direct with yourself on the matter, as it is one which falls within your purview.

My letter to the Minister of Customs covers a question which, important as it was early in December, is becoming increasingly so now.

I shall be grateful of on behalf of this federation you would advise me whether you have any such list in contemplation as that referred to in my letter to the Minister of Customs. In addition to the manufacturers referred to in that letter as using raw material totally unprocurable in this country, there are also some manufacturers who use as material raw to themselves products upon which a certain amount of initial work has been expended at the source overseas from which such materials are procured. Users of certain materials of this nature are becoming nervous, because they fear that they may not be able to certify that of the completed article exported to Canada, more than 50 per cent can be attributed directly to British material and British labour.

Very similar questions have arisen in the past with the dominions of New Zealand and Australia, both of which, as you are aware, give, as does Canada, a preference to goods of British manufacture. Various discussions have taken place over a period of time. As the result of these in the cases of both of those dominions, lists such as I refer to have been issued by them. I mentioned this fact because if, as we trust, this question of the issue of a list by yourselves in receiving or will receive favourable consideration by you, the results of those discussions to which I refer are available either through the board of trade here in London or otherwise.

The question is regarded as one of very great importance amongst manufacturing interests in this country, which is my reason for troubling you at such length.

The federation will look forward with the greatest interest to the reply you may be good enough to send to this letter.

(Signed) J. Moir Mackenzie.

I will read a cablegram from the same gentleman, dated January 18, 1929, to the Hon. James Robb, Minister of Finance, Ottawa, as follows:

In view continued uncertainty here position of entry into Canada under British preferential rate or otherwise of certain British manufacturers inevitably composed of raw or semi-manufactured raw material not procurable commercially in British countries, Federation British Industries respectfully urges postponement of application of new customs tariff basis ruling from first February to first May to allow that full consideration of general principle and specific cases which federation has suggested by letter. If order comes into force February first serious dislocation trade many lines will result.

(Signed) Mackenzie.

An hon. MEMBER: Is there any reply to that?

Mr. CAMPBELL: There is the usual reply that one might expect. There is another letter from the same gentleman addressed from London under date of February 25, 1929, to the Hon. J. A. Robb, Minister of Finance, Ottawa. In part, this letter reads:

In common with all other trade associations, members of this federation, the Association of British Chemical Manufacturers, 166 Piccadilly, London, W.1., was informed of the recent alteration in basis in the British preferential tariff.

Then the writer refers to an interview he had with a representative of chemical manufacturers, and he says:

I explained to my caller that as far as we were aware, the government of Canada was not prepared to issue a list of this description. He then raised specifically the question of mercury and its compounds. He pointed out that mercury is unprocurable from empire sources and that as a constituent it enters into innumerable compounds of a chemical nature, being either the predominant factor as regards value or at any rate being a very considerable factor.

I informed my caller that as far as information available in this country at the present time went, I thought that what was in the minds of the authorities in Ottawa was that each such compound would have to be considered on its own merits and a decision given covering such a compound.

A further conversation took place between Mr. Pratt and myself, when he pointed out that the number of such compounds containing mercury was a very large one indeed and was being continually added to as new specifics are produced.

I asked him if he would write to me on the matter, and this he has now done. On behalf,

therefore, of the Association of British Chemical Manufacturers, I would ask you to be kind enough to give consideration to the case as put by him in his own words, as follows:—

"I should like to have a ruling on the following point of principle in connection with the submission of special cases on behalf of this association.

If we take the case of mercury compounds as an example, we find that the raw material, namely mercury, is not obtainable commercially within the empire. In most mercury compounds, the cost of the metal itself will constitute more than 50 per cent of the cost of the final product."

There is a long brief dealing with the matter. I will now read a memorandum handed to the minister by the British High Commissioner in this city. This is dated from the High Commissioner's office, Ottawa, January 28, 1929, and it reads:

After a careful examination of the new Canadian regulations governing the grant of imperial preference to goods entering Canada from Great Britain, His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom are of the opinion that the application of these regulations on first February would result in an unfortunate dislocation of trade.

Conscious of the motives of the Canadian government in framing and announcing the new regulations for the benefit of inter-imperial trade His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom desire to suggest that the regulations in question should not be brought into operation until first April or first May, thereby enabling traders to adjust themselves to the new conditions and at the same time to fulfil forward contracts the raw material for which will have been ordered some time before the new regulations were announced.

His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom have further ascertained that the following goods, amongst others, which are manufactured wholly in the United Kingdom, will be unable to qualify for imperial preference because the raw materials, which are unobtainable in the United Kingdom in commercial quantities, exceed 50 per cent of the total value of the manufactured article:—

Manufactures of copper and its alloys, cotton yarns up to 40 counts, grey cotton piece goods, certain types of silk goods, paper manufactures and electric cables. Detailed particulars to support the statement that the goods for which exemption is asked are wholly manufactured in the United Kingdom and that the raw materials are not obtainable in the United Kingdom in commercial quantities are being prepared in London for the information of His Majesty's government in Canada; but pending their receipt the High Commissioner in Canada for His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom has been instructed to put forward very earnest request for exemption of the goods mentioned above from the new Canadian regulations, or the modification of the latter in such a manner as will enable goods wholly manufactured in the United Kingdom from the above raw materials to continue to benefit by Canada's traditional policy of preference for British empire manufactures.

[Mr. Campbell.]

There are further complaints in the correspondence, and it is not surprising that no recent complaints have been made, because the minister has not dealt with those that have already been forwarded—

Mr. ROBB: What justification has my hon. friend for saying that the minister has not dealt with the complaints?

Mr. CAMPBELL: There is nothing on the file to show, and the minister has not said that he has dealt with them. Will he tell us now whether the matter has been dealt with and whether such a list has been published?

Mr. ROBB: I informed the house a few moments ago that the Department of National Revenue had a man in England who was looking into all these cases as they came before us, but since then we have had no complaints from the overseas boards. I understand that the officer is now on the way home. I imagine when he returns, we shall have the report, but I repeat that while my hon. friend has read from a long list of statements which have come from overseas, he has not made out any case that British importations have been stopped. My hon. friend has read some statements wherein it is claimed that certain goods were not obtainable in the United Kingdom. The British High Commissioner made the same statement to us, but we told him frankly that the United Kingdom did not comprise the whole British Empire, and that certain goods, if they were not obtainable in the United Kingdom, as we knew they were not, were obtainable in Canada and in South Africa. I will admit at once, as I admitted before, that there may be cases where we will have to make modifications, but we are not going any further than some of the other British dominions. Australia requires 75 per cent, New Zealand 50 per cent and the mother country herself requires 75 per cent on certain optical goods going in there from here. I am not sure just what South Africa requires. Surely it is not unreasonable on behalf of the British workingman to see to it that so far as possible British workingmen are employed within the United Kingdom if the reduced tariff is to be taken advantage of. When I brought this measure in before, I told my hon. friend that our attention had been directed to the fact that the British preference was getting into disrepute even among the British workingmen. Why? Because the goods were brought in from non-preference countries, indeed from

countries with which Canada had not a favoured trade agreement. They would do a little work on them, repack the goods on the wharves, perhaps at Liverpool or some other shipping point, and then ship them to Canada as British goods. I am sure that my hon. friend desires, as we all do, that if we are to give a British preference it should be as far as possible a preference for British goods, and it is not unreasonable to ask that there be 50 per cent of British labour and material, the labour in the United Kingdom and the material from anywhere within the empire. There may be cases where it is not obtainable, but these cases will be adjusted when the report of the officials of the department investigating the matter comes before us. That report has not yet been presented.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have no complaint to make of the regulations in so far as they stimulate inter-imperial trade. Our complaint has been on the ground that this regulation impedes inter-imperial trade. The Minister of Finance refers to South Africa, New Zealand and some of the other dominions, but those dominions have exempted a list of goods which are not commercially procurable within the British Empire. That is the whole argument. Take velvet, for instance. In the raw it is procurable in Japan. It is brought to England and manufactured there, but the raw material is more than 50 per cent, and under this regulation it could not come in under the British preference.

Mr. ROBB: The British government has not brought that to my attention so far as my recollection goes.

Mr. CAMPBELL: No doubt there are a great many other commodities that have not been brought to the minister's attention. It seems to me that at the very time when the United States are proposing to increase their tariff against our natural products, it would be good business for us to make it as easy as possible for the British people to buy our products, instead of putting into effect a regulation that certainly will have the effect of impeding inter-imperial trade. Until such a list is published and until certain of these goods are exempted from its application, this regulation must certainly interfere with trade from the mother country, and will prevent many British goods from coming in and getting the advantage of the British preference.

Item agreed to

Customs tariff—541c. Woven fabrics of vegetable fibres, coated or impregnated, imported for use exclusively as "brattice cloth" in underground mining operations: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 10 per cent; general tariff, 12½ per cent.

Mr. CANTLEY: May I ask the minister if there is any brattice cloth made in Canada?

Mr. ROBB: This item covers a woven jute fabric used for the diversion of air currents in mines. It is not of a class or kind made in Canada, and is essential to deep workings. At present it comes in under item 546 at 12½, 25 and 30 per cent. This has been requested by the Ontario Mining Association and the Mining Association of British Columbia. The imports are not ascertainable. The estimated reduction in taxation will be about $80,000.

Mr. CANTLEY: The minister's information is quite correct so far as it goes. I have never known of any brattice cloth made in this country. It is just a jute fabric usually impregnated with pine tar.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—569e. Miners' safety helmets, of a class or kind not made in Canada, for use exclusively in mining operations: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

Mr. ROBB: The present rates are 22½, 30 and 35 per cent. There is no separate classification of imports. The change suggested in this item is to cover the hard hat or safety helmet used by miners as a protection against injury. This has been requested by the Ontario Mining Association.

Mr. ADSHEAD: In a case of this kind, where human life is concerned, I would think it would be better not to restrict the application of the item by using the words "of a class or kind not made in Canada." The very best helmets obtainable for this purpose should be allowed to come in free, because the safety and the very lives of the miners are at stake.

Mr. ROBB: The mining association represented that this would satisfy them.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Did they ask for the inclusion of those words, "of a class or kind not made in Canada"?

Mr. ROBB: The officer of the department tells me that it was their suggestion.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Of the miners themselves?

Mr. ROBB: Of the Ontario Mining Association.

Mr. ADSHEAD: That is not an association of the miners who dig the coal.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—618a. Gaskets of rubber for use in the permanent sealing of cans for food products: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 7½ per cent; general tariff, 10 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN: It is proposed to amend this item by inserting before the word "rubber" the word "unvulcanized", and before the word "cans" the word "metal."

Mr. BENNETT: Why is it only for metal cans?

Mr. ROBB: This was asked for by the customs, in administering the act.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The item reads:

Gaskets of rubber for use in the permanent sealing of cans for food products.

The rates proposed are free, 7½ and 10 per cent. What were the old rates?

Mr. ROBB: Fifteen, 25 and 27½ per cent.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would understand the item as meaning rubber gaskets for use in glass sealers, fruit jars, and so on, but the minister now proposes to restrict its application to metal cans. Would the resolution as it stood prior to the amendment apply to glass sealers used for preserved fruit?

Mr. ROBB: No. These particular sealers are rubber rings, not unlike elastic bands, which are used in the permanent sealing of cans in sardine canneries. Those used in Canada, according to the evidence presented to the tariff board, are obtained almost entirely from Norway. They come in at 20 per cent under the French treaty. Those my hon. friend refers to are made in Canada.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not understand this thing yet. Will the minister tell the committee why the amendment is necessary?

Mr. ROBB: The customs department asks that the change be made for administration purposes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I cannot understand how it affects administration.

Mr. ROBB: I may tell my hon. friend that I do not either. It is asked for by the customs.

[Mr. Adshead.]

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Then as neither the committee nor the minister understands the reason for the change, why make it? As I read it at the moment it means this, that the manufacturer of canned goods will get his rubber bands at the reduced rate, but the unfortunate housewife who is canning her fruit in the fall will be paying for her rubber bands at the high rate. That is wholly unfair and absolutely out of keeping with the alleged policy of the Liberal party I protest against this. It is a small thing and I do not see why the minister should make the change; but if in principle it is sound to give the canneries this reduction, surely it is sound to give the housewife on the farm the same advantage.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment. I will take a chance on it as it is. If there is any trouble we will have to straighten it out later.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the minister have leave to withdraw the amendment?

Mr. McPHERSON: Might I suggest that the minister strike out the word "permanent" and so obviate any argument as to what this means?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. McPHERSON: The article, it is true, is small, but my experience is that the customs board in determining under what classification an article may enter can give a more weird exhibition as verbal acrobats than any other body I know of. I expect on the first attempt to pass this article through the customs the importer would be told: "That cannot possibly be for the permanent sealing of cans for food products. What can it be for? Only for temporary purposes. Therefore you are not entitled to any reduction of duty."

Mr. BENNETT: I cannot think anything could be permanent under this.

Mr. McPHERSON: No, I think they would immediately rule it was not permanent. I suggest that the word "permanent" be struck out.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, I move that the word "permanent" in the second line be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Item as amended agreed to.

Customs tariff—632b. Specially designed needles of a class or kind not made in Canada, for use only in repairing fish nets, when such nets are used exclusively for the fisheries, but not for use in repairing nets for sportsmen: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 632c as it is here in print has been changed to 632b.

Mr. BENNETT: What is involved in this?

Mr. ROBB: Would my hon. friend like to know?

Mr. BENNETT: I would not have asked if I did not wish to know.

Mr. ROBB: This application was received from Doctor O. B. Price—Doctor Price M.P. —on January 8, 1929. He desired that this be dropped from 15 and 17½ to the free list.

Mr. BENNETT: Have the government met his wish?

Mr. ROBB: I was delighted to.

Mr. SHORT: How many of these needles were imported last year ?

Mr. ROBB: Needles of vulcanite fibre, used for making fishing nets, not made in Canada, imports not traceable.

Mr. MANION: That is why they gave in.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Chairman, here is another amusing piece of phraseology that demands explanation. Will the minister tell the committee just how he is going to make this clause operative? The last part of it reads "but not for use in repairing nets for sportsmen." Why put in a clause of that kind? It is absolutely impossible for the department or for the minister or for anybody else to undertake that sportsmen will not buy these needles in some way or other for the repair of their nets. And what harm would it do if they did? I wonder if the minister ever saw a sportsman's fishing net? It constitutes a receptacle a foot or a foot and a half across and involves less than a yard of net.

Mr. SHORT: I do not suppose there was ever a needle imported for that purpose. I think the only reason it is inserted there is that the minister is trying to show to the country that he is doing something for the fishing industry. I do not know any other reason for the inclusion of that phrase. In the customs department they cannot find that any of these needles have ever been imported for this purpose.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): Does the minister know that the few needles which do come in are donated by the manufacturers of nets? It is just on the same principle as applies to your cigar-lighter: the cigar store does not charge you for refilling it.

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps the minister thinks the sportsmen will be sports enough to pay the duty on the needles when they buy them.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The sportsmen will say: we are sportsmen, and therefore anxious to pay a duty to the Liberal government.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—682c. Metal swivels, of a class or kind not made in Canada, when used exclusively for the fisheries, not to include swivels for sportsmen's use: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 682b has been changed to 682c, metal swivels, and so on.

Mr. BENNETT: How many of these were imported?

Mr. ROBB: There is no separate classification of imports. The imports are not ascertainable.

Mr. SHORT: What is the idea of putting this on the free list? Who made application for it?

Mr. ROBB: I understand that the representatives of the fishing industry asked for it.

Mr. SHORT: Perhaps Mr. Deachman made application.

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I have no objection whatever to the item carrying, but I presume the minister has secured satisfactory evidence from the Tariff Advisory Board in connection with both these items. He insists that no reductions take place until he has had an investigation by the board.

Mr. ROBB: Do not press me too closely on that.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Were the two items, the one for needles and the other for swivels, submitted to the tariff board before the reductions were allowed?

Mr. ROBB: Not for inquiry. It was submitted to them when we sat around the table.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I presume the Minister of Finance sat around the table with the tariff board and decided on the reduction in duty on other commodities as well?

Mr. ROBB: The government of the day are responsible for the tariff.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In other words, a tariff inquiry before the tariff board is not absolutely necessary prior to the introduction of a reduction. Do I understand that to be the case, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. ROBB: Why should my hon. friend attempt to cross-examine me on that when he himself has advocated a tariff reduction this afternoon and I have consented to it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Just so we may get this clearly, the minister states frankly that he has power—and very properly so—to make any necessary reduction in the tariff that in the public interest appears to him to be necessary without an advisory board examination.

Mr. ROBB: Contingent upon the approval of parliament.

Mr. FORKE: If nobody checks him up it is all right.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In other words, all this tariff talk we heard from the minister and others associated with him on the other side was so much "bunk."

Mr. BENNETT: Eyewash.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Absolute eyewash. They have sheltered themselves behind the board in order to escape the inevitable logic of their own pledges. They have refused to carry out their promises to the people of Canada and they come to this house and say, "This matter has not been fully investigated by the tariff board", or, "If you want a reduction apply to the tariff board", and so forth. The minister now frankly admits, what we have always held to be true, that if the Liberal government sincerely wished to carry out their pledges to the people they could have introduced the necesary reductions from year to year.

Mr. SHORT: Is there any record of imports under this item?

Mr. ROBB: Not ascertainable.

Mr. SHORT: It is such items as this that the expensive tariff board is investigating?—the tariff board which this country is paying so much to keep up. Is that board having round table talks over such items, which do not amount to anything so far as the fisheries of the country are concerned? Why, I do not think we import a single article under this item.

Mr. CANTLEY: Yes, there were three last year.

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend object to this item?

Mr. SHORT: I am not objecting to it because there is nothing to object to. I am saying that it is a waste of time for the tariff board, which is costing the country tremendous sums of money, to investigate items like this.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): There is a distinction between these swivels when used by fishermen, in which case they are free, and when used by sportsmen, in which case they are dutiable. A swivel is a little thing about the size of the end of your finger. What provision is there for deciding when a swivel is to be used by a sportsman and when it is for the use of fishermen?

Mr. ROBB: The customs administer that.

Mr. VALLANCE: We have listened to a lengthy criticism from the hon. member for Bow River in regard to this item and he has referred to the tariff board in connection with the matter. Some hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia, basing their statements on answers to questions put to the minister, point out that there are no imports under this item, and the hon. member for Bow River states that many of us who are supporting the government have on various occasions contended in the country that it was impossible to propose reductions inasmuch as the matter had not been before the commission. It seems ridiculous on the face of it for an individual with the intelligence of the hon. member for Bow River to attempt to prove something against the government while hon. members from Nova Scotia condemn the government, using an argument that disproves what the hon. gentleman says. One says that we are attempting to hide behind something, and the others say that although we are doing something, in the final analysis we are doing nothing.

Mr. SHORT: Does not the final analysis show that this tariff board have done nothing?

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—689b. Equipment, of a class or kind not made in Canada, and integral parts thereof, for distributing stone dust in mines: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 5 per cent; general tariff, 10 per cent.

Mr. CANTLEY: What information has the minister in regard to this?

Mr. ROBB: Stone dust is used in coal mines to limit the possibilities of coal dust explosions. It was represented to the tariff board by the Mining Society of Nova Scotia and the Mining Association of British Columbia that the equipment essential to the distribution of stone dust throughout the workings could not be procured in Canada, and it was being assessed for duty at 15 per cent, 25 per cent, and 27½ per cent, under item 453. It was stated by the Mining Society of Nova Scotia that the use of stone dust was being made compulsory in that province, and request was made for free entry of the distributing equipment. It has been thought wise, however, to retain a measure of protection, as this would seem to be an apparatus which might be made in this country; for which reason also the item is restricted to cover equipment of a class or kind not made in Canada.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The only objection I have to the item is that it is not free. Item 569e, already carried, provides for the free entry of miners' safety helmets, of a class or kind not made in Canada, for use exclusively in mining operations. I cannot understand why this equipment is discriminated against.

Mr. ROBB: It is free under the British preference.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes, but 5 and 10 per cent respectively under the intermediate and the general. It would be just as well to make it free under all tariffs. This is something intended for the prevention of loss of life and the minister will only make it more difficult for mining operators to prevent explosions in mines, while at the same time he is rendering it safer for the miner to the extent of admitting helmets free. I do not know just how to describe an inconsistency of this sort. Miners' helmets are free but this equipment is taxed.

Mr. ROBB: There is the same spread as before.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would the minister consider amending the item by striking out the 5 and 10 per cent and making it free?

Mr. ROBB: I prefer to maintain the British preference.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Well, why did not the minister do so in connection with miners' helmets?

Mr. BENNETT: Especially in view of the fact that they make safety helmets in England.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister is not consistent.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Wherever these words, "of a class or kind not made in Canada," occur in the tariff, what is the practice of the customs authorities? Do they throw upon the importer the burden of proving that the article in question is not made in Canada or do they assume that responsibility?

Mr. STEVENS: They ask Mr. Deachman.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend from Bow River (Mr. Garland) has no doubt observed the statement made by the minister that in this matter it has been thought wise to retain a measure of protection. From this statement the hon. member for Weyburn will realize the policy of the administration.

Mr. COOTE: Item 689a provides for the free entry of miners' rescue appliances, designed for emergency use in mines where artificial breathing is necessary in the presence of poisonous gases, and automatic resuscitation apparatus for artificial breathing, to aid in the saving of human life. If there is reason for making these appliances free under all tariffs, why should not this rescue apparatus be made free also? Stone dust is used to prevent explosions; the other apparatus is used to resuscitate persons after the explosion has occurred. Surely it would be better to prevent the explosion. There is an old saying that an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure. It is difficult to understand why this item, 689b, should not be free under all headings.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am sure the minister would find no objection in the house to his placing on the free list this particular machinery designed to prevent loss of life. I have not heard a single voice raised in opposition to the proposal which has come from I think two corners of this house.

Mr. ROBB: Quite true, but the mining associations which asked for this change are quite satisfied with the item as it stands.

Mr. COOTE: Is that what they asked for?

Mr. CANTLEY: What authority has the minister for making that statement?

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend say they are not satisfied?

Mr. CANTLEY: I am asking the minister for his authority for that statement.

Mr. ROBB: I have had no complaint from them; I understand they are satisfied.

Mr. CANTLEY: I doubt it.

Mr. MacNUTT: Would the minister tell the committee the importations under this item last year?

Mr. ROBB: There is no separate classification; we are unable to trace it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Before we pass on, could the minister tell the committee the volume and the value of the importations of this machinery from Great Britain and from other countries under the intermediate and general tariff?

Mr. ROBB: I have just told my hon. friend there is no separate classification, so that I am unable to give the committee that information.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That being the case, does not the minister think it will be much safer to put the whole business on the free list? Then he can be satisfied that he has done his duty not only to the mine workers of Canada but also to his own principles.

Mr. ROBB: I think we had better let it go as it is.

Mr. CANTLEY: I would like the minister to say if it is not a fact that to-day there is no finality in machinery designed for coal dusting. Coal dusting is a comparatively new method of combating the explosive dust which lodges everywhere in a coal mine, and I believe that to-day no machinery has been really perfected as a distributing agency for coal dust. Various people are experimenting with machines designed for this purpose, and until some particular method of distribution is decided upon as being the best would it not be well to allow machinery of this type made anywhere in the world to enter Canada free?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend is going on record as favouring certain principles, but I would say that this is a very substantial reduction, and as far as I know the mining associations are quite satisfied with this change. At any rate, parliament will meet again in another year, when this matter can be considered again, so I would suggest that it go through now as it is.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What was the original item?

Mr. ROBB: The old rates were 15 per cent, 25 per cent and 27½ per cent, and now they are free, 5 per cent and 10 per cent.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What was the number of the old item?

Mr. ROBB: This machinery came in under item 453.

Mr. GARLAND: (Bow River): Item 453 provides for telephone and telegraph instruments, electric and galvanic batteries and so on.

Mr. ROBB: That must be a n.o.p. item.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is the minister quite sure of the number?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend has not read the whole item. Further down he will find the following:

. . . . and all machinery composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, n.o.p.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—695b. Drawings or sketches of garments, but not including patterns, when imported in single copies by manufacturers of garments: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

The CHAIRMAN: This item has been amended to read as follows:

695b. Drawings or sketches of garments, or of boots and shoes, but not including patterns, when imported in single copies of each such drawing or sketch by manufacturers of garments or of boots and shoes or of boot and shoe patterns: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Here is another of these petty little discriminations against the consumers in Canada, perpetrated by an alleged Liberal administration. Drawings of sketches of garments, or patterns, as the housewives call them, for dresses or boots and shoes, when imported for the use of manufacturers enter free of duty, but if a housewife sees an excellent design she would like to have for her own use, she must pay duty on it. Really the minister cannot be consistent in his policy if he resists a protest against this discrimination. Will he tell the committee why the housewives in Canada should not be given the same advantages in securing these patterns as are enjoyed by the manufacturers?

Mr. ROBB: This does not cover patterns; it includes drawings or sketches from which the patterns are made. This is proposed to cover rough freehand sketches by designers, which are usually made in foreign style centres either direct from the model or from photographs, and in consideration of a fee paid by the Canadian designer who desires to copy the style sketches, either by himself or by his representative. They have no artistic, commercial or intrinsic value to anyone except the man who makes them, and they cannot be used as patterns. At present they enter under a duty of 22½ per cent.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Does the minister not think he should add the usual phrase "of a class or kind not made in Canada"?

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Who requested this reduction?

Mr. ROBB: The clothing and boot and shoe men of Canada.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Does the minister mean to say that the boot and shoe men and the clothing men, who enjoy a very high protection on their finished article, are asking that these sketches come in free?

Mr. ROBB: I just noticed that I have before me the record of a public hearing before the tariff board in connection with this matter, held on January 23. Those present were:

Mr. R. P. Sparks, Canadian Garment Manufacturers' Association.
Mr. L. Phillips, Canadian Garment Manufacturers' Association.
Mr. C. F. Sherwood, Canadian Garment Manufacturers' Association.
R. E. Oaks, Manufacturers' Credit Bureau.
H. W. Macdonnell, Canadian Manufacturers' Association.
A. E. Darby, Canadian Council of Agriculture.
R. J. Deachman, Consumers' League of Canada.

Mr. Sherwood, secretary of the association, read the brief, stating that the Canadian garment manufacturers made it a practice to go to New York and to pay for the privilege of looking over models produced by New York manufacturers. The Canadian manufacturer would make rough sketches of such models as appeared to him to be suitable for Canadian use. On bringing these into the country they were subject to a duty rate of 15 per cent under the preferential and 22½ per cent under the general. . . .

Considerable discussion took place over the wording of the proposed section, Mr. Sparks holding that the word "pattern" should not be used, as "patterns" were generally finished products which had a saleable commercial value, and its adoption might be objected to by patternmakers.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I take it that this is the same Mr. Sparks who was so active in connection with the customs inquiry. This is a noble generosity on the part of the Liberal administration in extending to him a privilege which certainly his animosity would hardly deserve. Now may I ask why, in conceding to the manufacturers this undoubted privilege, the government have not included the patterns used by the housewives of Canada? What is the duty imposed on patterns used in making dresses and so on?

Mr. ROBB: Exactly the same duty as will be paid by these people if they bring in such patterns, but this item does not cover patterns; it is designed to include the sketches from which the patterns are made.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But why not give the housewife a chance by letting the manufacturer still pay for the patterns and allowing the housewives to get them free? That would be a reversal of the policy of the government which would be exceedingly acceptable to the consumers.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—696. Philosophical and scientific apparatus, utensils, instruments, and preparations, including boxes and bottles containing the same; maps, photographic reproductions, casts as models, etchings, lithographic prints or charts; mechanical equipment of a class or kind not made in Canada. All articles in this item, when specially imported in good faith for the use and by order of any society or institution incorporated or established solely for religious, philosophical, educational, scientific or literary purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or for the use and by order of any college, academy, school, or seminary of learning in Canada, and not for sale, under regulations prescribed by the minister: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

Mr. ROBB: The only change in this item is the inclusion of the words, "mechanical equipment of a class or kind not made in Canada."

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): What is philosophical apparatus?

Mr. BENNETT: I should think the tariff board would be one.

Mr. McGIBBON: As the Minister of National Revenue constantly keeps out of the house I wonder if the Minister of Finance would procure an answer to the question I asked earlier in the day?

Mr. ROBB: What was that?

Mr. McGIBBON: With reference to automobiles.

Mr. ROBB: I will ask my colleague about that. He will be in before we finish with the business of the committee.

Mr. TUMMON: Before we leave these items I wonder if the minister would refer to item 460f, face loading machines, shaker trough or belt trough conveyors, air engines, and so on.

Mr. ROBB: That item is being held over; it will come up again.

Mr. TUMMON: Would the minister answer a question with reference to that part of the item which reads, "integral parts of all motive power or machinery mentioned in this item," and state whether that would apply to only machines now in use in Canada or would it apply to parts imported to go along with other parts made in Canada in order to complete the unit or machine?

Mr. ROBB: I will refer that question to my colleague the Minister of National Revenue who administers the department. I am bound to say that I am not in position to answer for the gentleman who administers the department.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will the minister say just what items are being held over?

Mr. ROBB: There were some items in the early part of the list.

The CHAIRMAN: The first two.

Mr. TUMMON: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the point I have raised is a rather important point and one which should be decided. If it is necessary that the Minister of National Revenue should be in his place to answer these questions I think he should be present, because we are entitled to the information before the item is finally passed. Will the Minister of Finance give the house his assurance that the Minister of National Revenue will be here to give what information is required or to answer any questions we might ask?

Mr. ROBB: I would rather not undertake that.

Mr. BENNETT: We are entitled to have the answers.

Mr. ROBB: I will try to communicate with my colleague and ask him to be here.

Mr. BENNETT: He was here this afternoon.

Mr. MANION: Get the Sergeant-at-Arms to bring him in.

[Mr. McGibbon.]

Mr. McGIBBON: He has been conveniently gotten away.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Cantley) has pointed out that this item might lead to a very great unfairness. Take, for instance, a hospital which is conducted as a public institution and a hospital conducted by a religious organization; in the one instance it could get this apparatus free and in the other it could not.

Mr. ROBB: I think the intention was to make it broad enough.

Mr. BENNETT: But that is not the case.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member knows that there are cases where imports coming to hospitals or religious organizations are permitted by the treasury board to come in.

Mr. BENNETT: I recall an instance where a statue was brought in and passed and also another instance where a ring for ecclesisastical purposes which could not be made in Canada was allowed to come in.

Mr. MacLAREN: If the minister would include the words "scientific institutions" or something of that kind it might clarify things.

Mr. BENNETT: The word "scientific" has not been construed to mean a hospital, that is the trouble.

Mr. MacLAREN: I was suggesting that the words "scientific institutions" be added.

Mr. ROBB: Item 466a covers glassware and other scientific apparatus for laboratory work in public hospitals and also apparatus for sterilizing purposes, not including washing or laundry machines when imported for the use and by order of any public hospital; free.

Mr. BENNETT: But that is limited to three things as compared to this one; how about X-ray apparatus?

Mr. ROBB: I am advised that this change was asked for by the customs department for administrative purposes.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the minister must see the difficulty. This item is limited in its operations to specifically named institutions. Why could not the word "hospitals" be added, or the words "any society, hospital or institution"? The minister might let this item stand and ask the officials of the department about it.

Mr. ROBB: I think perhaps we had better reconsider that item.

Mr. BENNETT: If the words "or hospitals" or "seminaries of learning" were added it would cover it.

Item stands.

Customs tariff—779a. Copper rods when imported by manufacturers for use in their own factories in the manufacture of electrical conductors, the individual units of such electrical conductors not to exceed the area of No. 7/0 gauge conductor, per pound: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, ¼ cent; general tariff, ½ cent.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): I made reference to this item when I was speaking on the budget and I endeavoured to explain the situation in regard to copper rods. I will go over this again in order to refresh the minds of the hon. members. Copper bars are the finished product of the smelter and the raw material of the rolling mill which rolls them into copper rods. Copper rods in their turn are the raw material of the copper manufacturers. The situation is something like this: A small ring of men in the United States control 95 per cent of the copper output of the world. They do not mine it but they control the output and they export copper bars to other countries at a higher price than they sell to their own people in the United States. The purpose in doing that is this: they want to fix the price of copper the world over. If they fixed it in the United States, they would run foul of their anti-trust law. Therefore they fix the price for export, and then each one goes back to his own office and quotes for home consumption in the United States a price $8 a ton less than the price he quotes people in other countries.

Mr. BENNETT: Five dollars a ton.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Well, that makes my argument that much stronger. There is located in Brockville one concern which rolls copper bars into copper rods. It employs some thirty-one men in that work. It receives 60 per cent of its raw material from the smelter at Trail in British Columbia.

Mr. BENNETT: Is it not fair to say that they did, but they do not now? I think the record shows that.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Why not now?

Mr. BENNETT: Because they have discontinued manufacturing that raw material at Trail.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Does my hon. friend mean to say that copper is no longer smelted at Trail?

Mr. BENNETT: It is smelted, but not refined to the extent that would make it available as raw material for that particular plant. I think that was the evidence of the Mr. Phillips people.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): That was not the understanding I had of it.

Mr. BENNETT: I am just asking the hon. gentleman if that is not the fact.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): My understanding was that they get 60 per cent from Trail and that they have to purchase the other 40 per cent in the United States; that the smelter at Trail is not under the control of this copper ring, and therefore does not charge this excess price. But this concern in Canada has to pay an excess price of $5 a ton on its copper bars and then when it comes to sell its rods it is met by the competition of concerns in the United States who get their raw material at a lower price but who do not pay any duty on the rods coming into Canada. The proposal now is to charge on copper rods a duty of half a cent a pound, or $10 a ton. This is the raw material of no less than five factories which are using copper rods in Canada. The concern at Brockville employing thirty-one men is handicapped to the extent of $5 a ton and the proposal is to offset this handicap by putting double that rate, or an additional $10 a ton, on the raw material of five different factories in Canada. The concern in Brockville is handicapped on only 40 per cent of its raw material. These other concerns, if this duty is added, will be handicapped on 100 per cent of their raw material. This would be equal to multiplying the handicap by five and placing it on another branch of the same industry. I do not think this is economically sound, and I would suggest that the minister let the item stand over.

Mr. ROBB: Will my hon. friend tell us who, of these five companies he has just mentioned, objects to this?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): I am not saying that any of them objects, but looking at the matter with a purely philosophical mind—

Mr. BENNETT: Ah, but that apparatus is free.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): There is no head tax.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING

Bill No. 124, for the relief of William Ernest Foulkes—Mr. Cahan.

ELIAS ABRAHAM

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (Cartier) moved the second reading of Bill No. 159, for the relief of Elias Abraham, otherwise known as Elie Abraham Allen.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to ask a question with regard to this long list of bills sponsored by the hon. member for Cartier. Are these Ontario or Quebec cases?

Mr. JACOBS: Does my hon. friend pretend that my jurisdiction extends only to the province of Quebec?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Not at all. I am asking for information, as to whether these cases come from the province of Ontario or from the province of Quebec.

Mr. JACOBS: Is that merely to satisfy curiosity?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Not altogether. We have been informed in this house that nearly all these divorce cases come from Ontario, that that province alone gives us nearly all this trouble. I should like to know as a matter of fact whether that is correct. We know that some cases come from the province of Quebec. What is the state of affairs with regard to this long list of bills sponsored by the hon. member for Cartier?

Mr. JACOBS: I think they are all from the province of Ontario, perhaps with one exception. Apparently my reputation as a divorce getter has extended to Ontario, for I get all this business from there.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the second time on division.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 119, for the relief of Bessie Ruth Glass.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 125, for the relief of Edith Marie McFarlane.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 128, for the relief of Cleoniki Paleologou Drakoulas.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 140, for the relief of Nanette Coffey.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 141, for the relief of James Graham McCreadie.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 142, for the relief of Stephen Dymon.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 179, for the relief of Madelaine Virginia Lumsden.—Mr. Bothwell.

Bill No. 180, for the relief of Edgar Charles Buchanan.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Bill No. 184, for the relief of Edna Maud James.—Mr. Spence (Parkdale).

[Mr. Cahan.]

Bill No. 185, for the relief of Helen Jane Sim Pittendreich.—Mr. Spence (Parkdale).

Bill No. 187, for the relief of Alfred Roy Edwards.—Mr. Spence (Parkdale).

Bill No. 189, for the relief of Molly Vaughan.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 190, for the relief of Lillian Augusta Dunn.—Mr. Tummon.

Bill No. 191, for the relief of Myrtle Mary Jane McLean.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 193, for the relief of Mary Bertha Dupuis Ranger.—Mr. Millar.

Bill No. 206, for the relief of Walter Henry Lyne Dixson.—Mr. Tummon.

Bill No. 207, for the relief of Ida Rosenberg.—Mr. Spence (Parkdale).

Bill No. 208, for the relief of Marjory Lavinia Bradford.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Motions for second readings agreed to on division.

DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS

RIGHT OF MARRIED WOMEN TO ESTABLISH DOMICILE

The house resumed from May 3, consideration in committee of Bill No. 75, respecting the domicile of married women in proceedings for divorce—Mr. Ward—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I presume on the—

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, may I interpose? The bill has been amended slightly, and perhaps it would facilitate discussion if I gave to the house the amended form. When it was up for consideration on May 3 members of the committee offered certain objections and proposed certain amendments. I have endeavoured to embody those proposals in the bill in its amended form, because I consider them practical and they do not destroy the principle of the bill.

Mr. CAHAN: I object. If the hon. member has amendments to propose they should be put on the notice paper for examination.

Mr. WARD: I have a number of copies here for any hon. members who wish to see them.

Mr. CAHAN: I still object. The bill is so important that these amendments should be printed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was going to offer the same objection. In view of the very

great importance of the bill and the importance of the change which the hon. member is suggesting, the amendments should be printed.

Mr. WARD: Certainly I should like to defer to the opinions of the Minister of Justice and of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, but the principle of the bill has not been changed one iota. We have merely changed the wording; we have deleted subsection 3 and embodied 2 and 3 in one section. The principle is, however, exactly the same as when first the bill was introduced.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand the hon. member is moving an amendment to section 2 of the bill.

Mr. WARD: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: The committee is now considering section 1 and this section will have to be disposed of before an amendment can be considered to a subsequent section. So far as printing the amendments is concerned, under the rules notice is not necessary unless the committee so decides. As this is a public bill it will, however, first be necessary to adopt section 1 before any amendments may be considered in relation to section 2. Shall section 1 carry?

Mr. CAHAN: On the title we are at liberty to discuss, are we not, the general principle and purport of the bill?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 1 is the short title; shall section 1 carry?

Mr. CAHAN: This, as has already been stated, is a bill to provide for a divorce jurisdiction in the case of women who are judicially or otherwise separated from and living separate and apart from their husbands; and the general provision is that if a woman has been deserted by and has lived separate and apart from her husband for a period of two years, and is still living apart from him, she may secure domicile and be entitled to divorce in any court having jurisdiction to grant divorce a vinculo matrimonii. This bill will enable any woman to desert her husband and to obtain, so far as the jurisdiction of this parliament extends, the right to proceed to the United States, to Reno, and to acquire domicile there. And if in the state of Nevada divorce under the law is granted for minor disagreements between husband and wife—and divorce is granted there for incompatibility of temperament—

Mr. WARD: Will the hon. gentleman pardon an interruption? The amendment as proposed to the bill does not permit women to get divorce outside the Dominion. If the hon. gentleman will read the amendment he will see that the argument he is making is not applicable to the bill as amended.

Mr. CAHAN: I was discussing the bill for the purpose of directing the attention of the committee to its very expansive character. As it now stands it gives legislative confirmation to any divorce hereafter obtained in any part of the world, from here to Patagonia and on the coasts of the seven seas, if the woman—

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I ask the hon. member by what authority the federal government of Canada could give a married woman, or anyone else for that matter, the right to take legal action in another country?

Mr. CAHAN: At the present time, if either husband or wife deserts the other and proceeds to the United States to obtain a temporary domicile there, and secures a divorce in any state of the United States, that person is not as a general rule permitted to come back to Canada and marry again in this country. But this bill, if it is passed in its present terms, provides that either husband or wife may desert the other matrimonial partner and proceed to any country in the world and obtain a divorce for causes which we in Canada do not recognize but which are recognized in the foreign domicile so acquired, and should such person come back to Canada, this parliament is declaring that, so far as its legislative jurisdiction extends—and it extends to such individual upon return to Canada—that foreign divorce shall be valid within the various provinces of the Dominion. I consider the bill so extreme and broad in its terms that it certainly should not receive the approval of the house. However, I am prepared to listen with consideration to the amendments proposed; but I think they should be printed so that we may have an opportunity to study their precise terms and especially their legal purport.

Mr. LADNER: I suggest that the committee should have the amendments before it for consideration, because after all in discussing this bill we are considering something of an extraordinary nature. I have before me the amendment which the hon. member (Mr. Ward) proposes and it is so entirely different from the bill as originally submitted that it seems quite reasonable that we should

have it before us for consideration. The principle is the same; but the amendment states:

A wife deserted by, and living separate and apart from her husband shall be deemed to retain the domicile of her husband at the time she was so deserted until she has acquired a domicile of her own choice in Canada and may acquire such domicile for herself in Canada as though she were a femme sole, when such desertion has continued for a period of two years, and on acquiring such domicile in Canada may commence an action for divorce where so domiciled praying that her marriage may be dissolved on any grounds that entitle her to such divorce in any court having jurisdiction to grant a divorce a vinculo matrimonii.

Mr. CAHAN: That is an entirely new bill.

Mr. LADNER: My suggestion is that we allow the hon. member to submit his amendments so that we may intelligently consider the bill as it will be actually before us.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Are we not now considering section 1?

The CHAIRMAN: Section 1 has not been adopted.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Section 1 is the short title, with which this discussion has nothing to do. What possible objection can there be to it? Let us first dispose of section 1.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If one is opposed to the bill, one is also opposed to that section. We are discussing a bill which is different from the bill as originally proposed, with this same section 1.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Nevertheless I contend that the only question before the committee at the present time is section 1.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Section 1 means nothing unless it is followed by something else; it has a meaning because there is a second section. And it is the second section to which we are objecting.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 carry?

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Married woman separate from husband.

Mr. WARD: I desire to move an amendment which will replace sections 2 and 3 and which will practically comprise the entire bill:

A wife deserted by, and living separate and apart from her husband shall be deemed to retain the domicile of her husband at the time she was so deserted until she has acquired a domicile of her own choice in Canada and may acquire such domicile for herself in Canada as though she were a femme sole, when such desertion has continued for a period of two years, and on acquiring such domicile in Canada may commence an action for divorce where so domiciled praying that her marriage may be dissolved on any grounds that entitle her to such divorce in any court having jurisdiction to grant a divorce a vincula matrimonii.

Mr. STEVENS: May I ask my hon. friend if he is moving this as an amendment?

Mr. WARD: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend has not moved the amendment yet.

Mr. WARD: I move that the bill be amended by inserting this paragraph in lieu of sections 2 and 3 of the present bill.

Mr. LADNER: May I suggest to my hon. friend that in his amendment the words "and upwards" be inserted after the words "two years"; that is the usual phraseology in these proceedings.

Mr. WARD: I have no objection, so long as the principle of this bill is embodied in legislation. That is my only reason for introducing the bill.

Miss MACPHAIL: I cannot think any hon. member of this house will oppose the bill as amended, because it involves human rights. Although anxious that it should be in good legal form, I am not so much interested in the legal aspects of the matter as I am in the human rights of the case. A woman has just as much right as a man to be able to establish a legal domicile of her own where she can take action, and it is only because we still have a hang-over from the dark ages that this action must be taken to-day. While I am not really particularly interested in the involved legal argument of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George I want to see the bill passed in such form that it will enable a woman to establish a legal domicile of her own, and until she can do that she is indeed not a "person," as the supreme court decided some time ago. I feel that everyone will agree with the principle of the bill and will be anxious that women may be afforded the same privileges which men have enjoyed for a long time. There is no reason why men should have a corner on all the good things in life.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does my hon. friend claim that there should be two domiciles in a marriage union, one for the husband and one for the wife?

Miss MACPHAIL: Certainly; are there not two people?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That does not sound like the dark ages; it sounds like the period before the dark ages. It is against the natural law.

Miss MACPHAIL: That natural law stuff covers a lot of special privileges. Will the Minister of Justice, who gets so righteously indignant about two domiciles, say that if we should have only one it should be the domicile of the wife?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would have no objection. If the hon. member had been here the other day she would have heard me say that I care not whether it is the domicile of the husband or of the wife, but so long as there is a marital bond there must be only one domicile. That is the principle of British and international law.

Mr. BROWN: Following out that argument, then, I think it might be well contended that the woman should have equal rights with her husband in the one domicile.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think my hon. friend should abolish matrimony altogether; let us all be equal and free.

Miss MACPHAIL: Even that would not be as bad as some of the things we have now.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Free love and free everything.

Mr. LADNER: On the argument presented by the Minister of Justice I would like to ask whether, in the case of a man who has been iniquitous in every sense of the word as far as his marital relations have been concerned and who moves off to unknown parts, he thinks the domicile should walk with the man and leave the poor woman stranded without any rights in regard to her future life or with regard to her children?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am informed that in such cases the court always goes a long way to decide that the last domicile persists. If a man goes all around the world surely he would not benefit or profit by such vagrancy.

Mr. BENNETT: Then the domicile of origin commences.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, and I am told that this is usually accepted by the courts.

Miss MACPHAIL: If that is true why is it that the legal profession has passed legal resolutions on this subject, asking that these changes be made?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The "legal profession" is a very wide expression; I do not think all the members of the legal profession have endorsed such resolutions.

Mr. LADNER: I may tell the Minister of Justice that in the courts of British Columbia, and I presume also in the other provinces where divorce courts exist, it is well-established law that you must establish domicile before you come under the jurisdiction of the court. If you do not know where the man is how can you establish domicile?

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): It will be the last domicile.

Mr. LADNER: No. I have had cases where the man has been gone for six or eight years, and the court will ask where that man is at the time of the trial, because he may have acquired domicile in Ontario or in Alberta, and in many of these cases the wife or the dependents do know where the husband is. He may have established a domicile in the United States, and once that fact comes to the attention of the court it is without jurisdiction to grant relief, so the argument of the Minister of Justice falls to the ground.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I was referring to the majority of cases. Such instances as my hon. friend has mentioned may arise, but I say that for the purpose of meeting difficulties which may exist in special cases we should not open wide the door to all sorts of applications such as I mentioned the other day. I do not want to repeat what I said then, but while I am on my feet I would like to direct the attention of the committee to the new bill—because by substituting a new section for sections 2 and 3 of the former bill my hon. friend has practically brought in a new bill. This bill would not limit the new domicile of the wife to the purpose of prosecuting an action for divorce; it establishes a domicile for all purposes.

Mr. CAHAN: It is beyond the jurisdiction of this parliament so to enact.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Parliament has no right to deal with domicile. I know the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) will not like it but we are still in the same position as we were when we allowed the provinces to settle their own provincial matters, and domicile generally comes under provincial jurisdiction. The bill states:

A wife deserted by and living separate and apart from her husband shall be deemed to

retain the domicile of her husband at the time she was so deserted until she has acquired a domicile of her own choice in Canada and may acquire such domicile for herself in Canada as though she were a femme sole.

When such desertion has continued for a period of two years, after acquiring such new domicile she may institute proceedings for divorce. I believe the bill is beyond the jurisdiction of the federal parliament.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is the Minister of Justice speaking as the head of the Justice department in interpreting the British North America Act?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am speaking for myself just now. I think the request of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George was a very reasonable one, that we should have an opportunity of having this new bill printed and be given the time to consider it. It is a very important matter with which we are dealing and my first impression is that we are going beyond our jurisdiction.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): The bill, as at present instituted, is an attempt to undo an unjustice which the law at it stands undoubtedly does to women, and I submit that the Minister of Justice, instead of criticizing the bill, should lend his powers and his legal ability to making it workable and giving the relief which the bill intends to give.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I regret that I cannot help my hon. friend, but I am opposed to spreading divorce in Canada. I am sorry the hon. member for Southeast Grey does not like that, but that is my principle.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I was asked by a very prominent lawyer in a city of Canada to give my support to this bill. He told me that he had had a case where a woman could not establish a domicile. Her husband had left her for many years and she did not know where he was. The learned judge on the bench told her that he was very sorry but under the existing laws of Canada he could not grant a divorce and give her the relief to which she was entitled.

Mr. CAHAN: I suggest with conviction that this clause No. 2 is too wide in so far as it provides that for all purposes one may so acquire a domicile. It is possible that inasmuch as this parliament has jurisdiction to deal with divorce, it may incidentally have legislative jurisdiction to decide as to what shall constitute domicile for the purposes of divorce, but this bill is so wide that it comes in conflict with the provincial laws with regard to domicile as it affects property and civil rights. In so far as this bill affects property and civil rights, which are within the legislative jurisdiction of the provinces, this section would be ultra vires of this parliament; and, therefore, it seems to me that if the mover of this amendment desires that this bill shall have the effect which he intends, and only that effect, the paragraph should be drafted differently so as to make it clear that, in dealing with the acquisition of domicile, it is the acquisition of a domicile for the purposes of divorce only and not for the purposes of civil status and civil rights.

Mr. McPHEE: Does not the first section of the bill show that?

Mr. GEARY: What does it show?

Mr. McPHEE: That "this act may be cited as the Divorce Jurisdiction Act."

Mr. GEARY: That is just a name.

Mr. BENNETT: I argued the case of Cook versus Cook before the Privy Council. The courts of Alberta had decided that a wife might, under the Matrimonial Clauses Act, obtain a divorce for herself. The Privy Council, following the decision, the House of Lords in the Jeffrey case, reaffirmed the old doctrine that the domicile of the wife was that of the husband and that there could be no domicile for her other than that of the husband, wherever that domicile might be. During the progress of the argument it was observed by one of the law lords that the only way in which the matter could be dealt with would be by the parliament of Canada. As the Minister of Justice has said, there is undoubtedly such a thing as two domiciles. There is the law of domicile with respect to the distribution of property, but we are not dealing with that here. I suppose there is no harm in saying that I discussed this matter with the hon. gentleman who introduced the bill, and also with the law officers. I think the most important words have been struck out, and they are, "for the purposes of this act a married woman. . ." This is an act which deals with the domicile in divorce matters, and this parliament would have jurisdiction. I quite agree with the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George and the hon. Minister of Justice that we would be exercising powers entirely beyond our jurisdiction, so far as the British North America Act is concerned, unless we say that we are only legislating for the purposes of this act, that is, for divorce purposes.

The hon. Minister of Justice is opposed on principle to divorce, and the other evening he placed his position before the house with

respect to the general principles regarding domicile in a manner to which no exception could be taken. He stated what the highest court of the realm has pronounced to be the law, having regard to the provisions of the statute under which we in Alberta exercise jurisdiction in divorce matters, namely, the English Divorce Act of 1857. Under the act of 1857 it was declared that a woman who was separated from her husband—I did not intend to participate in this debate and I have not the time to send out for the section—should have all the rights of a femme sole and she could contract or do as she pleased. Since that time the position of married women has greatly changed. Under the provisions of the law in the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Ontario, and the maritime provinces—I cannot speak with authority with respect to Quebec—a woman has a separate existence under the Married Women's Property Act with respect to property, with respect to contract and with respect to all rights which make her, in the eyes of the law, an individual apart from her husband. Up to the present time the law of the Dominion as to domicile has been that the domicile of the wife is that of the husband, and in the divorces granted by this parliament the question of domicile has been established on the basis of the domicile of the husband. This parliament has declined to grant divorces in more cases than one because the husband was domiciled in the United States of America, and that, under British law, being the domicile of the wife it followed that the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada had disappeared. This bill merely proposes to carry into divorce legislation the principle of which has been adopted in each province of confederation, namely, to confer upon the wife, when she has been abandoned and is living separate and apart from her husband as a femme sole, the right to acquire for herself a domicile.

Leaving that question for the moment, what is a domicile? I think many members of the house look upon residence and domicile as being one and the same thing. There are two factors which determine domicile; one is actual residence in a particular place and the other is the intention. Although there may be a residence for fifty years, if the second factor, namely, intention, is absent there is no domicile established. The leading case in that connection is that of an American who went from Philadelphia to the United Kingdom and lived there for thirty or forty years. When he died it was contended that he was domiciled in England. It was successfully set up that he had never lost his United States domicile, because during his lifetime he had declared that he intended to return to the United States, and always spoke of that and no other as his country. Although there had been a residence of, I think, something over thirty years in the United Kingdom, there was no presence of the second factor that makes domicile, namely, the intention to remain there as his home. That is, the intention is the all-important matter.

Here is a case of a wife who is abandoned; she is living separate and apart from her husband. She may be judicially separated or she may not. She is living alone. This bill declares—and the words "for the purposes of this act" are all-important; without them the bill is I think, ultra vires of this parliament—that for the purposes of this act, namely, for the purpose of divorce, first, the British principle remains; that is, if the point at which she was abandoned by her husband was his domicile, that is her domicile. If she was abandoned in Alberta, her domicile is Alberta; if she was abandoned in Saskatchewan, her domicile is Saskatchewan; if she was abandoned in Manitoba, her domicile is Manitoba. Then we say what the Supreme court of the United States said, I think in 1868; what state courts in the United States have held for many years; what the Dominion of New Zealand said some years ago, since overruled by the decision in Cook versus Cook, namely, that this woman may now exercise the rights of a femme sole. In other words, she may exercise the same rights as though she had never been married. She may acquire a domicile of her own. How? First, by remaining in a particular community as her home; and then, with the intention of remaining there indefinitely.

Mr. THORSON: May I ask the hon. member a question? Has he given any thought to this consequence that might follow if the wife acquired in Manitoba for example a domicile separate from that of her husband? This parliament would then be conferring upon the courts of Manitoba, the jurisdiction to grant a divorce in respect of a couple, one of whom was domiciled in Manitoba and the other domiciled outside of Manitoba. Under the present law the Manitoba courts have jurisdiction to pronounce divorce only when both parties are domiciled in Manitoba.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has certainly indicated what the obvious result is; namely, that by this legislation the wife, being a femme sole, being abandoned by her husband, being no longer under his protection, her status being

still that of a married woman, as the minister has well said, may change that to the extent of acquiring a domicile as though she were a single woman. That is all. Then we say that, she having acquired that domicile, the courts of that country have at once jurisdiction, as the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre says over her matrimonial state, that is, they have the right to divorce her from her husband. As I say, the supreme court of the United States, I said in 1868 but I think as a matter of fact it was 1870, declared that one of the incidents that resulted from the widening of the rights of married women was that, when abandoned, she could acquire a domicile of her own. Our courts have, as the minister has said, declared exactly the opposite, and this parliament has the power to deal with the matter. The question is, shall it exercise that jurisdiction? But it has not the right to exercise this power, as the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George says, unless such power is limited to divorce that is for the purposes of the act and the act only. To that extent it is an addition to the existing legislation which is British legislation of 1857. Therefore I am perfectly certain, unless we do this, the very injury which the Minister of Justice desires to avoid will continue, namely, we shall have people leaving Canada, going to the United States, setting up a fictitious domicile and securing a divorce with all the consequences incident thereto and all the uncertainties as to the legitimacy of the offspring. That is a very serious matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would rather have the United States assume the responsibility than ourselves.

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister of Justice and I differ in that regard, I would rather be a party to this legislation to give legality to the situation than become a party to the scandals that, we know, exist with reference to it. That is my reasoning in arriving at a conclusion in the matter. I admit the force of the hon. gentleman's reasoning and of the objection of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. On the other hand, I can give half a dozen cases that come to my mind. One is that of a woman living in Alberta who has been abandoned by her husband. She has no idea where he is. The courts hold that if he is a roving person and has no known domicile, the domicile of his origin is the domicile that attaches to him, because the law is that every man is born with a domicile and is never without it. So it was held in the Cook case that this roving husband who was at one time domiciled in Alberta, although he changed his mind and roved about, had the domicile of his origin, namely, Ontario, and therefore the Alberta court could not deal with the matter.

What we are doing is to decide whether or not we desire to have a condition continued with all the scandal that attaches to it, with men and women going to a foreign jurisdiction, setting up fictitious domiciles, obtaining divorces in those courts which divorces are valid in every part of the United States, by reason of its constitution, sometimes marrying in the United States and coming back to Canada, confronted with the uncertainty of their own position and that of their children. We have to choose between that and the enactment of a statute whereby we declare that a woman who, in her own province, is a separate person with respect to contracts, obligations, debts, sitting in parliament, holding any office which may be in the gift of the people—and under our statutes she is eligible for any office except that she may not as yet sit in the senate—shall be given this additional right, namely, that of acquiring for herself for the purposes of this act a domicile. So far as I am concerned, I am in favour of giving her that right to acquire a domicile in order that her status, which is that of a single person with respect to contracts, obligations, property and everything that concerns her existence as a citizen, may be the same for the purpose of a domicile for the purpose of securing a divorce. In that way let us prevent the scandals to which I have referred and say that a woman who is abandoned by her husband may acquire a domicile for the purposes of this act, namely, a divorce act, and for any purpose concerning property in any way, shape or form. I think proper words could be found to express that meaning and we could pass this bill at this session.

Progress reported.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock we were considering item 779a, copper rods.

Customs tariff—779a. Copper rods when imported by manufacturers for use in their own factories in the manufacture of electrical conductors, the individual units of such electrical conductors not to exceed the area of No. 7/0 gauge conductor per pound: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, ¼ cent; general tariff, ½ cent.

Mr. CLARK: I should like to ask the minister where and to what extent in Canada copper bars are manufactured.

Mr. ROBB: At Trail. That is the only place as yet, but they are preparing to manufacture them elsewhere.

Mr. CLARK: Do they not manufacture sufficient copper bars for all the concerns that use them in Canada?

Mr. ROBB: No, the supply is not sufficient.

Mr. CLARK: Since when?

Mr. ROBB: I remember the manager at Trail telling me that they supplied the Canadian trade with all that they had available, but that they did not have sufficient. They hoped, however, to have sufficient within a reasonable time.

Mr. CLARK: Have they not been granted a bounty?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: And that bounty has been paid to the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company for some years?

Mr. ROBB: I have not a list of firms that have received the bounty. That is administered by the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. CLARK: But the bounty is still being paid?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, on a reducing scale; I think they are down to the minimum now. My recollection is that when the bounty provisions expired last year, they were renewed for another year, possibly two years.

Mr. BENNETT: They expired the year before last, I think.

Mr. CLARK: There is a situation in connection with this matter that I would like to bring to the attention of the minister and the committee. I understand quite well that the only smelter in Canada that does produce copper bars is the Trail smelter of the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company. Their supply of copper has come until recently almost exclusively from the Granby Copper Company at Allenby. Some two million dollars' worth of copper is produced there annually. I quite understand that the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company could not supply the demand of Canadian manufacturers for copper bars at the present time for the very good reason that all the copper now produced by the Granby Copper Company is exported from Canada in its raw state to the Tacoma smelter. I desire to bring this matter as forcibly to the attention of the government as I can, for I believe that when we have in Canada smelters capable of refining our raw mineral wealth, those smelters should be utilized.

I quite realize, too, that there may be a dispute between these two companies as to the terms and conditions upon which this ore should be smelted, but I realize also that it is quite possible for this government to bring these two concerns together and to tell the Granby company that the exportation of copper in its raw state will not be tolerated, and to tell the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company that it must accept the ore of the Granby company and refine it on a fair basis. A fair basis could easily be arrived at by arbitration between the two companies. This is a situation which in my opinion merits the consideration of this government. If, for instance, we were smelting our raw copper at home, there would be no necessity for going down on our hands and knees to the United States for these copper bars. There would be no necessity for us to say to the United States: So long as you sell your copper bars to us at a price higher than you sell them in your home market we will put our tariff against your copper rods. This is what we are telling them. This is retaliation. We are going down on our hands and knees to the United States, whereas the root of the trouble lies in the fact that we do not insist on the refining of our raw copper at home.

I would draw further to the attention of this government that British Columbia at the present time is the greatest producer of copper in Canada. That may not long be the case, because Saskatchewan and Manitoba, through the medium of such properties as the Hudson Bay and Sherritt-Gordon will become great copper producers. Ontario, through the medium of International Nickel, will also become a great copper producer. Canada bids fair to become one of the greatest copper-producing countries in the world, and British Columbia should be an example to this government in that connection. We are producing there to-day twelve million dollars' worth of copper per annum. A large proportion of this copper is going out of British Columbia in its raw state, unsmelted. We have across the harbour from Vancouver the Britannia Mining Company, producing about five million dollars' worth of copper per annum, all of which is going out of this

country in its natural state. That is quite a sufficient quantity of copper to justify the erection of a smelter, and I suggest to this government that it is its duty to advise the Howe Sound company that that condition will not be tolerated beyond a certain period. I do not think we need put any export duty on this raw material. All we have to do is to tell them that we will not have our raw mineral wealth going out of this country unrefined. Give them ample time in which to finance a smelter and the thing will be done, and Canada generally will benefit by such a policy. The reason it is necessary for us today to introduce a resolution such as that before the committee is because we have failed to take advantage of our natural wealth and failed to make provision for the refining of that wealth even to some extent here in our own country. The time has come when the Canadian people demand that such steps be taken. They want their raw materials fabricated at home. That is a natural desire, and one which the government should take notice of.

Mr. McGIBBON: As the Minister of National Revenue is in his place I would like to ask him for some information which I have tried unsuccessfully to get from the Minister of Finance a number of times, namely, as to the basis of arriving at the Canadian content of cars made in Canada.

Mr. EULER: I am not sure that I understand exactly what the hon. gentleman desires, but I take it that he refers to the excise tax of 5 per cent, which is remitted in certain cases on cars manufactured in Canada. Am I right in that?

Mr. McGIBBON: Yes.

Mr. EULER: The excise tax of 5 per cent is remitted, or rather there is an exemption on cars of $1,200 and under only. I presume my hon. friend's question is as to how the 50 per cent Canadian content is made up to qualify for the exemption.

Mr. McGIBBON: Is there not a drawback on the raw material as well?

Mr. EULER: That is an entirely different matter from the excise tax exemption. They are two separate things. As to which does my hon. friend want information?

Mr. McGIBBON: On both.

Mr. EULER: I have given information as to the first; that is, that the 5 per cent exemption is granted on cars selling for $1,200 or less.

[Mr. Clark.]

Mr. BENNETT: If 50 per cent of the content is Canadian.

Mr. EULER: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend's question is as to how that Canadian content is arrived at, whether on the average of all the cars or on each individual car.

Mr. EULER: A number of cars selling for less than $1,200 are manufactured in the same factory. We take the factory output of all cars of $1,200 and under, and they must qualify as to 50 per cent Canadian content before the exemption is granted. With regard to the fifty per cent content which is demanded before the drawback is payable on raw materials entering into those cars, it works out in practice the same way. The drawback is not granted until the fifty per cent is checked up.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister does not understand me. For instance, take General Motors. The Chevrolet is one of their low priced cars, and more than fifty per cent of it is made in Canada; some of their other cars contain less than fifty per cent. Do you take the average over the shop or the individual car?

Mr. EULER: We very seriously considered what the basis should be. Obviously it is impossible to take the individual car and follow it from the outset right through to completion. It is impossible to check all the materials that enter into each car. Then we were faced with the question whether we should take each particular line of car—my hon. friend mentioned General Motors—such as the Chevrolet, the Oldsmobile, the Oakland, the Pontiac, and others separately or whether it might be advisable for a number of reasons to interpret the law in such a way that we would take the total factory output, and then make all the output qualify on the fifty per cent basis before the company could get the drawback on their imported raw materials. After careful consideration—and I may say after consultation with some of my hon. friends opposite—as to the best thing to do, we adopted the factory output method. There has been a little criticism from one quarter alone. There has been no discrimination. At any rate, we have followed that plan.

Mr. McGIBBON: Does the minister think that is legal?

Mr. EULER: I do not think there is any doubt about the legality of it at all. I do not see wherein the difference lies just because a certain make of car is called by a

certain name. General Motors might call their cars all by the name McLaughlin-Buick Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, instead of, we will say, Chevrolet, Pontiac, Oldsmobile, Oakland, McLaughlin-Buick, and all the rest of them. However, there may be some difference of opinion, and as a matter of fact we are going to review the whole situation.

I might perhaps briefly state our reasons for taking the course I have mentioned. A good many of these cars, for example, the Chevrolet, and some other cars made by other concerns, contain away above fifty per cent Canadian content; some of them, on the other hand, would probably fall below the fifty per cent. We will take a car, for example, like the LaSalle.

Mr. McGIBBON: Or the Cadillac.

Mr. EULER: Yes, or the Cadillac. If you did not allow them to average the factory content over the whole seven lines made by General Motors, the result would be, as we considered it—I think quite correctly—that the higher priced cars would not be made in Canada at all; there would be no work done on them here; they would be imported in the finished condition, with the result that just that much labour would be lost to this country. There is the added result that to bring the total factory output up to fifty per cent, some of the lines being below that figure, on the other lines they would have to go still higher in order to obtain the average. That was one of our reasons for adopting the factory output method, to ensure that some work on the higher priced cars would be performed in Canada.

Mr. McGIBBON: How much work is done on the higher priced cars?

Mr. EULER: I cannot give that information accurately. I know there is a good deal of it done.

Mr. MacLAREN: I hope the minister will reconsider the whole tariff situation regarding copper. No doubt in the not far distant future conditions in Canada will be very different from what they are to-day. There will be smelting, and we shall have copper produced in Canada in the form of ingots, bars, and so on. But that is not the condition at the present moment. Therefore one is forced to consider and in the meantime to guard the interests of our brass founders. They are dependent upon the United States for their copper. Why? Because Canada does not produce nearly sufficient raw material—copper ingots—for the brass founders. Previous to the war the raw material, in the form of ingots, was imported free of duty. During the war a duty was imposed which is now something like one and a half cents a pound. That duty has continued up to the present time. Consequently our brass founders to-day are paying one and a half cents per pound on their copper—one and a half cents per pound for their raw material. There has been no increase in duty on the finished product. Therefore the brass founders have had a difficult course to pursue. I wish the minister would specially think of this; is it well to have a duty of one and one half cents per pound on copper, which is the raw material for the brass founders, the workers in copper and brass? I think not. I think there is much in the argument that so long as Canada fails to produce a sufficient amount of raw material in the form of ingots, the government might well do without the duty on copper in that form. Then there is this other advantage. The item before us is copper rods. Were the duty taken off ingots, it would be a strong incentive to our people to do their own refining and to produce their own rods and bars. It is an additional reason, I think, why at the present time we should remove the duty on copper ingots. Certainly it would be for the advantage of the brass founders, but also it would stimulate the production of refined copper. At the present time our copper and brass workers are in great doubt whether it is of advantage to them to manufacture their own products or pay a duty and import them.

Mr. GEARY: The Minister of National Revenue has told us very clearly how he arrived at the Canadian content of cars. I judge that he has such a staff that he is able to go into the cost of all cars and to ascertain what relation the cost of production bears to the price charged. If that is the case, I submit that in these matters we shall get much more satisfaction through this department than through the tariff board, in regard to whether or not the excise tax has been passed on to the public. The tariff board, I presume, would only avail themselves of the officials of the revenue department. Therefore I suggest to the government if they want to get at the bottom of whether this excise tax is being passed on to the public or retained by the companies they would be much better served by the revenue department. I should like to hear what the Minister of National Revenue has to say about it, but perhaps he is too modest to speak.

Mr. DICKIE: Let us get back once more to copper rods and let us hear from the government what their policy is with respect

to the processing of copper in our country At one time the Consolidated Smelters at Trail obtained copper from the Granby Company, the purchases running into millions each year, but owing to a slight dispute between these two concerns that copper ore is now going to the United States and Canada is suffering in consequence. Surely that dispute could be adjusted. I know of no argument in answer to the case put forward by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard. Let these companies be told, "We will give you two years to erect your smelters and treat copper ores in Canada; if not we shall take some means to see that you are penalized for not doing so". There is no reason why this should not be done; it would mean employment for many more people in Canada and would be a businesslike proceeding. I would do the same thing with the asbestos deposits in Quebec.

Here we also have an unsatisfactory state of affairs. The United States government have announced their intention to levy a 25 per cent ad valorem duty on shingles entering the United States and this means that our cedar logs will go there and be manufactured into shingles. What will this government do about that? What will they do in regard to the pulpwood situation, which has been brought to their attention time and time again on the floor of this house by myself and others? Is it not time that we looked forward to doing something to retain our people in Canada instead of allowing them to go across the line? Let us build up industries in Canada so that the sons of our farmers will have something to turn to when they graduate from the farms instead of having to leave this country in order to make a livelihood south of the line. It is time we received an answer to this argument, and so far I have heard not one from hon. gentlemen on the government side. What is the opinion of the Minister of Finance with respect to these vital questions? I consider them among the vital questions that confront us to-day in this Dominion.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I agree with the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard and with the hon. member who has just spoken as to what would be the real and permanent remedy in a case of this kind, namely, an export duty on copper. That would obviate the necessity of an application to the government, of any order in council, or of anything such as is proposed in this resolution.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): A duty on copper ore?

[Mr. Dickie.]

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes, in its raw state. Have it refined and finished in Canada. Let us refine our raw material so as to give employment to our own people; let us reduce it as far as possible in this country.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): How far would you refine it before allowing it to be exported?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): That is a matter of detail.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): A matter of important detail.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The general principle should be to manufacture in Canada, as far as practicable, Canada's raw material so as to give employment to our own people.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Carrying it to the final and finished product?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): If practicable, yes. In some cases it might not be practicable, but that is the general principle we should follow. Now I wish to refer to the brief presented by the Eugene F. Phillips Electrical Works Limited, of Montreal and Brockville, and reported in the records of the tariff board, reference No. 87, with regard to copper rods. This company has a rolling mill at Brockville, and its brief states:

In the applicant's brief dated January 9, 1928, (see pages 118 and 119 of stenographic report of first hearing) it was stated that:

From the opening of the Brockville rolling mill in November, 1922 to December 31, 1927, the Phillips company has purchased from the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company the latter's total output of copper bars—16,669 tons of a value of $4,425,300.72.

To complete its requirements of copper bars the Phillips company from the time of the opening of its rolling mill to December 31, 1927, has been obliged to purchase in the United States 27,115 tons of copper bars of a value of $7,659,622.30.

During 1928 the Phillips company purchased from the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company approximately 7,000 tons of copper wire bars having a value as of December 31, 1928, of $2,327,500, which represented the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company's total output of copper wire bars for the year.

During the same period—the year 1928—the Phillips company to complete its requirements, placed orders in the United States for copper wire bars to the extent of 6,250 tons, having a value as of December 31, 1928, of $2,078,125.

In September, 1928, the Granby Consolidated Mining, Smelting and Power Company discontinued the delivery of blister to the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company's refinery at Trail and diverted the supply to Tacoma, Washington, to be refined there.

The last consignment of copper wire bars received by the Phillips company from the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company was

shipped from Trail on October 29, 1928. Since that date no copper wire bars have been produced at Trail nor have they been procurable elsewhere in Canada.

As a consequence, since October 29, 1928, the Phillips company has been obliged to purchase its entire requirements of copper wire bars in the United States.

To the applicant's brief, dated January 9, 1928, were attached two sheets, showing the variations to December 31, 1927, in the prices charged by the Copper Export Association to the Phillips company for copper wire bars delivered in Brockville, also the New York refinery prices plus the freight rate to Brockville and the discrimination per ton against Canada for the same dates. At the first hearing on June 20, 1928, the applicant filed an additional sheet carrying the figures down to May 25, 1928. A further sheet continuing the figures to January 23, 1929, is attached to the present supplementary brief.

It is evident that the Copper Export Association is hopeful of forcing the Phillips company to close its Brockville rolling mill and of compelling the Phillips company to import its full requirements of copper wire rods from the United States, because on November 30 last, the Canadian Freight Association considered an application from the American Smelting and Refining Company, one of the members of the Copper Export Association, for a commodity rate on copper rods from Baltimore to Brockville, although there has never been a movement of copper rods into Brockville.

This matter was before the tariff board and it was clearly shown that there was a discrimination against Canada, in the matter of the sale of these bars, of amounts varying from $2.50 to $4.25 and possibly higher per ton. The fact is that this association has so arranged matters that it sells copper bars in the United States at a lower price than it sells to Canada. It is the opposite of dumping. In one case when they wish to put the Canadian industry out of business they dump their products into Canada; in another case, when they cannot do it in this way, they raise the raw material to the consumer in Canada, thus forcing him if possible to close his mill in this country for the manufacture of raw material so that the finished product must be purchased in the United States.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Does my hon. friend propose to forbid them to sell cheaply and also to sell dearly?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I propose to forbid them to trim us both ways, first by dumping and then by charging an exorbitant price for what we cannot buy in Canada. My hon. friend from Weyburn seems quite willing to stand it both ways; he is willing to let them dump fruits and vegetables into Canada and injure that industry.

Mr. ADSHEAD: When did they ever do it?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): They do it every year, because this government will not invoke the law in order to prevent that dumping. This is an effort to prevent them from charging more than they are receiving from their own people in the United States. I quite agree with other hon. members who have spoken that the more desirable way would be an export duty on our raw materials, but if the government cannot go that far I think they are quite justified in the action they are taking. For the benefit of the hon. member for Weyburn I want to say that Mr. Deachman appeared before this tariff board and argued the case; the tariff board, which is probably sympathetic to him, ruled against him and now my hon. friend wants to override the decision of the tariff board. I submit that he cannot have it both ways, and that this measure of relief is only fair and reasonable. It does not go as far as I would like it to go; it is not as permanent in its character as I would like it to be, but I submit that it will commend itself—

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): If you are in favour of it what is the idea of holding it up?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Is my hon. friend in favour of it?

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): If my hon. friend favours this measure why does he hold it up?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I am not holding it up; I am endeavouring to support it, but this is a matter of great interest to my constituency, and I think my hon. friend will agree that I am entitled to speak on it.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): My hon. friend says in this matter we are trying to overrule the finding of the tariff board, and I want to draw his attention to the fact that this is a case where the tariff board justifies its existence. That board found the facts, which are contained in the evidence; we have read the evidence and it is our duty now, as responsible members of parliament, to decide what we will do in the face of that evidence. Hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of talking about building up Canadian industry, and this is how they propose to assist the Canadian mining industry: First they say to the prospector, "We will tax you on all the tools and equipment you require before you can go out and look for mines."

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Talk about the issue.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): I am coming to it. Then, when the mine is found, they say to the company, "We will tax you an excessive rate on all the equipment and machinery you require for your mine." Then, after the mine has been developed through the expenditure of millions of dollars and after devoting years of work to it, they say to the company, "We will forbid you to sell your ores except to Canadian smelters." Then they say to those who would build a Canadian smelter, "We will tax you an additional sum on everything you require for the construction of the smelter." They say to the mining company, "You cannot sell your ore until the smelters are built," and they say to the smelting company, "You cannot build a smelter; we will tax you on everything you use." This is the way they propose to assist the Canadian mining industry.

Mr. MANION: The Canadian mining industry is going ahead by leaps and bounds in spite of what my hon. friend says. My hon. friend would help every industry except those in Canada, and every country except his own.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): The Canadian mining industry is going ahead, but if my hon. friend and his friends got into power with their policy, the industry would come to a standstill.

Mr. MANION: Under the Conservative government of Ontario the mining industry in this province is going ahead faster than that of any other province in Canada.

Item agreed to.

Mr. ROBB: When we were discussing these items the other evening it was brought to the attention of the committee that there were two classifications for a new machine used for reaping and threshing, and it is proposed to clear up that situation by bringing in a new resolution which will be No. 445. I beg to move:

That resolution No. 1 of March 1, 1929, relating to amendments to schedule A of the Customs Tariff be amended by adding thereto the following provision:

That tariff item 445 the enumerations of goods and the several rates of duties of customs set opposite said item, be struck out of said schedule A and that the following item, enumerations and rates of duty be inserted in said schedule A:

445. Mowing machines, harvesters either self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers, harvesters in combination with threshing machine separators including the motive power incorporated therein, and complete parts of articles specified in this tariff item. . . British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 6 per cent; general tariff, 6 per cent.

This brings into that schedule the machine referred to, so there will be no further misunderstanding; and it will qualify them to get the same remission on their raw materials.

Item agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS: Before we finally leave this portion of the minister's task I should like to ask whether any report was received from the tariff board with regard to reference No. 47, which has to do with staves for the manufacture of wooden barrels. Canadian Western Cooperage, Limited, of Vancouver, who made the application, asked for some consideration in connection with that industry, and I have under my hand the reference. It deals with staves and headings made from Douglas fir for the production of containers for practically all kinds of liquids. Among the products for which these containers are used may be mentioned the following: Pickled fish of all kinds, mild cured salmon, pilchard oil, whale and sperm oil, fish oil, lubricating oil, acetic acid, and so on. Pressure tanks, beer fermenting vats, et cetera, are included among the containers affected. The hearing took place and I should like to ask the minister whether a report has been made, and if so, whether he has given consideration to it.

Mr. ROBB: I am speaking from memory only, but I recall that there was a hearing but it has not been completed.

Mr. STEVENS: I have the minutes of the hearing before me. It is true that it is called the first hearing, but it looks to me to be a very complete case. Different parties were heard and very careful questioning, cross-examination and argument took place. I notice the hearing winds up in the usual stereotyped form, as follows:

Whereupon the first hearing of reference No. 47 was adjourned.

That has something of the significance of the declaration from the pulpit: "Here endeth the first lesson." I have had considerable correspondence on this matter, and I believe the minister has too. I submit that the hearing is complete enough for some action. I suppose the minister cannot undertake at this stage of the case to declare any policy in the matter?

Mr. ROBB: No, I would rather not. Mr. Chairman, before six o'clock we were discussing item No. 696. The hon. leader of

the opposition brought to the attention of the committee the fact that this was rather a wide item and he thought it should include public hospitals. I have been consulting with the officers of the department and although it is felt it would open up a rather wide field they feel that there is no reason why hospitals should be deprived of the advantages we are giving to the colleges and schools. Therefore, I beg to move:

That tariff item No. 696 be amended by inserting the words "public hospital" after the word "any" in the twelfth line.

That amendment will bring the hospitals under that classification.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would not like it to be confined to public hospitals unless that term includes private hospitals. What does the minister mean by the word "public"? Why not say "hospitals"?

Mr. ROBB: I think it is better to make it public hospitals. These are maintained by the public and in that way the department will be better able to control matters. The hon. member knows that publicly maintained hospitals should be considered in the same light as schools, colleges and seminaries. If it is opened up to include private hospitals we would be entering a very wide field and we think we are doing the right thing in using the language which prevails in tariff item No. 466a.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): What does the hon. minister mean by public hospitals?

Mr. ROBB: What is meant by public schools?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): They are different things entirely. A private hospital may be one which receives all kinds of patients and still be a private hospital; I would like to be sure.

Mr. ROBB: We are following the same language which is in other items of the tariff affecting hospitals.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would like to support the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) for once, as it is not very often I can agree with him. In many large areas in this country there are no hospitals execept the private ones. The rates are no higher than in public hospitals and they are giving very good service to the public; in fact if it were not for the private hospitals there would be no service at all in many communities.

Mr. MANION: I am going to agree with the Minister of Finance in this case, although I do not agree with him very often. There are some private hospitals which probably should come under this item, but there are many which are simply money-making institutions and which do not get the support of the public. They do not admit anyone for charity but only admit those patients who are able to pay for private rooms and for private service.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): What is meant by public hospitals?

Mr. MANION: Perhaps the Minister of Finance could answer that better than I can.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): In my own city we have a hospital which is run by the sisters.

Mr. MANION: That would be a public hospital. In Ontario every hospital which admits charity patients receives from the province a donation of so much per head per day, and that would be a public hospital. Hospitals of that type come under this ruling, but hospitals which admit only those who can pay their way and can afford the expense of private rooms, hospitals which are operated merely as money-making institutions, would not, I assume, come under this.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): If the hon. member is right in his interpretation I agree with him, but I wanted to be quite sure.

Mr. MANION: Let us find out what the Minister of Finance thinks about it.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I tried to find out.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Perhaps the minister would state whether a hospital maintained by religious denominations, such as the hospital maintained by the Salvation Army in Ottawa, would come under this heading.

Mr. ROBB: I think they are in as the item is now.

Mr. McGIBBON: I think the hon. member for Saskatoon and the member for Fort William will both agree that hospitals, whether public or private, are a good deal like medical men in that they look after all charitable cases. I do not think a private hospital would take the responsibility of turning anyone away from their door because they would lose public sentiment by so doing. I know of a private hospital which has never received a grant in fifteen years and yet has never refused a patient, regardless of whether or not they could pay for their treatment.

Mr. MANION: They should have obtained a grant.

Mr. McGIBBON: They could not qualify. Will the Minister of Finance tell us what this item 696 is substituted for, and what is the estimated loss in revenue?

Mr. ROBB: The only change is the insertion of the words:

Mechanical equipment of a class or kind not made in Canada.

Before that it was in item 453, dutiable at 15 per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent and 27½ per cent, or in item 657, dutiable at 17½ per cent, 20¼ per cent, 22½ per cent and 25 per cent. There are no separate classifications for imports.

Mr. GEARY: In regard to the new item 445, a typewritten copy of which I have glanced at, and which, I understand, follows the suggestion that the hon. member for Last Mountain made in the house within the last month or so, I should like to be told the reason of that change, and the amount of reduction it is estimated will occur in duty per annum. I thought the hon. member for Last Mountain made out a good case when he stated it in the house the other day, but this comes before us for the first time and it has not come from or been considered by the tariff advisory board. I do not suppose the manufacturer of a motive power has any knowledge of the introduction of the item, and I should be glad to be informed what it means.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend is now referring to the combined harvester and reaper. That item has been passed. It is simply clearing up the matter. As the situation was before, a thresher came in at 10 per cent and a reaper at 6 per cent. This new machine, introduced within recent years, was being charged a higher duty because there is in the Customs Act a section which states that when a commodity is affected by two different rates, the higher rate shall prevail. There seemed to be unanimity that this machine should come in at the lower rate. We are now clarifying the situation and the combined machine will have the same advantages as regards rebates as the other machine has under the 6 per cent duty It is in no worse and no better position.

Mr. GEARY: There is no reference to the motive power?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. LADNER: I do not think the minister answered the question put to him a little while ago in reference to item 696 in connection with hospitals, whether or not hospitals controlled by institutions such as the Salvation Army would have the benefits of that item.

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. ROBB: We considered the item before six o'clock when it was suggested that we should also include public hospitals. The item then read:

All articles in this item, when specially imported in good faith for the use and by order of any society or institution incorporated or established solely for religious, philosophical, educational, scientific or literary purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or for the use and by order of any college, academy, school, or seminary of learning in Canada, and not for sale, under regulations prescribed by the minister.

These institutions qualified, but I think the objection raised before six o'clock was that public hospitals had not been provided for. That would be my understanding of the matter.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If the minister's understanding of it is the same as that of those who are administering the act, I shall be satisfied; but if it is not so interpreted by those who are administering the act, then we are still at loggerheads in regard to this item. I wish the minister would more clearly define what he means by a public hospital.

Mr. MANION: Would it not be a proper definition to say that a hospital would come under this item provided it were doing really charitable work? I admit there may be some private hospitals doing charitable work, and if those hospitals have the equipment they should be put under the classification of public hospitals. But any hospital that could show to the minister administering the act that it was doing really charitable work, accepting and looking after patients practically free of charge, should come under this item.

Mr. EULER: Would the hon. member say that if they were doing so only in part?

Mr. MANION: All public hospitals look after a few private patients. For instance, the one general hospital in my city, a very fine hospital, is largely a public hospital inasmuch as it looks after patients at a lower cost than that which the hospital incurs in caring for them, and it receives grants from the province; but it has private wards where the patients pay their way. It should come under this arrangement. If it does not, I do not know what hospital would.

Mr. ROBB: I am guided by consultation with the officers of the customs department who administer the act, and they were guided by an item which has been in the tariff for many years. It was amended in 1913 and it has been in the act ever since. This is the item:

Glassware and other scientific apparatus for laboratory work in public hospitals, also apparatus for sterilizing purposes, not including washing or laundry machines; all articles in this item when imported in good faith for the use and by order of any public hospital.

There has been no complaint. Why should there be any complaint about this?

Mr. MANION: I was not complaining. I was defending the minister, I am sorry to say. I regret ever having to defend the minister. I do not often have to do so.

Amendment agreed to.

Item as amended agreed to.

Customs tariff—460f. Face loading machines, shaker trough or belt trough conveyors, air engines, flame proof enclosed driving motors for air engines, and integral parts of all motive power or machinery mentioned in this item, to be used exclusively in mining operations: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 10 per cent; general tariff, 12½ per cent.

Mr. ROBB: We had under consideration also 460f and it was pointed out that the item, as originally presented, read: "face loading machines", and it was suggested it should be amended to read: "coal face loading machines". We propose to return to the item just as it is in the printed form presented in the budget; but there seems to be a duplication of language in the item, and in the third line we are striking out the words "for air engines", so that the item will read:

Face loading machines, shaker trough or belt trough conveyors, air engines, flame proof enclosed driving motors, and integral parts of all motive power or machinery mentioned in this item, to be used exclusively in mining operations.

Mr. BENNETT: Without regard to coal mines?

Mr. ROBB: This broadens it out. I am striking out the three words "for air engines".

Mr. TUMMON: What was the previous rate?

Mr. ROBB: The previous rates were 15 per cent, 25 per cent and 27½ per cent, and a part of it came under another item at 20 per cent in the general tariff instead of 25 per cent. The new rates will be free, 10 per cent and 12½ per cent.

Mr. CANTLEY: If the minister wants to clarify the item, I think he ought to preface it with the word "coal" and make it read, "Coal face loading machines."

Mr. ROBB: That is what we are correcting. We are broadening it out. Objection was made earlier in the afternoon that it was limited to coal only, and it should be made a little wider.

Mr. CANTLEY: The item does not refer to anything except machines for loading coal at the face under long wall operations.

Mr. ROBB: Then nobody else will use it.

Mr. TUMMON: I notice the Minister of National Revenue in his seat. Would he answer the question I asked this afternoon? It was in regard to the parts, whether this item would apply to parts for a machine that was already in the country and was perhaps now in use, or to new parts imported into the country to form with other parts a new machine?

Mr. EULER: I would not care to make a definite reply offhand, but my impression at the moment is that it would make no difference. Whatever the purpose for which the parts were imported, I think they would all be on the same basis. I am just giving that as an offhand opinion; I would not care to make any definite statement at the moment.

Mr. TUMMON: I am very glad to hear the minister make that statement. Let me explain why I asked the question. A branch factory of one of the largest mining machinery firms in the United States is located in Canada, and they have been adding to their output year after year many of the machines that the parent plant makes in the United States, building them here in their branch factory. Under this item as it is now amended they cannot build the complete machine in Canada as cheaply as they can import it from the parent plant in the United States, but they want to build all they can in the Canadian factory, and in order to compete they will have to import some of the parts of the machine, building the others in the branch factory here. I am very glad that the minister interprets this change so as to allow construction of some parts in Canada.

Amendment agreed to.

Item as amended agreed to.

Customs tariff—618a. Gaskets of rubber for use in the sealing of cans for food products: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 7½ per cent; general tariff, 10 per cent.

Mr. BENNETT: The word "permanent" was struck out.

Mr. ROBB: Yes. I now beg to move to strike out the word "cans" and insert instead the word "containers."

Amendment agreed to.

Item as amended agreed to.

Customs tariff—112. Cocoanut, desiccated, n.o.p. per pound: British preferential tariff, 5 cents; intermediate tariff, 6 cents; general tariff, 6 cents.

Customs tariff—113. Cocoanut, desiccated, unsweetened, per pound: British preferential tariff, 2 cents; intermediate tariff, 3 cents; general tariff, 3 cents.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will the minister now tell us where the request for these changes came from?

Mr. ROBB: I suppose we will consider the two items together. Under the present tariff, desiccated cocoanut, sweetened or not, enters under item 113 at 5, 6 and 6 cents, chiefly from the island of Ceylon. Application was made for reduction on the unsweetened, it being represented at the public sittings that, in the case of the unsweetened, the specific duty at present operative had an ad valorem effect of about 60 per cent. It is proposed by means of the two items, 112 and 113, to reduce the duty on unsweetened or less highly processed cocoanut, without changing in any way the sweetened. Imports of desiccated cocoanut, sweetened or unsweetened, in 1928, were valued at $193,000, of which $180,000 came from Ceylon. Application was made to the tariff board by Dodwell and Company of Vancouver, supported by the Consumers League. There was no opposition.

Mr. ADSHEAD: When these items first came up I made the statement to the Minister of Finance that these changes meant a clear gift to the Dodwell Company of $66,000 per annum. I asked the minister to let the item stand over for a while, and he kindly consented. I take issue with the minister on this item, on the ground that this is a type of case which occurs so often in connection with the tariff, whereby we are led to believe that the tariff is being reduced when it is actually being raised to the ordinary consumer. In support of my statement I have before me the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce. Let me say, first of all, that the agent for the Consumers' League was unaware that an application had been made for a reduction simply on the raw product. The rates under item 113 as it stood before on cocoanut, whether sweetened or unsweetened, were 5, 6 and 6 cents. That is reduced to 2, 3 and 3 cents. We had no idea that that did not apply to the whole of item 113. But when the question comes before us in committee of the whole house we find that the two items have been split, and that the sweetened as before retains the higher tariff, and the unsweetened retains the low tariff, giving to the only manufacturer of this commodity that I know of in Canada this super bonus of $66,000. At page 7 of the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year ending December 31, 1928, I find there were 2,210,041 pounds of cocoanut, desiccated, sweetened or not, imported into Canada at a value of $159,228. That works out to a price of 7¼ cents per pound. Now when the tariff is reduced to 2, 3 and 3 cents, the manufacturer is given a distinct advantage of 3 cents a pound, and as he is the only importer and the only manufacturer of this commodity in Canada, it means that he can take out of the pockets of the Canadian consumers a clear profit of $66,000. That figure is obtained by multiplying 2,210,041 pounds by 3 cents. That represents a clear gift of $66,000 to the manufacturer for importing the cocoanut, sprinkling a little sugar on it, and then calling it a manufactured article. If you look a little further into the matter, and transform the specific duty into an ad valorem duty, you will find that it works out to an ad valorem duty of 82 per cent. There is no article that I know of in the tariff which merits a duty of 82 per cent. It is simply absurd in the extreme. It will be seen by this that the ultimate consumer is entirely left out of consideration. We hear a great deal about the low tariff policy of our friends of the Liberal party, but surely the consumer should be given some consideration in the matter. Both sweetened and unsweetened were equal before; they should be equal now. It is discrimination and it is ridiculous for a party that calls itself a low tariff party. This 82 per cent gives one company a monopoly of the business. I have brought this up because it clearly shows what is coming to one manufacturer and what is coming to the other. In respect to a great many of the articles where the tariff is reduced, it is reduced only on the article which the manufacturer himself uses, and the corresponding reduction of duty to the consumer is not granted; he does not reap that advantage because the manufactured article itself is not reduced by the same amount. Let me take an instance where one manufacturer gets a 10 per cent reduction on his raw material. In such a case surely that reduction should be passed on the ultimate consumer. For example, if the tariff on the manufactured article was 35 per cent before the reduction, then the price to the ultimate consumer should be correspondingly reduced. I have taken this case because in every instance that I know of the manufacturer gets the advantage and the ultimate consumer does not. In this case the sole manufacturer

of the sweetened article, Dodwell and Company, is getting $66,000 out of the pockets of the ultimate consumers of Canada. I would ask the minister to cross out that item 112 and make the amount equal in both cases.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): When this matter was up before I pointed out that the minister was interfering perhaps in a way of which he was not aware, and I should like to bring the matter to his attention again to-night. I would say now that he is not acquainted with what this resolution means. It appears to-night as if the member who has just spoken considers the manufacturing end is the desiccated cocoanut.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Sweetened.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): No, I am going to point out another side. The minister has said that the cocoanut in the raw state is admitted free. There are certain companies in this country who take the raw cocoanut and shred it here, and by the proposed change you are taking the labour from the people of Canada and giving it to the cheap coloured labour in the southern islands; in a word you are putting the Canadian companies out of business. One is the Baker Company of Montreal. They are importing the cocoanut free and shredding it here. It is not a matter of sweetening the cocoanut; that is not the manufacturing condition. The shredding that the member has spoken about is done in the southern islands. It is the labour there that he is trying to protect. I am trying to protect the white labour in Canada against this proposed change. I repeat, the change now proposed by the minister will throw the shredding of the cocoanut back to the cheap coloured labour of the southern islands to the disadvantage of the white labour of Canada. When the member for East Calgary sees that point I hope he will change his attitude. The minister does not know what he is doing. I have a letter from the Baker people saying that they are thinking about closing up business because the preference on the shredded cocoanut is given to the cheap labour of the southern islands. The manufacturer, as I say, is shredding the raw cocoanut here. If this change goes through there will be no work for that class of labour in Canada. It is a small amount of labour, it is true, but it should be protected.

Mr. ADSHEAD: May I point out to my hon. friend that these two articles do not deal with raw cocoanut, but simply with desiccated and sweetened. The particular manufacturer I have mentioned has a considerable bonus of $66,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): And by the reduction you are simply throwing the labour back to the southern islands. It is not a case of sweetening, although it looks like it. Of course the cocoanut is sweetened afterwards, but that is not the crux of the case.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, it would appear now, after listening to my hon. friend from East Calgary and my hon. friend from Kingston, that the tariff board could not have been very far out in trying to strike the happy mean. There was a hearing, and the Consumers' League was represented.

Mr. BENNETT: That is part of the board.

Mr. ROBB: The memorandum that I have before me does not indicate that the Baker Company opposed the application.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Why not hear their side?

Mr. ROBB: The memorandum before me from the board does not say the Baker Company were opposed to the application. The Baker Company must know there is a Minister of Finance, but I have no recollection of their having written to me opposing the proposed change. After listening to both my friends I think I had better take the advice of the tariff board.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The Baker Company did not ask me to bring up the matter. It is merely by accident that I have come across this case. The minister must see now that there is a side to it in connection with the manufacture of the raw cocoanut which he did not see before, and I do not think the tariff board saw it either.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend from East Calgary also brings out a side that I had not noticed.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Can the minister give the revenue received from this source last year?

Mr. ROBB: My memorandum does not quite agree with the figures quoted. The total importations for 1928 were valued at $193,226. I imagine that is the value f.o.b. point of shipment. The loss in revenue will be about $39,657.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Even if we accept the somewhat questionable figures of the minister as compared with those prepared by the Department of Trade and Commerce—

Mr. ROBB: I beg your pardon?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I say if we accept the somewhat questionable figures of the minister.

Mr. ROBB: Why does my hon. friend say "the somewhat questionable figures"?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): For this reason. The Department of Trade and Commerce gave the importations last year as 2,210,000 pounds at 6 cents a pound.

Mr. ROBB: The importation was 2,643,865 pounds.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If the duty is 6 cents on that total importation the revenue produced must have been around $132,000.

Mr. ROBB: How does my hon. friend arrive at 6 cents? It came from Ceylon, which enjoys the British preference of 5 cents.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How much came from Ceylon?

Mr. ROBB: Under the British preference there came in 2,589,065 pounds and under the general tariff 54,800 pounds. In other words, $188,613 came under the British preference—that is the value at point of shipment—and $4,613 under the general.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Under the British preference it carried a duty of 5 cents; that is to say, 2,500,000 pounds came in at 5 cents.

Mr. ROBB: The exact figures are 2,589,-065.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And the balance came in at 6 cents.

Mr. ROBB: That is, 54,800 pounds.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In other words, over $100,000 of revenue is recorded for last year's importations—roughly, $110,-000, or perhaps a little more. Now, $110,000 of revenue is not to be sneezed at. The minister suggests that all of that will be retained except $36,000 or thereabouts. Suppose we accept the minister's figures.

Mr. ROBB: There will be 10 per cent off that if it comes in direct under the British preference.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Well, suppose we accept that figure, of a loss of revenue amounting to some $36,000.

Mr. ROBB: $39,657.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Very well. The hon. member for Kingston raises the point that this may mean a loss of employment to some Canadian labour, whereas an hon. member in this corner points out that no benefit will accrue to the consumer; but the country has lost some $39,000. So that the only one who does get any advantage under the proposed change is this solitary manufacturer of sweetened desiccated cocoanut—Dodwell & Company. I suggest that in view of the representations made the minister might even the matter up, so as to give the people of Canada an opportunity to get some advantage from it, by levelling the duty down; instead of discriminating between the sweetened and the unsweetened article, let him include both items under the reduced rates. If he does this he will be doing something worth while; but to leave the matter as it stands is to benefit no one except this particular company. It is no use for the minister to shake his head or to say that because there was no opposition on the part of the Consumers' League the item should therefore be carried. As a matter of fact I am informed that the Consumers' League was not aware that the reduction was to be granted on just one part of the original item; the league assumed that it would be granted to the whole item. It is now protesting, and I have had representatives of the Consumers' League in my room pointing out the discrimination in this particular item.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I wish to read for the benefit of the committee and of some of the Montreal members the following:

> So just now we are thinking of the probable necessity of having to close down this industry in Montreal. We find it almost impossible to compete with coloured labour which is used in the making of cocoanut in the southern islands as against our using white labour in Montreal, and, too, paying freight on whole cocoanuts, which is the raw product, as against the rate of freight on the finished product.

There is the situation. They are bringing in raw cocoanut and manufacturing it here, shredding and sweetening it, and now it is proposed to bring in manufactured cocoanut from the southern islands to compete against white labour in Montreal.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Does this cocoanut come in whole?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Yes.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): For this purpose?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): To these people.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): I did not understand so.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Well, I am telling you.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): I understand it is already desiccated when it comes in.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): That is just where the labour comes in. The cocoanut comes in whole and is broken and shredded here.

Mr. GOTT: The hon. member doesn't know his cocoanuts.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The first night this question was under discussion it looked as if the whole process of manufacture in this case consisted in the sweetening of the cocoanut, but that is not the case. The raw product is coming into Canada and is being shredded here.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): How many people do they employ in the shredding process?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I do not carry these figures around in my head; I am giving their statement. If the hon. member would like to go to Montreal with me we could find out. He is so much interested in the manufacturing end of the business in this country that I am willing to go with him. I have a little more interest in white labour in Montreal than in the cheaper labour down in some place I know nothing about.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): But you are not sufficiently interested to know how many men are engaged in the business.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I cannot give you the number of men engaged.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Will the minister deny that Dodwell & Company, by means of the preference, are going to get an advantage of $66,000 which they would not otherwise enjoy? That is one question I want to ask him, and a second is this: Will the minister put both the sweetened and the unsweetened product on the same basis?

Mr. ROBB: The records show that the loss of revenue will be $39,657, so that I cannot understand where the hon. gentleman gets that figure.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Out of 2,210,000 pounds imported.

Mr. ROBB: But they do not get the whole business.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Who?

Mr. ROBB: Dodwell & Company.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Who else does? They are the only persons that applied for this and I assume that they are doing the whole sweetening business. At any rate, if someone else does share in the business it makes no difference in the net result.

Mr. JACOBS: Does not the hon. gentleman see that as soon as they are placed in the advantageous position which it appears they will be in when the schedule goes through other people will come into competition with them and they will not retain the $66,000? It will induce competition in the business. With regard to the Montreal concern about which my hon. friend from Kingston is so solicitous, I understand that this is an American company with its head office in Boston. This is the first time I have known the hon. gentleman to be so anxious about the welfare of people in Boston.

Mr. STEVENS: But the company is employing Canadian labour.

Mr. JACOBS: How many does it employ?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Suppose it employs ten or twenty persons, what difference does that make? I hope more American branches will come over.

Mr. JACOBS: As a matter of fact, how much white labour is employed in Montreal in this business?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): As a member for Montreal you should know. You should be in your place fighting even for one little company.

Mr. JACOBS: I have to look after my own little cocoanut in Montreal.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I am not surprised that there are so many protectionists on the Liberal side. The hon. member argues that if the tariff were kept on there would be more competition, and that is one of the worst protectionist arguments I have ever heard.

Mr. JACOBS: I am not ashamed of my protectionist views.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I know now why Sir Wilfrid Laurier was defeated in 1911: there were so many men pretending to be free traders while they were protectionists, and who absolutely crucified Sir Wilfrid Laurier for his free trade principles.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I am glad that my hon. friend has at last found one outspoken protectionist on the Liberal side. For years he and his friends have been telling how the Liberal party is honeycombed with protectionists and now he has found one member

of the Liberal party who will justify himself and his friends in making that statement for a long time to come.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The rest of us have known that to be the fact all along.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): The hon. member for Mackenzie has been saying a lot of things he has known, and now I am glad he has made this statement in the house because he has been making statements throughout the country which he has not made in the house.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The hon. members from Saskatchewan had a good many things to say about the tariff which they have not said in this house.

Item agreed to.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I have one more word to say. There are a number of items in this tariff which give to the manufacturers distinct advantages which virtually means raising the prices of these articles to the consumer. I hope that when this parliament meets next session there will be a different attitude shown towards the tariff policy, just as there has been a different attitude shown toward the income tax policy. If there is not a change, as far as I am concerned I will have to vote against the government.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would like to know how my hon. friend from East Calgary expects the government to bring forward a low tariff policy while he supports them in their high tariff policy.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I do not suppose this is pertinent to the question, but I might say that I was all right when I voted against the government all the time last year, but because I see differently this year I am all wrong.

Item agreed to.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and concurred in.

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 212, to amend the Customs Tariff.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

WAYS AND MEANS

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Special War Revenue Act, chapter one hundred and seventy-nine of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, as amended by chapter fifty of the statutes of 1928, and to provide:—

1. That part III of the said act be amended by repealing the following sections and subsections: Paragraphs (b) and (c) of subsection one, and subsection two, of section thirteen; section fourteen; section fifteen; section seventeen; section eighteen; and section nineteen, thereby repealing the tax on the net premiums received by every company licensed or registered or otherwise authorized to transact in Canada or any province thereof, the business of insurance.

2. That part IV of the said act, which imposes a tax on cable and telegraphic messages, be repealed.

3. That part V of the said act, which imposes a tax on railway and other tickets, be repealed.

4. That part VII of the said act be amended by striking out section fifty-eight and substituting therefor the following:—

58. No person shall sell or transfer the stock or shares of any association, company or corporation, or any bond other than a bond of the Dominion of Canada or of any province of Canada by

(a) agreement for sale;

(b) entry on the books of the association, company or corporation;

(c) delivery of share certificates or share warrants or bond endorsed in blank or payable to bearer; or

(d) any other method whatsoever;

unless in respect of such sale or transfer there is affixed to or impressed upon the document evidencing the ownership of such stock or shares or bond, or a document showing the transfer or agreement for the transfer thereof, an adhesive stamp or a stamp impressed thereon by means of a die of the value of

(a) three cents for every one hundred dollars or fraction thereof of the par value of the bond sold or transferred;

(b) four cents for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over one hundred dollars per share;

(c) three cents for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over twenty dollars per share, but not more than hundred dollars per share;

(d) two cents for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over three dollars per share, but not more than twenty dollars per share;

(e) one cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price of three dollars or less per share.

5. That section eighty-six of the said act be amended by providing that the rate of the consumption or sales tax be reduced to two per cent.

6. That any enactment founded on paragraph one of this resolution shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of March, 1929.

7. That any enactment founded on paragraphs two, three and four of this resolution shall come into force on the first day of May, 1929.

8. That any enactment founded on paragraph five of this resolution shall be deemed to have come into force on the second day of March, 1929, and to have applied to all goods imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption on and after that day, and to have applied to goods previously imported for which no entry for consumption was made before that date.

Mr. ROBB: These reductions have been generally well received, with the exception of the proposed tax on the transfer of stock. It has been represented to us that the proposed tax on mining shares was somewhat drastic, so I desire to move an amendment, as follows:

That paragraph 4 be amended by striking out clause (e) and substituting therefor the following:

(e) one cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over one dollar per share, but not more than three dollars per share:

(f) one-fourth of one cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over fifty cents per share, but not more than one dollar per share;

(g) one-tenth of one cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price of fifty cents or less per share.

I think that will be fair.

Mr. CLARK: I think the minister is still imposing too high a tax upon the cheaper shares. The effect of an unreasonable tax upon the lower priced shares will be to hinder the legitimate development of the mining industry and deprive the general public of an opportunity of sharing in the mining development which is now taking place in this country. The result will be that a monopoly will be placed in the hands of the larger interests. The fact that mining has developed to such an extent in British Columbia is due largely to the faith of the men with small savings, and if too high a tax is put upon these shares it will hinder legitimate mining development. The minister says that he is reducing the tax. He has reduced it very materially, but I should like to give a practical illustration of the effect of the tax as he had it compared with his present proposal. The Consolidated Mining & Smelting Company in British Columbia recently took over 74 per cent of the stock of the Caledonia mines on Vancouver island. They purchased outright 339,600 shares at 20 cents per share, a total value of $67,920. Under the minister's first proposal the tax would have been $3,396, or 5 per cent of the total price. On a purchase and sale the tax would have amounted to 10 per cent, or $6,792. A private investor could have purchased over $11,000,000 worth of securities of a par value of $100 and would have had to pay only the same amount of tax. The minister now proposes that the tax on shares worth 20 cents will be one-tenth of a cent. It is true that the tax is being reduced, but in my opinion it is still too high. Taking the illustration I have given, the tax would amount to $340 on a total purchase price of only $67,000, or over $700 on a purchase and sale of stock. I submit that that is too high; it is out of all proportion to the tax paid by the investor purchasing stocks on the market. The legitimate mining development in British Columbia has been brought about by the smaller investors, the men with small savings guided by good engineers. In the case I have cited by way of illustration these men went out and prospected and they showed sufficient ore to interest the Consolidated Mining & Smelting Company. If the minister insists upon too high a tax upon the purchase and sale of these shares he will make them unmarketable and immediately kill the interest of the public in legitimate mining development. On shares sold or transferred at 50 cents the tax is to be one-quarter of one cent per share, or one-half cent per share on a purchase and sale. Let us consider the shares purchased by the Consolidated Mining & Smelting Company as being worth $1.01 per share. That would mean a purchase amounting to $342,996 worth of stock, and the minister proposes to put a tax of $3,396 upon that purchase. The same tax would permit of a purchase of over $11,000,000 worth of stock of a par value of $100, and I submit again that the proposed tax is out of all proportion and will discourage legitimate mining development in this country.

Mr. LAWSON: I had intended offering some remarks in connection with this proposed amendment to part VII of the Special War Revenue Act, and the proposed reduction in the tax suggested by the hon. Minister of Finance this evening does not in any way change my view of the principle of the taxation; it merely offers, as a sop, a reduction in the burden cast upon the lower priced shares. To my mind this is most inequitable taxation. On the basis of the original proposal one buying or selling the lower priced issues would be paying a varying percentage in tax to the government. On one-cent shares the tax would be 100 per cent; on two-cent shares it would be 50 per cent; on three-cent shares the tax would amount to 33⅓ per cent; on four-cent shares it would be 25 per cent, and so on down the list. I endeavoured to make a rapid calculation upon the proposed amendment, and as I figure it the purchaser will be paying 10 per cent tax on a one-cent share; 5 per cent tax on a two-cent share; 3.33 per cent tax on a three-cent share; 2.5 per cent tax on a four-cent share, and so on. In the case of the higher priced issues valued at $100, the percentage the purchaser will have to pay in the way of tax will amount to only 3/100 of one per cent. Let us consider for a moment the results of a tax of this nature, first, from the public standpoint, second, from the standpoint of the development of the

mines, and third from the point of view of other far-reaching effects. The average speculator in mining stocks must of necessity speculate in the lower priced issues; it is only those of means who can interest themselves in the high priced issues. As I pointed out a moment ago, if a man sells stock at $100 a share he would be paying to the government 3/100 of one per cent of the sale price by way of tax, but if he sells stock at $1 a share he would be paying 1 per cent. This, to my mind, is iniquitous. It will, in my opinion, have an adverse effect in connection with the financing of the mines. I am not unmindful of the fact that, under the act as it stands, the original issue of treasury shares is not taxable, nor will it be under the amendment; but we must bear in mind the basis on which new mining properties are developed and the development financed. In the first place, companies are incorporated in order to get money, and money can be raised only in one of two ways: either you must engage a corps of salesmen who call upon individuals to sell them shares of stock, a method which is exceedingly expensive and which lends itself to all the possibilities of misrepresentation and fraud, or you must offer that stock through some mining exchange where the divergence and width of the market make possible some fixed price. In order to offer that stock through an exchange, it is customary to have the issue underwritten by a broker or by some individual or corporation interested in the development of mining property. Obviously, for a new stock there is no demand which will produce funds to develop the property unless there is a market for the stock, and there will not be a demand unless the trading in that stock is active upon the market. Activity is obtained by brokers circularizing clients, by publishing the details of the property and its development to date in circulars, magazines, et cetera. The vast bulk of this class of stock consists of low priced issues; the moment you impose upon low priced issues a tax equal in percentage to the amounts indicated, you curtail trading in the market, and the moment you curtail trading in the market, you thereby prevent the company from obtaining the amount of funds which it would otherwise obtain for the development of those mines.

Let me cite a couple of concrete examples. Let us take Crown Reserve Consolidated, one of our mining issues, selling to-day at five cents. Under the original proposal there would be a tax of 20 per cent imposed on every sale. Under the new proposal there would be a tax imposed of two per cent. It is not possible for that company to re-finance its operations and continue development with a tax at that rate imposed upon all the sales of its stock.

Let me take a more striking illustration, a new property in the Red Lake district. Picard a year ago was selling at 70 cents a share. To-day it is selling at approximately 3 cents a share. This is caused by the company running out of funds, being unable to sell more stock and having a bailiff come in to execute a judgment. That company is supposed to have reasonable possibilities. It desires to re-finance. What opportunity has it of doing so when by this legislation you prevent an active market for those shares?

May I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that many of the higher priced dividend paying stocks to-day, were a short time ago selling for 10 or 15 cents a share? A most striking example is Teck Hughes, which as late as 1921 was selling at 16 cents a share and which, I see by to-night's quotation, is listed at $9.60 a share. I took the record of the Standard Stock and Mining Exchange, because it is, I think, the largest mining exchange in Canada. If hon. members will look at the record they will find that there is a trading on that exchange now in 156 issues, of which 112, in other words, approximately 74 per cent, are stocks selling at under $3 a share. I endeavoured to make a computation of the difference the proposed tax would make on the basis of one day's trading. I admit I shall now have to revise it to some extent by reason of the amendment proposed to-night by the Minister of Finance, but I selected the tax paid in one day by eleven out of fifty brokers trading on the Standard Stock and Mining Exchange. In one day broker No. 1 under the present basis of taxation would pay $190.29, and bear in mind that, in making that payment, he is merely the representative of the public who are investing in stocks. Under the new rate of taxation he would pay, on stocks under $3, $5,901.50, and on stocks over $3, $78.75, or a total of $5,980.25 as against the $190.29 being paid to-day. Let me give you the totals of the computation of the eleven. In one day, on one exchange, eleven out of fifty brokers, who in turn would be charging to the customer the tax payable, would pay $21,037.89 in tax instead of $809.57.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, May 8, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

IMPERIAL CABLE MERGER

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 213 to authorize consent to the sale of certain cable and wireless telegraph undertakings established under the Pacific Cable Acts, 1901 to 1924 (Imp.), and the West Indian Islands (Telegraph) Act, 1924 (Imp.).

Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Argenteuil): Perhaps the hon. minister will give us a short explanation?

Mr. VENIOT: This is a bill to enable us to accept the agreement that has been entered into between the different contracting parties and the merging company, if it is satisfactory to Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER: Such bills require the consent of the crown.

Mr. VENIOT: Consent has been obtained.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

WIRELESS STATIONS

Mr. KENNEDY:

1. What wireless stations has the Dominion government in operation in Northern Alberta, Yukon, and the North West Territories?
2. What department or departments of the government have charge of these stations?
3. What was the total cost of construction of each station?
4. What is the annual cost of operation of each station?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Aklavik, N.W.T.; Herschell Island, Y.T. (summer operation only); Dawson, Y.T.; Edmonton, Alta.; Mayo, Y.T.; Fort Simpson, N.W.T.; Fort Smith, N.W.T.; Fort Resolution, N.W.T., (summer operation only).

2. These stations are operated by the Department of National Defence for the Department of Interior.

3. Aklavik, N.W.T., $28,613; Herschell Island, Y.T., included in Aklavik; Dawson, Y.T., $19,049; Edmonton, Alta., $22,950; Mayo, Y.T., $20,246; Fort Simpson, N.W.T., $44,536; Fort Smith, N.W.T., $20,936; Fort Resolution, N.W.T., included in Fort Smith.

4. The annual cost of operation of each station for 1928-29, was:—Aklavik, N.W.T., $16,105; Herschell Island, Y.T., $1,400; Dawson, Y.T., $12,648; Edmonton, Alta., $13,065; Mayo, Y.T., $16,495; Fort Simpson, N.W.T., $18,338; Fort Smith, N.W.T., $18,255; Fort Resolution, N.W.T., $1,952.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION—SCHOONER "DOROTHY"

Mr. BRADY:

1. Who comprise the members of the International Fisheries Commission on the Pacific coast?
2. Is the Seattle halibut schooner Dorothy under charter to the commission?
3. For what service is said steamer commissioned?
4. How long has said vessel been engaged in this work?
5. What is the total cost up to date connected with the services of said boat?
6. What part of the total cost is paid by: (a) Canadian government; (b) United States government?
7. What is the total number of persons on the personnel of said boat?
8. How many are scientific men and what qualifications are required before appointment?
9. How many men are employed in other capacities?
10. How many Canadians are employed on the Dorothy, and in what capacity?
11. How many Americans are employed, and in what capacity?
12. What salaries are paid and to whom?
13. To whom does the scientific staff make reports?
14. How many of such reports have been received so far?
15. Are such reports available on request?

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Cardin):

1. Canadian members: W. A. Found and J. P. Babcock. United States members: Henry O'Malley and Miller Freeman.

2. Yes, for a few trips. She is now on the last trip for this year.

3. In connection with a study of the life history of the Pacific halibut.

4. During the following cruises:—1st cruise, October 27-November 23, 1927; 2nd cruise, November 23-December 20, 1927; 3rd cruise, January 3-February 9, 1928; 4th cruise, October 26-December 10, 1928; 5th cruise, January 10-February 25, 1929; 6th cruise, March 4, 1929.

5. $37,974.45.

6. One-half by each.

7. From fifteen to seventeen on the different cruises.

8. From two to four on the different cruises. Graduates from a Canadian or United States university in fisheries or zoology.

9. The scientific staff consists of seven in all, from two to four of whom work on the boat as required.

10. There are four Canadians, and three United States citizens on the staff. As the Dorothy was chartered with her crew, the nationalities of members of the crew are not known.

11. Answered by No. 10.

12. The salaries of the staff are: W. F. Thompson, director, American, $500 per month; H. A. Dunlop, asst. director, Canadian, $310 per month; F. H. Bell, scientific asst., Canadian $245 per month; R. V. Butt, scientific asst., American, $195 per month; N. L. Freeman, scientific asst., Canadian, $175 per month; John Kask, scientific asst., Canadian, $150 per month; W. C. Herrington, scientific asst., American, $230 per month.

Clerical staff: Marion Egerton part time clerk, Canadian $25 per month; Dorothy Myers, stenographer, American, $135 per month; Grace Shirk, librarian. American, $135 per month; Harold Lokken, part time clerk, American, $15 per month.

13. The director reports to the commission. The remainder to the director.

14. The director reports to the commission as a whole twice each year and as frequently as necessary to the chairman.

15. The first report by the commission has been published. Several memoirs by the scientific staff are in course of preparation and will be published from time to time as they are completed.

ST. JOHN RIVER BUOYS

Mr. JONES:

1. Were tenders called for in the year 1927 by the Department of Marine and Fisheries or by any other governmental department for the work of placing buoys in the St. John river from Milledgeville to Fredericton, and from the mouth of the Jemseg river to the head of Grand lake and up to Bellisle?

2. If so, who were the tenderers and what was the amount of each tender?

3. Was the lowest tender accepted? If not, why?

4. Who is at present performing this work and at what rate?

5. Have any complaints been received by the department in question against the services rendered by the present contractor in this connection?

6. If so, from whom, when, and what is the nature of the complaint?

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Cardin):

1. Tenders were invited for the maintenance of the buoy services at (a) Hatfield point, and (b) on St. John river, Jemseg, Grand lake and Bellisle river.

[Mr. Rinfret.]

2. (a) No tenders were received for the buoy service at Hatfield point.

(b) Two tenders were received for the buoy service on St. John River, Jemseg, Grand lake and Belleisle river, namely, from Chas. H. Gorham for the sum of $360 per annum and from William J. McNamara for the sum of $500 per annum.

3. The contract for the buoy service on St. John river, Jemseg, Grand lake and Belleisle river was awarded to William J. McNamara for the sum of $360 per annum.

4. (a) Benjamin F. McCutcheon is at present maintaining the buoy service at Hatfield point for the sum of $30 per annum.

(b) William J. McNamara is at present maintaining the buoy service on St. John river, Jemseg, Grand lake and Belleisle river for the sum of $360 per annum.

5. No.

6. See answer to number 5.

CADET TRAINING—ALBERTA

Mr. ADSHEAD:

1. Has the provincial government of Alberta asked for the appropriation for cadet training for the year 1929?

2. What date was such request made?

3. By whom was it signed?

4. What cities in Alberta had cadet training in 1928?

5. How many scholars in Alberta were under cadet training for 1928?

6. What amount of money was paid to the Alberta government for cadet training for the year 1928?

Mr. RALSTON:

1, 2, 3 and 6. No payments for cadet training are made to provincial governments as such. The department pays an allowance to the instructor and another allowance to cover cost of uniforms. These amounts are usually paid to the authorities in charge of each cadet unit.

4. Calgary, Edmonton, Lethbridge and Red Deer.

5. 5,974 cadets were enrolled and trained in Alberta during 1928.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is oleomargarine permitted to be sold as an article of food in Canada at present?

2. Has oleomargarine ever been permitted to be sold for food in Canada, and, if so, when and for how long?

3. If it has been on sale in Canada at any time: (a) how much was imported into this

country each year it was on sale; (b) how much was manufactured in this country each year it was on sale?

4. How did prices for oleomargarine compare with prices for butter each year when it was on sale in Canada?

5. What products enter into the manufacture of oleomargarine?

6. Are these products commonly produced by our Canadian farmers, and, if not, from what countries do they commonly come?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. No.

2. Yes. The manufacture, importation and sale of olemargarine became legal December 1, 1917; the manufacture and importation was prohibited after August 31, 1923, and the sale was prohibited after February 29, 1924.

3. (a)

Importations

Dec. 1, 1917 to March 31, 1919..	6,480,430	lbs.
Year ended March 31, 1920.. ..	6,497,031	"
Year ended March 31, 1921.. ..	4,630,747	"
Year ended March 31, 1922.. ..	1,339,748	"
Year ended March 31, 1923.. ..	1,165,440	"
6 months ended September, 1923.	745,015	"
Total..	20,858,411	"

Manufactured

(b)

Dec. 1, 1917 to March 31, 1919..	10,483,179	lbs.
Year ended March 31, 1920.. ..	8,450,002	"
Year ended March 31, 1921.. ..	6,224,422	"
Year ended March 31, 1922.. ..	1,902,629	"
Year ended March 31, 1923.. ..	2,122,029	"
5 months ended August, 1923.	1,880,678	"
Total..	31,063,839	"

4. Records of prices on oleomargarine during the whole time it was sold in Canada are not available. Average prices in Ottawa stores, May 9, 1921, to May 19, 1921, were: butter, 40·14 cents; oleomargarine, 33·13. The average price of twenty brands of butter in retail stores, May 12, 1922, was 45·85 cents, and the average price of twelve brands of oleomargarine was 28·41 cents. On May 26, 1923, the average retail price of butter in Ottawa stores was 41·61, the average retail price of animal oleomargarine 28·75 and the average retail price of vegetable oleomargarine 31 cents.

5. Two kinds of oleomargarine were sold in Canada, namely, that containing animal fats, and that which was purely vegetable. The so-called animal oleomargarine was composed of oleo oil, neutral lard, might or might not contain vegetable fat and was churned in milk, salt was added. If vegetable fat in the so-called oleomargarine was used, such fat would likely be cotton seed oil. Vegetable oleomargarine consisted principally of cocoanut fat churned in milk with salt added.

6. Oleo oil and neutral lard are products of Canadian packing houses. The vegetable fat or oil is not produced in Canada. These come principally from the United States.

MARGARETSVILLE BREAKWATER

Mr. SHORT:

1. What amount was expended on repairs to the breakwater at Margaretsville, Nova Scotia, in 1928?

2. Who was the foreman in charge of the work and how much was paid to him for services?

3. What were the names of those engaged in the work, and what amount was paid to each workman?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. $799.94.

2. (a) Frank Atchison; (b) $77.

3. Gordon Aldred, $45.75; Charlie Roach, $52; Denley Porter, $49.50; William Nixon, $54.50; John Dwiney, $55; Winslow Patterson, $31.50; Whitfield Wilkins, $1; Thomas McLean, $55; Roland Atchison, $53.75; George Banks, $36.75.

GLACE BAY CUSTOMS STAFF

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South):

1. What is the present staff of Glace Bay customs house?

2. What is the salary paid to each?

3. What are the dates of their respective appointments?

4. Is there any vacancy in the said office now?

Mr. EULER:

1, 2 and 3. Sub-collector of customs and excise, grade 1 outport, salary $1,740, employed 15th January, 1923.

4. Yes, but Glace Bay was reduced from a port to an outport and a decision has not been reached whether the permanent appointment of a second officer is necessary.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

PRIVATE GEORGE GREGORY

Mr. GARDINER:

For a return showing:

1. The total amount of money paid to or on behalf of Private George Gregory, No. 160599, since his discharge from the overseas expeditionary forces at Calgary, Alberta, on June 4, 1928.

2. The amount of money paid directly to Gregory and for what purpose, namely, pension, etc.

3. The amount of money paid on behalf of Gregory and for what purpose, namely, hospitalization, etc.

PORT GEORGE, N.S., POSTMISTRESS

Mr. SHORT:

For a copy of all correspondence in connection with the dismissal of Vera Slocumb from the position of postmistress at Port George, Annapolis county, Nova Scotia, and for a copy of similar correspondence in connection with the filling of the position of her successor.

WHEAT CONGESTION AT TERMINALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. N. CAMPBELL (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) if he can give the house some information regarding the congestion of wheat shipments at Port Colborne and Montreal. I realize that he may not have the information on hand, and if not, I would suggest that he have it ready on Friday next.

Hon. JAMES MALCOLM (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I do not know that there is any information I can give to the house with which hon. members are not conversant. There is a heavy movement of grain from the head of the lakes to the seaboard, and it is said that there is just the same quantity of grain in storage in the country as in former years. The crop is heavier by probably 75,000,000 bushels and undoubtedly there is at the moment an excess of grain at the seaboard. It is said further with respect to congestion at Port Colborne, —this matter was referred to recently by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning)—that it is due partly to the fact that the large carriers were filling elevators faster than the canal sized boats could get the grain to Montreal. There is a good deal of Argentine grain on the European market and orders are not plentiful. The marketing of Canada's crop is in the hands of those who own it. There is no further information I can give to explain the congestion apart from the fact that there is not at the moment a sufficient market for the grain we have at the seaboard.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REPORTED ERECTION OF GRAIN ELEVATOR AT PORT HURON

On the orders of the day:

Mr. B. W. FANSHER (East Lambton): I wish to direct to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) a question based on a despatch appearing in The London Free Press headed thus:

C.N.R. completes plans for building big grain elevator at Port Huron. Sir Henry Thornton makes announcement at dinner given in his honour in the Michigan city.

Is it correct that the Canadian National proposes to build elevator facilities in the city of Port Huron and, if so, why was that place chosen in preference to Sarnia on the Canadian side?

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): I am sorry I cannot answer the question offhand. I shall make inquiry regarding the matter.

WAYS AND MEANS

FREEDOM OF SPEECH, LIBERTY OF THE PRESS, RIGHT OF ASSEMBLY

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring before the house a matter that affects a considerable section of the citizens of this country: that is, what seems to be a more or less concerted effort to abrogate certain British rights and to suppress, at least so far as certain sections of the community are concerned, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of assembly. A little time ago we had the arrest of Arvo Vaara, the editor of a Finnish newspaper, Vapaus. Then came the cancellation of certain licenses to communist halls in Toronto at the instance, I believe, of the police of that city; then next the forbidding by the Toronto police of the use of any language other than English in certain halls, under penalty of such halls having their licenses cancelled. The next step was the breaking up of street meetings in Toronto, in connection with which six men were arrested on the charge of being disorderly as a result of having failed to move on at the request of the police officers. And now there is pending an application for the deportation of two of these men—a rather serious matter which will have to be dealt with by the Department of Immigration. The other day a petition was presented to the house by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Lapierre)—this was on April 25—for the suppression of the Finnish paper Vapaus, "for what appears to the petitioners good and sufficient grounds"—that was all. Then more recently according to the press, steps were taken in various cities to prevent Mayday celebrations.

I could not but contrast this series of repressive measures with the accounts we had the other day concerning the Mayday celebrations in London, England. The communists there went on parade and were offered facilities in that parade by the metropolitan police; when they held their meeting they were guarded by the police lest in any way the meeting should be interfered with. Lord Byng himself was observed in the crowd. Every effort was made to see that the fullest rights of freedom of speech were protected. There seems to be a danger in this country of our allowing other methods to prevail.

Now I am aware that it is not popular to plead the cause of the communists, and to allay any misapprehensions I may as well state at the beginning that I do not belong to the communist party. I wish to say, however, that there is an altogether unreasoning prejudice with regard to anything bearing the name of communism. For instance, in a recent issue of a paper published in my own city, the Evening Tribune, of May 4th, the following appears in one column:

It is expected that M. Lunacharsky whose photo appears above, will be appointed as the first minister from Soviet Russia to the Vatican at Rome, Italy. A mutual agreement has been reached between these states in a treaty by which the Vatican recognizes the Soviet government and the Soviet agrees to the free function of the Roman Catholic religion in Russia.

That is published on the front page, and in another column on the same page of the same issue I find another article headed:

Soviet to bar Russian Easter celebrations. Anti-God societies urged to prevent citizens from attending churches. Suppression as far as possible of the celebration of Russian Easter which falls to-morrow, has been determined on by the Soviets. Anti-God societies have been urged to intensify their efforts to prevent people attending churches and to induce them to give up their religious beliefs.

Then further:

Iszvetia, the official government organ, publishes a new law for the control of all religious organizations and this provides that religious bodies must register, but must confine activities to special buildings and cannot form cultural, educational or medical aid societies. The restrictions are so general as practically to place religious organizations at the mercy of local Soviets who are given unlimited opportunities of closing or confiscating church buildings.

Quite obviously those two articles are incompatible; yet that is the sort of thing we meet with constantly, when anything is mentioned concerning Russia or the communists in any part of the world.

It is quite true that Trotsky, one of the great Russian leaders, was exiled, and that probably logically debars the communists in this country from protesting against any curtailment of speech here. But it does not debar me from protesting against curtailment of speech, for I believe that freedom of speech has always been the proud boast of Great Britain. It is true that there are a number of foreign born among the communists, but I would urge that this is all the more reason why we should very jealously safeguard the rights of these foreign born. They are almost without political voice. This again emphasizes the need for showing them the utmost fairness in Canada.

It is quite possible it may not be very good politics for me to introduce this matter. In my own city of Winnipeg the communist party is one of the political rivals of the Independent Labour party, and the members of the communist party have constituted themselves our most bitter critics. But if I were not pleading for the communists I should be pleading for ourselves, that we maintain the British traditions, or what we have always been told were the British traditions, of freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of assembly. Moreover, I ask the house to remember that when a lawyer undertakes to defend a man charged with murder he does not lay himself open to the charge of defending the crime of murder—much less to that of advocating murder; so, if I undertake to present certain phases of this question to-day, I hope hon. members will refrain from sugesting that I am advocating all the things which may have been advocated by some of the people for whom I speak. I know we have had some difficulty in that regard in the past.

I fancy that the attitude of a number of citizens of Toronto, although I hope this number is not very great, may be illustrated by a recent editorial which appeared in the Toronto Globe of April 27 under the heading "Communism Must Go." The editorial stated:

The thin edge of the communist wedge has entered the life of the mining districts.

And again:

There is presented the odd anomaly of a strange people in a new land filled with opportunity preferring to cherish the bitternesses of the older country from which they come. These deluded immigrants, apparently chiefly Finnish, cannot see that, by feeding their minds on the disastrous teachings of embittered demagogues, they are standing in their own light and erecting a barrier between themselves and the rest of the community. Here they found a young country needing citizens ready to aid in its development. They also came among a people eager to give them welcome and anxious for their assistance in creating a new and virile

community actuated by Christian ideals, honouring the king and obedient to the laws of this Dominion. But they will not assimilate. In all contacts with their fellows there arises the clash of the old, bitter spirit with the expansive optimism of a generous-minded and progressive people.

The Globe goes on to call attention to the fact that in the face of a common danger, all the residents of one of these northern towns, irrespective of denominational divisions, have united in protest against what it terms this great menace of communism.

I think the attitude of labour might be represented in a paragraph from an editorial appearing in the Canadian Railway Employees' Monthly for March:

Arvo Vaara, editor-in-chief of the Finnish newspaper, Vapaus, published in Sudbury, Ontario, has recently been found guilty of seditious libel, and sentenced to imprisonment for six months and a fine of $1,000. In default of payment, he will have to serve a further two years in jail.

And again:

He is a spokesman for the down-trodden and the exploited, particularly among the miners of northern Ontario. He is close to the workers, and knows how ruthlessly they are treated by the mining corporations, some of which have made more millionaires in Canada in the past year than during any previous ten years of our history. When he maintains that the death of King George would not affect the lot of the worker, he is expressing an obvious fact. When he says that capitalism is the real ruler, he is expressing an opinion which is very commonly held. Some people may think it is treason to express it, but the law does not yet make it a crime. Vaara's real offence was, apparently, that he allowed himself to be so stirred by the appalling conditions among the workers that he was guilty of a breach of etiquette with respect to royalty.

With regard to the Vapaus article itself, I have no desire to take the time of the house by reading it in full, but after speaking in a disrespectful way of the king, the article proceeds with the following paragraphs which seem to have been considered especially objectionable:

Will the king die, does not matter to us. The social order will be equally oppressive to the poor, whoever is king. Large capital is that which determines life's social conditions, and thus kingship has no other significance than to act as a certain kind of ornament while nabobs riot in splendour on wealth amassed from the blood and sweat of the workers. Of the king's condition the whole world is informed through telegrams. But is any thing wired of the condition of the millions who right now live in utter misery in the very heart of the British Empire, England? No, they are not telegraphed about. Efforts are made to conceal well such matters. They not being in accord with the fomenting of patriotic enthusiasm.

So, will the king die. If he does, we hope royalty dies at the same time, and its place be taken by a workers' republic. A change of kings will not better our conditions, no matter who holds the sceptre.

The rise in power of the workers themselves only will save us from the curse of the capitalistic system.

I notice that the evidence in the case showed that various organizations had to do with the publication of this paper, and it was not at all clear that the editor himself was definitely responsible for writing this article. However, this is what the judge said:

But is there any evidence here that any person other than the prisoner wrote, or published, this article?

So it was rather a negative sort of evidence in that respect. I think it is decidedly to the credit of the judge that he makes the statement:

It does not constitute a crime to speak in a slighting manner of the Prince of Wales, however reprehensible it may be.

In his charge the judge made two main points. The first was:

You are to say whether this article was intended to bring into hatred or contempt the person of His Majesty, or of the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to carry yourself, if you will, away to that northern country and remember the very hard conditions under which many of these miners live, with none of the comforts of civilization as we know them. They have come from a hard life in the old country to a hard life in this country, and I am not at all sure that they have been received with open arms as the Globe suggests or that they have been given the opportunities they should have been afforded. In order to let the house understand a little of the background which perhaps accounts for the bitterness of this article I would go back to the report of the royal commission on the Hollinger mine disaster, which occurred some time ago. In this connection I should like to read a few brief extracts from the report of the commissioner, who investigated the disaster which resulted in the death by suffocation of some thirty-nine miners:

The fire started in stope 55-A, east of crosscut 12, on the 550-foot level of the Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, Limited.

Again:

The material in the stope was dry refuse from the thaw house.

Again:

There was an omission on the part of the general manager in not inquiring or knowing how and where such inflammable matter was being placed.

The assistant general manager was remiss in not personally satisfying himself that thaw house refuse was being disposed of through the central waste pass, or by other proper method diluted or mixed with waste rock and other material as he had been informed was the practice of the company with respect thereto.

And again:

The general manager and the assistant general manager cannot dissociate themselves from responsibility for their own organization; and, in my opinion, the responsibility of a general manager and assistant general manager is not limited in extent or time, where it concerns the safety or protection of the workmen or others under them.

Then we come to the commissioner's findings from which I desire to quote a few more paragraphs:

That the scales of justice should be evenly balanced, it was necessary that I should weigh the evidence unaffected by the glare of the fire. I have, therefore, dissociated my mind from the demonstrated fact that thaw house refuse was highly inflammable and required the utmost care in its disposal.

Later:

Those who guided the activities of the mine and those who gave their services, one and all testified to a belief in a state of physical security.

And again:

--and if the suppositions which I advance are tenable, the omission can be said to be a neglect of a condition that became obscured; lost track of in the concentrated effort for increased production which the directors, as a body of businessmen, properly sought if the mine lent itself to it, and which the shareholders would have a right to expect.

And again:

There was a dependence by the management upon officials under them, and these officials upon the workmen, but no one saw to it that the chain of continuity of action was complete...

The dependents of those who lost their lives may have the assured consolation that all that human ingenuity or resourcefulness could do was done, that no human agency could have saved a life that was lost and that those whose hour had come passed on their way to other and higher activities without a struggle, quietly, calmly and unconsciously stepping across the great divide.

And again:

"Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth," James 111:5. Out of a chaos of facts a simple lesson emerges: It need not have been; a sad refrain, but how true and beyond cavil or contradiction.

Let the curtain drop on what has been and rise on what is to be, thereby allowing confidence and morale to restore itself, is my parting word.

(Sgd) T. E. Godson,
Commissioner.

Toronto, May 17, 1928.

This is a most anomalous report. Some thirty-nine of these men were lost in the fire and someone must be to blame. A commissioner was appointed to fix the blame but he reports that it is hard to decide, that the management and the men had forgotten to take care, but that it should be a consolation to those who have lost their friends to know that they passed out in a hurry and dying did not hurt them very much. If some of us had been in the position of the miners and had lost some of our friends by a preventable accident and then had a commissioner come along and make such an amazing report I wonder how we would feel? Communism is fostered in this country by such intolerable conditions!

A second point made by the judge in his charge to the jury was as follows:

If you come to the conclusion after reading the article that it is calculated or intended to excite ill-will between the different classes of the king's subjects, that is, between the workers referred to in the article, and the capitalist class, or the other classes of the country, then that might be deemed to be seditious.

I submit that that simply means that if the workers were to go out to present their case and inferentially denounced the employers or those at the head of the capitalist system, they could be charged with and convicted of sedition.

I hold in my hand a publication entitled The Thunderer. This paper may have come to some of the other members of the house as it came to me, through His Majesty's mail delivered through the post office here in the parliament building. This issue is dated Toronto, April 6, and contains the following:

We say, we repeat it, that any Canadian who places his head beneath the foot of a wop, who calls himself Pope Pius XI, forfeits all claim to rationality; he is an apostate from the order of manhood, and contemptibly crawls through the world like a worm.

And then again:

Rome's petticoated boys and their dupes slandered the editor of The Thunderer—they stabbed "Pat" Sullivan in the back; they started the fight, and now they cringe like whipped curs before "Pat's" lash.

The Thunderer is here to stay, and Rome's Black-Militia and their followers can no more obstruct this snappy bi-monthly than Cardinal "Pea Soup" can dam the St. Lawrence with a bottle of "holy" water.

On page 2 of this issue the following appears:

A Fiend

He is a priest who ravished a defenceless fifteen-year-old orphan, who had just arrived from Ireland. He committed the crime in his parochial school hall, where he was in the habit of offering the holy sacrifice of the mass for the children of the parish. He kept her

in his power through fear. Finally he forced her into public prostitution, and he often visits her for immoral purposes in her abode of shame.

He has an honourable place in the published list of the Catholic clergy of his archdiocese. She is numbered among the inmates of a brothel. He is beloved as a "Reverend Father in God." She is loathed as a common harlot—Father Crowley, Romanism A Menace to the Nation, p. 420.

And then on page 4:

Tyrant and Slave

The Roman Catholic Church is the hereditary enemy of democracy. For no one can be a loyal Roman Catholic without renouncing his mental and moral freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of a petticoated priest. The priests claim to be sacred persons, a caste apart from their fellows. Unless a man accepts them and their dogmas, they tell him he is damned. This is church teaching for Roman Catholics. If a Canadian places his head beneath a priest's foot, he is no more a free and enlightened citizen than a dark-skinned worshipper kneeling before a highly-decorated medicine man on the outskirts of an African jungle. The silk hat and dog-collar of the Roman priest makes no real difference between the mental attitudes of the priest and the worshipper. The one is a tyrant and the other a slave.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Who is the editor of that paper?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is The Thunderer, an independent bi-monthly, issued by the The Thunderer Publishing Company, 191 John street, P. Sullivan, editor.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: What city?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is published in Toronto. The charge on which Vaara was convicted was that of inciting ill-will between different classes of the king's subjects, and he is in gaol to-day; yet papers like The Thunderer circulate freely throughout the country and come to us through the mails. I submit that that is not British fair play. Why should the poor, defenceless working man, who has not perhaps a full knowledge of the king's English and who in this case must use his own language in order to reach his own people have his paper censored and given publicity? We translate the offending article and scatter it all over the world. Then we send the editor to gaol. Is that the way to encourage the highest type of Canadian citizenship in this country? I think that matter can be allowed to stand without further discussion, as I cannot go into it in detail in the brief time at my disposal.

The Toronto police, under threat of the cancellation of the licenses of the halls, have forbidden the use of any language other than English in the halls where working class meetings are held. I can understand that the police may be granted certain authority to see that the halls are properly protected, that they are sanitary, that they have proper fire escapes and that kind of thing.

Mr. GEARY: Is it any language other than English?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Perhaps the hon. member can tell us what it is?

Mr. GEARY: French may be spoken. There is no question about that.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. GEARY: Under that order it may be used in meetings.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am glad to hear that. But the languages of other races that have rights in this country are not allowed to be used in meetings. There have been published complaints with regard to the use of Yiddish. I have had complaints from Toronto friends with regard to the use of, I think, Bulgarian or Macedonian in national clubs, which have been organized under more or less religious auspices. These languages are being barred, so I am informed—and I think from credible sources—in the city of Toronto. I would say that the police of Toronto, if they are doing this, are exceeding their authority. Their action is impinging upon the fundamental rights of British citizens.

Mr. JACOBS: Why does the hon. member not make his complaint to the municipal authorities of Toronto instead of to the Dominion parliament?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The complaint has been made—

Mr. GEARY: Where?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: —but I will show more fully, later on that I am making my complaint here because this is a place where I have a seat and the federal parliament has certain responsibilities in the matter.

Further than that, street meetings have been broken up. The judge in the trial of at least one of the men was Judge Coatsworth. He presided on April 25, 1929, at the trial of one Harvey Murphy. I was interested in noting that Judge Coatsworth's name occurs on some literature which has been sent to me. The leaflet before me is entitled " The Canadian Christian Crusade." Among the members of the advisory board is His Honour Judge Coatsworth of Toronto, and I presume

it is the same gentleman. The reasons for the existence of this organization are given as follows:

The C.C.C. was organized as a result of the grave concern aroused in the minds of God's people over the ever-increasing menace of communism, bolshevism, and atheism.

Aim of the C.C.C.

(1) To secure provision to address companies of younger and older people on the subject of the 4-A propaganda, and thereby counteract its attack against the Word of God.

(2) To issue a "C.C.C. leaflet" periodically, giving startling facts relating to atheistic activities, and their menace to the life of the Christian community.

(3) To secure a representative in every Christian assembly who will receive such leaflets for distribution that prayer may go up in a mighty volume against this evil.

Inquiries are solicited, and should be addressed to:—

Secretary, Canadian Christian Crusade,
Room 301, 366 Bay street,
Toronto, 2.

On the third page of this leaflet appear the following statements:

The A.A.A.A.—

An hon. MEMBER: What is that?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have no idea.

—have issued a leaflet with various quotations from the Bible, which they ridicule and attempt to utterly disprove.

I am indebted to Mrs. Bertha Carr-Harris for permission to quote from her book "The Five A's versus The Four A's in this connection, and propose to take some of their statements, and answer them from scripture verification.

Atheism: "Heaven is a solid roof supporting reservoirs of water."

Reply: "The Hebrew word for 'firmament' is 'raquea', and has no such meaning. It indicates an expanse"

Atheism: "Four-footed fowls!"

Reply "'All winged creeping things that go upon all fours are an abomination unto you.' Such things as flying frogs, flying lizards, still found in Asia, were prohibited as articles of diet."

Atheism: "Rainbow given as a pledge. . . ; The rainbow is as old as rain and sunshine."

Reply: "It is not said that it came into existence at this time, but it was then pointed out as a sign."

Atheism: "If Methusaleh lived 869 years, he survived the flood. He was not in the ark. Where was he?"

Reply: "He was dead. That's where he was. He was 187 years old when Lamech was born. Lamech was 182 when Noah was born. Noah was 500 years old when Shem was born (see Genesis 5: 25 to 32) and Noah was 600 years old when the flood of waters was upon the earth (7:6). Therefore—187 plus 182 plus 500 plus 100 equals 969. 'And all the days of Methuselah were 969, and he died' (5:27)."

(More of these answers will be given each time The Leaflet is issued until some of the absurdities of denial are cleared up.)

Pray Pray Pray and Give Thanks.

I said that on that document is to be found the name of Judge Coatsworth, and he is one of the men who decided whether or not these men were guilty of holding street meetings and of being disorderly. That shows very clearly a prejudiced mind.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. A judge may not be attacked in the House of Commons except by way of impeachment.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand that Judge Coatsworth has resigned and so I suppose he may be attacked now.

Mr. GEARY: The proper course is indicated in Beauchesne at page 101:

The proper course for persons who feel called upon to attack the conduct of a judge is to proceed by way of a petition in which all the allegations are specifically stated so that the person accused may have full opportunity to answer the charges presented against him.

If my hon. friend wishes to attack a judge who, if I may say so, happens to be a very learned and exemplary person, let him do so in a proper manner.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not intend further to attack the judge. I want simply to call attention to the general situation which exists. A little while ago I pointed out the hard conditions under which many of these Finnish people had to live and work. I think I was not going too far afield when I called the attention of the house to the religious and intellectual background of the judge who presided at the trial of this case. Someone asked me a little while ago why I brought this matter before the house. I said that it was because this was the place where I had a seat. I feel this is an important enough question to bring before parliament and the country at large. I would ask several things of the government; I am not insisting upon a decision to-day, but I would urge that the government consider these matters. First, I would ask that they carefully consider the question of leniency in the case of Vaara and the six men who have been imprisoned because of the attempt to hold a street meeting. I know it is not usual to grant leniency in the case of short sentences, but this is a very exceptional type of case. Second, I would urge that with respect to these men whose cases are now before the Immigration department, deportation should not be ordered on political grounds. These men were attempting to hold a street meeting. Possibly they broke the ordinances of the city. They were sent down for a month. Further than that they were charged

with being disorderly because they in some way resisted the police. Possibly they are guilty on that charge. I submit that this is not a sufficient ground for deportation, that behind the charges against them lay the fact that they were members of the communist party and attempting to carry on communist propaganda. I would hope that in this country we would not follow the lead of the American republic, which has deported people for political reasons. It is a long time since Great Britain did any such thing.

I would even go so far as to suggest that certain representations might be made to the provincial authorities and to the police of the city of Toronto that they were coming at least rather near to exceeding their authority in prohibiting meetings at which languages other than English or French were being used. If I remember aright, there are clauses in the treaty of Peace which commit the signatories to respect the language rights of nationals, and I take it that we have certain responsibilities in Canada under that treaty of protecting the language rights of the various peoples who are living in this country. Whether or not, however, we undertake to keep our faith with the others who signed the treaty, I would say that from the standpoint of expediency it is highly desirable that when we invite people to come to us from other lands these immigrants shall be assured that they will have in Canada the full use of their own language.

Mr. EDWARDS (Waterloo): If they obey the laws of the country.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: My hon. friend from South Waterloo suggests, if they obey the laws of the country. We have certain laws on the statute books under which these men may be charged and tried if they are not obeying the laws of the country, but it is absolutely absurd, that the police, simply for their own convenience, should say: You must not use a language that we cannot understand.

Further, I would suggest to the government that the government put on the statute books even at this session—and only the government can do it at this session—any legislation that is necessary in order to protect what most of us have been taught were the fundamental rights of British people.

May I in closing venture to quote a paragraph or two from an editorial on personal liberty in the Round Table of March, 1929:

> The second foundation of the British commonwealth is the liberty of the individual. This immortal idea, the most precious and important of all social rights, legally established in England by the long struggle which lasted from Magna Charta in 1215 to the Bill of Rights in 1688, and protected by countless enactments and judicial decisions, is the basis of law everywhere in the British commonwealth. This is not always perfectly realized. Liberty may be denied to individuals by fraud or corruption or ignorance here and there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman's time is up.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that under standing order 37 I have the privilege of speaking even beyond forty minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing order 37 reads:

> No member, except the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition, or a minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister, or a member making a motion of "no confidence" in the government and a minister replying thereto, shall speak for more than forty minutes at a time in any debate.

In the present instance there is no motion of "no confidence", but the hon. gentleman may continue while I consider the matter further.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall not trespass upon the time of the house, except to finish this quotation:

> It may for short periods be temporarily suspended in cases of civil emergency or foreign war. But nowhere in the British Empire can it be constitutionally destroyed, nor has it ever, even in times of emergency, been long suspended.
>
> What this means may be realized by considering the consequence in other countries of extravagant idealisms, communistic, nationalist, racial or religious, which have recently triumphed at the expense of the older and far more important ideal of personal liberty. In Russia, in Italy, in many other countries of Europe, and in most parts of Asia outside the British commonwealth, the liberty of the individual is at the mercy of the caprice of government, whether constitutional or revolutionary. The right of assembly, the freedom of the press, the right of asylum, the integrity of the courts, the immunity of the individual from unlawful arrest, even the right of private judgment, are all habitually denied. The people may enjoy national independence; they may be able to try various experiments such as socialism, or some new but arbitrary form of law and order after a period of chaos; but they have not the most precious of all rights, security that the law and the courts will secure to them as individuals the advantages of liberty and justice, whatever government may be in power.

I plead, Mr. Speaker, that we in this country should follow the lead not of Europe or even of the great republic to the south, but rather that of the motherland, and in all these cases absolutely and rigidly insist upon the fullest measure of freedom.

Mr. SPEAKER: In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I maintain my first ruling that the hon. gentleman should not have been allowed to speak for more than forty minutes, although by the courtesy of the house he was given that privilege. Standing order 37 says:

> No member, except the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, or a minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister—

The hon. gentleman was not properly speaking in reply to the motion made by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) that the Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of ways and means. It was on that motion that the hon. gentleman rose for the privilege of expressing certain grievances before the house should go into committee of ways and means, but he is not entitled to speak for more than forty minutes.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Argenteuil): May I suggest that Your Honour consider the matter a little further? I am not quite sure in my own mind what the committee originally intended by this rule, but the question now raised is a very serious one, and I think it ought to be carefully considered by Your Honour, if you will do so, and perhaps give a judgment later. This motion is certainly a government order; there is no question about that. The Minister of Finance moves a government order, and the first member who speaks in reply is entitled under this rule to speak for more than forty minutes. Again, if a member makes a motion of "no confidence" in amendment to the motion for supply, that case is also specially provided for in rule 37.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is a motion, but there is no motion of "no confidence."

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Apart from that, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) is the member speaking in reply immediately after the Minister of Finance moved a government order, and therefore under rule 37 he should be entitled to speak for more than forty minutes. I admit that the words of the rule are not as plain as they might be, but the Minister of Finance certainly moved a government order, and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is the first member speaking in reply to it. I quite admit that it is arguable, but it is a matter that the Speaker might very well consider most carefully because it makes a lot of difference. It might very well be that at various times on the motion to go into ways and means or supply, a member would wish to speak on a subject which it would take him much longer than forty minutes to discuss, although he would not go so far as to move a non-confidence motion. Many questions are discussed to better advantage without a non-confidence motion, as the government are then able to view the question dispassionately. To say that on a motion to go into supply no member shall speak for more than forty minutes, unless he is going to move a non-confidence motion, is proceeding a little further, I think, than the committee intended. It might be well for the Speaker to consider the point carefully. I think the first member to speak might be allowed more than forty minutes on a motion to go into supply, even although he does not move a non-confidence motion, because he might desire to discuss a very important question.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, might we not ask that this point be debated? That is, that we might have an opportunity of presenting it before Your Honour makes a final ruling. Frankly, I think this is a most serious step. For instance, a government order might deal with any government bill, and under the suggested ruling we would be limited to forty minutes replying to a minister on a highly complicated bill that might take a long time properly to review. In regard to this particular motion to go into committee of ways and means or committee of supply, it is the inherent and most sacred right of a member to present to the house the grievances of any subject. In reply to the motion of the Minister of Finance that the house go into committee of ways and means, and before that is granted to the minister, a member has a right to present his grievance, which might take him a very considerable time. Personally, I would earnestly request Your Honour not to make that final ruling on this occasion, because to my mind it would very seriously abridge our rights.

It has been suggested that I elaborate for a moment the question of dealing with a government bill. We will take as an instance a bill that might be on the order paper now, we will say a railway bill involving a large expenditure of money and a very complicated issue. If the member who sets himself the task of preparing an answer to the government's proposal were limited to forty minutes, he could not possibly do so adequately.

Mr. DUNNING: There is not any suggestion of that in the ruling.

Mr. STEVENS: Oh yes, it would follow if that ruling were established. The minister

presenting the bill has unlimited time to cover the ground fully, but the member replying would be limited to a period within which it would be impossible for him to present his case. Therefore I would respectfully urge Your Honour not to make that the final ruling until we have had further time to consider it. I would also ask that Your Honour grant us an opportunity to debate it fully, especially in the absence of my hon. leader.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the remarks made by the member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley) and now by the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) are, I think, extremely opportune. The new rules of the house ought to be interpreted according to the spirit, and not according to the strict letter. Now, the standing proposition of the Minister of Finance every time we are going into supply is for the house to transform itself into committee of the whole to grant ways and means to His Majesty's government. This is a substantial function of parliament and, as Your Honour has well stated, it is a substantial right of every member to take advantage of that motion to present to the house any grievance from any community represented by him.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Why should that be limited to one hon. member?

Mr. BOURASSA: I will deal with my hon. friend's point in a minute. Therefore I say it is the outstanding duty of every member not to let that privilege be abridged. It may be abused at times, it may be used inopportunely by this or that member. But we should not consider the rules from that point of view. We should take the general rule as it is, and the principle underlying it. Now, every time the Minister of Finance moves that the house resolve itself into committee of ways and means, it is the right—and very often the duty—of each or any member to oppose that motion in order to bring before the house any grievance or something which he may think of immediate interest to the country.

The question then raised takes precedence over every other business, and has to be dealt with thoroughly by the house before it decides to vote for or against the motion of the Minister of Finance.

I have been asked a very pertinent question by the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Young): Why should it be confined to one member? That is the chance of every member. The first member to stand up when the motion is made by the Minister of Finance takes that precedence for that day. He brings up the question which he thinks ought to be discussed and settled by the house before the motion of the Minister of Finance is adopted. I think it is a very important point, Mr. Speaker. It might give rise to consequences much more important and numerous and varied than we may imagine at first. We must look at the rule, and at the ruling passed upon it, not from the sole point of view of the member who has brought up the question to-day, but from the point of view of its general application. I claim that whether there is or is not a motion of want of confidence, every member who challenges the motion to go into committee of ways and means has the right to present fully to the house the question which he thinks important for the time being to be disposed of. It can be only one question. It has to be dealt with by the house before the motion of the Minister of Finance is adopted, and I think we should look twice before we abridge that individual right of all members of the house.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, the dilemma in which we find ourselves to-day is only another illustration of the undesirability of the rule we passed a couple of years ago. I am quite willing to accept your ruling, sir, and also the objections made against it, because they are both correct in that they illustrate our position.

You, sir, have ruled, taking the concrete instance, that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) is not entitled to speak longer than his forty minutes, because the motion before the house is to go into committee of ways and means, and he was discussing a subject quite remote from the motion. Therefore it would seem reasonable that he should not be allowed to exercise a privilege denied, as my hon. friend says, to other members. Why should the privilege be granted to the man who first gets to his feet? I may have a burning grievance of as much importance to my constituents as the grievance of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is to his constituents. Because he first gets your eye, sir, he can speak for all eternity, and I am limited to forty minutes.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) made a very clear point, but he omitted one illustration which I think is very strong. It is a well-known fact that the budget speech of the Minister of Finance is generally replied to by the financial critic of the opposition rather than by the leader of

the opposition, and I believe this rule was worded for that purpose, so that it would allow the man speaking on behalf of His Majesty's opposition to criticize the whole budget; he would not be limited to forty minutes, which would be evidently grossly unfair. Therefore that privilege is to be conceded. If we allow that, we must also concede the privilege to any private, insignificant member to get up and delay the house while he discusses perhaps some private local grievance when that right is denied to other members following him. I suggest that the matter could be best solved by taking another vote, and I am sure that we should find the majority of the members willing to do away with this foolish forty minute rule.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): The intention of the committee at the time the rule was drawn up was to limit speeches to forty minutes, but we made certain exceptions thereto. The first exception was made in favour of the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition and that was agreed to unanimously. But the question was raised that someone might speak on behalf of the Prime Minister—someone on the government side—or some member of the opposition might speak on behalf of the leader of the opposition, as for instance the critic of the opposition speaking in reply to the budget speech. We therefore extended the exceptions from two leaders to the minister who might move a government order or to the member of the opposition replying thereto on behalf of the leader of the opposition. That was our intention.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): It does not specify a member of the opposition.

Mr. MARCIL: We thought that the leader of the opposition on occasion might not wish to speak himself but might request one of his colleagues to speak for him, and our intention was to limit the rule to the two leaders or to the two members speaking on their behalf—a member of the government speaking on behalf of the Prime Minister or a member of the opposition speaking for the leader of the opposition. I quite agree with the two hon. members who have spoken immediately before me that it is a time-honoured custom of parliament to allow grievances before supply, but the intention of the rule was to limit speeches to forty minutes, with the exceptions I have indicated.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): I would point out what would seem to be an anomaly if such an interpretation were put upon the rule. The rule distinctly states that the member speaking in reply, immediately after the minister, shall be included in the exceptions. According to the hon. gentleman's interpretation, we find ourselves in this dilemma: Either the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) was speaking in reply to a minister or else he was speaking absolutely out of order. If he was not speaking in reply to the minister he was not speaking to any motion. It seems to me that he could be speaking only to the motion made by the minister.

Mr. STEVENS: Which admits of any subject being presented.

Mr. BROWN: Certainly. So that if the rule should be that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre shall be limited to forty minutes then we find ourselves on the other horn of the dilemma, that he was not speaking to any motion at all and was therefore out of order. It may be that this rule goes further than those who devised it intended it to go; that may very well be. But the rule is as we have it, and it is not just now in point to debate whether the forty minute rule is desirable or not. I cannot see, under the rule as we have it, but that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, speaking as he was, was entitled to take any time he saw fit in presenting his case.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): As a member of the committee that redrafted the rules, I cannot agree with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). My recollection is that the committee intended to allow the first member of the house speaking in reply to a minister to exceed the forty minutes. I understand the tentative ruling to be that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is limited to forty minutes inasmuch as his speech is not a reply. The committee did not undertake—and I do not think this house would undertake—to dictate to any member what form his reply should take. If the hon. member chose to say what he did say in reply to the minister's motion that is for him to decide; no matter what he may say, he replies. It may be irrelevant or otherwise; we all have differences of opinion as to the effect and the advisability of statements made in the house. But no matter what his statement was it was a reply and therefore should not be limited to forty minutes.

Mr. T. W. BIRD (Nelson): As a member of the committee which revised the rules I remember distinctly both the spirit and the intention behind that rule. There is no doubt

in my mind that the exception was inserted to safeguard what we have considered to be a very valuable privilege in parliament, namely, that grievances might be discussed on the floor of the house. I was so certain of this that I prompted the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to the effect that he had more than forty minutes in which to state his grievance. I agree with the hon. member for Bonaventure with respect to his main contention, but I do not agree with him that the committee intended the exception to be confined to the official opposition. That clause was inserted to apply to every member of the house replying to a minister in the technical sense. As a member of this house I have always understood that an hon. member rising to a motion to go into supply was replying to the minister who moved the motion. I have always understood that to be technically so, and I believe the rule was drawn up to give effect to that right. My memory is so distinct regarding the motives and the intention of the committee in this respect that, as I say, I took it upon myself to prompt the hon. member when he was speaking and when I saw that he was being hurried for time.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Although I have already spoken I should like to make one further comment. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has raised a point which seems to me to be very relevant. There is no question that it was intended that if a member of the government moved the second reading of an important bill when he would have the right to take more than forty minutes, the member who spoke immediately after him would certainly be entitled to speak for more than forty minutes. But under what rule would he exercise that right? He would have the right under standing order 37, which relates to the member speaking immediately after the minister who moves a government order. It seems to me that inasmuch as a member has that right to speak for more than forty minutes after a minister moves a second reading, the same rule must apply in this instance.

Mr. NEILL: We have now heard from four members of the committee who framed the rule and no two of them are in agreement as to what it means.

Mr. E. A. LAPIERRE (Nipissing): I cannot allow the statement made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre regarding the editor of the newspaper published in Sudbury—Vapaus—to pass without explaining to the members of the house the situation as it exists in that city and in the district of Nipissing. The editor of that newspaper was tried and after a fair trial convicted of seditious libel. The newspaper did not represent the opinion or the sentiments of the Finnish population of northern Ontario. We had in that district a very large number of Finnish families, many of whom are pioneers who have lived in that section of the country for more than a quarter of a century, and their descendants to-day have taken their place along with other Canadians and are engaged in trade, in the professions and in other occupations. They are considered among some of our most desirable citizens. I would point out to my hon. friend that notwithstanding the fact that we have this large foreign population in the district of Sudbury we have been free from strikes for the last twenty-five years. Living conditions among the mining population of northern Ontario are far better and far more comfortable than they were made to appear by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. No class of labourers in Canada receive better remuneration, live under better social conditions or are more prosperous than the mining people of the north, and no class of people have contributed more to the development of that great north country than those who are engaged in carrying on the work of our mines. Many years ago these people realized that it was to their own interest to create living conditions in the mining districts which would attract the very best labour, and the model towns of that district are taken as examples throughout Canada.

We have been free from strikes; we have been free from strife and we have been entirely free from racial or religious disturbances. The Finnish people in our district are not communists or socialists and the people in northern Ontario have failed to be influenced by propagandists who have been sent there to induce the labourers employed in the mines and in the lumber camps to join Communistic organizations. In that way we have kept free from labour disturbances and have succeeded in creating living conditions for that class of people under which they have no reason to complain. I would invite the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to visit some of the new plants which are being erected at present, before he makes such statements as to the living conditions of the mining men in the north.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I visited some of the old plants.

Mr. LAPIERRE: That may be so, but I am inviting my hon. friend to visit some of the

new plants, and I would direct his attention to the fact that no labour disturbance ever has taken place in our mines.

I will leave it to those better informed to reply to the hon. gentleman with regard to the Hollinger mine, but when I visited that mine a few years ago it compared favourably with any of the hundred mines I have had the opportunity of seeing during the last eight or ten years. I may tell my hon. friend also that the working conditions in our copper and nickel mines to-day are equal to those existing in any other place in the world.

In conclusion I wish to say that the petition which was presented to this house requesting the suppression of that communistic paper published in Sudbury represented the very best elements of our society. It was signed by representatives of all the organizations interested in the welfare and the future development of northern Ontario, and I may say that that section of our Finnish population known as the White Finns—

Mr. HEAPS: What other colours are there in addition to white.

Mr. LAPIERRE: I will leave that for my hon. friend to deal with; he knows them better than I do. These people, however, have been absorbed into our population and to-day are just as good citizens as we have anywhere in that north country.

Mr. G. R. GEARY (Toronto South): There are one or two points arising out of the address of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) to which, as representing at least a part of the city of Toronto, I should refer. Just how the hon. member considered the greater part of his speech to be relevant to the subject he was discussing I cannot make out. His speech was a criticism directed mainly, one gathers, against the courts which tried offenders for breaches of certain clauses of the Criminal Code.

As to the Hollinger mine fatality the hon. member who has just taken his seat, of course, is well versed. I know little of that case, but I do know that within a week of the disaster the Ontario government instituted an inqury under a gentleman who was not a judge of the Supreme Court of Ontario, but who was a judge holding equal rank with judges of that court, Mr. Justice Godson, who at one time was mining recorder. It is not my intention either to commend or to criticize Mr. Justice Godson, but I have no reason to suppose that he, any more than any other judge of the Supreme Court of Ontario, should be subject to unfair criticisms in this house. I have not the slightest doubt but that he gave his decision in that case after careful inquiry, to the very best of his ability and with absolute conscientiousness. That being so, I think it is too bad now to criticize him. If there is any action which should have been taken following his report I think my hon. friend would be on more solid ground in suggesting it, but he has not ventured to make such a suggestion.

The other case taken up by the hon. gentleman was the one to which the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Lapierre) has referred. That is the case of the judge who tried and sentenced an offender under the Criminal Code. With all respect to my hon. friend I do think that no good purpose is served by ex parte criticism in this house of a judge of our courts. It was the integrity of the court to which my hon. friend referred when he read from the Round Table magazine, and if we cannot trust our courts and if we are free to criticize our judges on such grounds I think matters have come to a very serious state. If this house considers it necessary to criticize the judgment of any judge here rather than in the proper courts of appeal, if such there be, the house should so declare, but at the moment the house should follow the rule which says there must be no criticism of a judge in this house. I regret very much that my hon. friend has sought to violate this rule, not only in regard to His Lordship Mr. Justice Godson but also in regard to His Honour Judge Coatsworth, who is a judge of the very highest standing.

The city of Toronto, through its police commission, has issued an order in regard to speeches at public meetings, with the terms of which I am not fully conversant. I do not think my hon. friend himself will defend in this house the doctrines of communism; I do not believe he can see eye to eye with those who profess to follow those doctrines of communism. I may say that no city in Canada is more ardent in defence of the principle of free speech than is the city of Toronto.

Mr. SANDERSON: No more so than many other cities.

Mr. GEARY: No, I do not say that; I did not intend to do more than point out the position taken by the city of Toronto, since it has been more or less attacked this afternoon by my hon. friend. He may say he was not attacking the manner in which the affairs of that city have been conducted, but from his reading of certain magazines or pamphlets, of which I have never heard but which hap-

pen to be published in Toronto, which fact he emphasizes, I can only understand that he wishes to take objection to the conduct of public affairs in that city. The police commissioners, who are an independent body, issued an order, to prevent communistic appeals being made—which appeals would have the result of creating disorder—in a language which was not one of the authorized languages of this country, and I think the hon. member will admit that the meeting he mentioned was being conducted in a language which does not come within that classification. I do not defend the action of the police commissioners because I do not know enough about it, nor do I criticize it, but I do say that the action of the chief of police, endorsed by the Board of Police Commissioners, has been apparently sanctioned by the approval of the people of Toronto, and also apparently by the people of the province.

Miss MACPHAIL: Has the hon. member not heard anything of the protests made by citizens of Toronto against the ruling of the chief of police?

Mr. GEARY: No, I have not heard of any, but if the hon. member says that such complaints have been made I am perfectly willing to accept her word.

Miss MACPHAIL: If the hon. member had been reading the press he would have seen them.

Mr. GEARY: I have not observed them, but at all events they have not induced a reversing of the order.

Miss MACPHAIL: It wouldn't in Toronto.

Mr. GEARY: I am one of those here to represent my city, and I think we can judge very well from what the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) has just said, exactly what the sentiments are which inspire so many of these remarks. The city of Toronto has not lacked in any sense a proper appreciation of her responsibility as a city, to her province, to her dominion and to her empire. I say that on behalf of my city with regard to what I think are feelings which are not justified and to expressions which are made, quite often without cause, by hon. members of this house.

If it would be admitting anything to the hon. member, I will say that the city of Toronto is definitely and I hope unalterably opposed to the adoption of the principle of communism in this country. I do not know this for a fact—perhaps the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will correct me if I am wrong—but I am informed that the Labour party in Toronto, which owns a building called the Temple, does not permit communistic meetings to be held within that building. That is to say, organized labour, which is strong in Toronto and commands the respect of the people of every class, does not choose to allow its building to be used for this same sort of meeting, even when the addresses are made in English. The police commissioners have decided that it is in the interest of public order to forbid communistic meetings being held in a language which is not understood.

In a very ingenuous way the hon. member complains of a man who was arrested for resisting the police and charged with disorderly conduct. I leave it to the house to decide whether or not that was disorderly; it certainly was not orderly.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: My reason for referring to that was because the charge is now being made the basis for an appeal for deportation.

Mr. GEARY: I think the hon. member is in the proper forum as regards deportation, but in regard to the domestic affairs of the city of Toronto I personally would be very much obliged if hon. members would consider that after all Toronto has got to a point where she may be supposed to be able to take care of her own interests and we do not overwelcome interference and criticism which we think is not justified.

Mr. MALCOLM LANG (South Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the northern part of Ontario has entered into this discussion I feel that I should express my sentiments on this matter. I quite agree with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) when he says that we should all try to live up to the traditions handed down to us from the old land, the traditions of the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press. I do not believe that we can follow that too closely, because just as soon as we depart from those principles we get into difficulties. I also agree with what the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Lapierre) has said regarding the good citizenship of the Finnish people in northern Ontario.

I do not know anything about the paper which was suppressed as I did not follow the case at all, but I do feel that the people who seem to be taking this matter so seriously have been misled. I have been in touch with conditions there because the southwest corner of my riding comes within four miles of Sud-

bury. I meet the people in that section at intervals throughout the year and I know that some people in Sudbury were greatly worked up about this affair, but to my mind it was only a tempest in a teapot. Only a few people were concerned in it, but probably they are the class who would try to get others interested in their agitation and perhaps they did express themselves in a way which was not fitting as citizens of our country. However that may be, the case has been in court and has been dealt with. My opinion is that the Finnish people around Sudbury are not going to be affected seriously by any action which has been taken by certain people or by the courts with regard to this matter. My experience, not only with the Finnish people but with the other European peoples who have come to our country, is that they always prove to be good citizens. It is true that when they first come here and do not know our language they have difficulty in understanding our ways; probably they do not understand our laws and it takes them some time to become accustomed to our methods of living. Whether their children come with them, or are born in Canada, I have always found that after they have attended our common schools they become a high type of citizen.

The tragedy which occurred at the Hollinger mine some two years ago has been mentioned in the house to-day by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. That was a disaster which was entirely unexpected and something which we all felt very keenly about, but it did occur. I knew Judge Godson for many years before he became a judge, when he was a mining commissioner, and I feel quite satisfied that he used his best judgment in trying to arrive at a finding in connection with the cause of that disaster. Nothing transpired because of his finding other than that the management have the experience which they had in that particular case and I believe that since this disaster has happened, the management of all the mines in northern Canada and indeed, throughout the whole country, will be much more careful. In the mining camps in the north country the mines, and particularly gold mines, are known mostly as wet mines, and mining men never believed that a fire such as happened at the Hollinger mines, could occur. But, however that may be, nothing that could be said by anyone or any findings by any commission that might sit on the case could make me change my opinion with regard to the matter, namely, that the responsibility for a tragedy such as happened in the Hollinger mine at that time, must rest upon the management of the mine. Had the management been what it should have been, greater care would have been taken to see that the regulations laid down in the Mining Act of Ontario were properly carried out, and such a tragedy could not have occurred.

There is another angle of the Hollinger disaster which, it occurs to me, has something to do with the comparatively small spread of communism throughout our country. Had there been throughout the mines in the Porcupine camp and other parts of northern Ontario a good miners' union well organized and kept alive; had the miners' union continued to exist as it did in the earlier days of the camps, then even had the management been neglectful in regard to the care of the mines, the matter would have been forcibly called to their attention by the men working in there, because they would have had behind them an organization strong enough to protect them in making necessary comments or complaints to the management so that the work could be carried on properly and carefully. I know the opinion I hold is not shared by everyone, perhaps not by the majority of the people in the north country, but I think nothing tends more towards a good, safe and successful operation of a mine or any other big industry than a good organization amongst the employees and one that in its operation merits the confidence of the management and the executive, so that the executive of the labour organization will be called in to meet and may meet with the management and discuss around a table the conditions which they have to face in order to make a success of the enterprise in which they are all engaged. For some years past the organization of the men employed in the mines of northern Ontario has not been kept intact. I hope that the time will come when the men will have a good organization. They need it. It will be a good thing for them and it will be a good thing for the mine owners and the mine managers, because only by their properly working together can the best success be made out of the development that is taking place in the north country.

Just a word with regard to communism. I think I am right in saying that they never had a good miners' union in the Sudbury district; but if we had a good miners' union throughout northern Ontario, that in itself would do a great deal towards preventing any spread of communism among peoples who come to our land from parts of Europe where they do not know our conditions and who, under the conditions that exist in the north

country to-day, are left to fight their own battles, to look after themselves without any organization to help them and probably without the care, sympathy and assistance that they should have from their employers. It is not any wonder that some of them drift into the hands of these agitators who are endeavouring to spread communism throughout the land. I am thankful to say that communism is not spreading to any great extent throughout northern Ontario, but I am not inclined to place the blame for the little that exists, upon the poor individuals who are taking part in that agitation. We who have had more opportunities than they have, who have lived in that country for a long time, who are and always have been citizens of Canada, who know the conditions, and who have invited these people to come and live with us, and who want them to remain with us, should take a greater interest in them, and thereby keep them away from the communists who gather around them. I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the house, but when this opportunity arose to-day I felt that I should make my viewpoint clear upon just these few matters.

Miss AGNES MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): I think all have appreciated the speech of the hon. member for South Timiskaming (Mr. Lang) who has just taken his seat. Let me state in the beginning of the few remarks which I intend to make, that I am not a communist. Neither, indeed, is the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth). It was just this winter that he was chased out of the Labour temple by the communists—or at least, caught his train a moment or two before he intended to. He had his meeting broken up by them and I understand he is not in very good odour with them. So it cannot be said that either of us is a communist, although I need not defend the hon. member because he is quite able to do so himself.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I interrupt? I left the meeting before the row started. Even the communists did not frighten me.

Miss MACPHAIL: I can quite believe that. I am interested in this discussion only from the viewpoint of free speech, free assembly and a free press. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Geary), an hon. gentleman who is held in very high regard by all the members of the house, say that he was not familiar with the protests that had been made by the liberal-minded people of the city of Toronto. I suppose they are so few in numbers that the sound they made did not reach the ears of my hon. friend. By "liberal" I do not mean Liberal in politics, but liberal in thought; they are not the same thing. But surely anyone who has been reading the press knows that W. A. Cameron, the minister of Lloydminster church, conducted a real campaign, and a very able one, in favour of free speech in the city of Toronto, that meetings were held in Hygeia hall and many letters written to the members of this house, all because of the ruling, I believe, of the chief of police of the city of Toronto. I should be glad to think that all over Canada we had freedom of speech and of assembly and of the press. I think it is true that we have freedom of speech and freedom of assembly, except in a few dark spots, but we have not quite got, I think, freedom of the press, and I think all hon. members of this house will secretly agree with that. We boast a great deal about following British traditions and honouring them by copying them, but this is one in respect to which I think we have fallen short. In Great Britain there is much greater freedom of speech than there is here. There one can say I fancy, almost anything and no one tries to stop him. But in this country, unless one is saying what is an accepted fact, one runs into difficulties. I think we might well become more British and less American in that regard. I do not think there is anything to be gained by trying to make all people think alike. I have every confidence in freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press because I believe that the truth will out, and if you let people talk who have nothing to talk about, they will naturally kill themselves; but if they have something that is a living and a vital thing, you cannot stop it from coming out, and the more you try to stop it, the more it grows until it becomes so strong that it overcomes all obstacles in its path and sometimes brings a great deal of destruction, like a dam when it bursts. That was borne out by the speech of the hon. gentleman who preceded me. I was happy to hear him say that he believed that if there was organized labour in the northern areas there would not be so much communism. That is my own idea, and one always thinks that the person who expresses one's own ideas is very clever indeed. I think that the more opposition there is to freedom of speech and assembly, the more opposition to decent standards of living and to acquiring decent standards of living by organization of the men themselves, the

more communism there will be. Suppress that and you will bring about the thing you fear—communism. I want to support the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre because I believe in free speech, free assembly and a free press. I believe that the more freedom there is in those respects, the greater will be our happiness and our self-respect.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): While I did not follow the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) in regard to conditions in northern Ontario, I must support him and the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) in their advocacy of the right of free speech, even if it comes to free speech in the House of Commons in connection with the forty-minute rule. I do not need perhaps to say that I am no communist and that I have no sympathy with such doctrines, and I hope there are no communists in the district I represent. I believe that the best method of dealing with extreme views is to afford them the greatest publicity. It is far better to have these doctrines shouted from the housetops or in the public squares than whispered in the cellar, because that is where they will be whispered if you do not allow them free outlet in God's air, so to speak. The surest way of propagating a doctrine is to make a martyr of somebody in connection with it. History all down the line tells us that. You can pour a pail of water on a cement floor, and you cannot eliminate it by beating it; you only spread it, and that is the effect of trying to stop people uttering seditious doctrines with which we are thoroughly out of touch.

The hon. member for Southeast Grey spoke of conditions in the old country. I was over there a couple of years ago, and I went to Hyde Park one Sunday evening. I was amazed at the freedom of speech that was allowed there. A man mounted a soap box and he talked sedition from the word go, and I was astonished to see that the people were listening to him and appeared to be taking it in.

Mr. HEAPS: How do you know it was seditious?

Mr. NEILL: It was in my opinion.

Mr. HEAPS: That is all.

Mr. NEILL: And in the opinion of most people. What was the ultimate result? There were a couple of men who looked like artisans standing in front of me, one of them with his wife. My hon. friend from North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) will no doubt want to know how I knew it was his wife. I took that for granted, Mr. Speaker, in spite of my experience with divorce cases in Canada. These two men stood in front of me and I thought they were taking it all in, but at last one of them said, addressing the speaker,, "Oh, go and bile your bleeding head. Let's go home, Bill," and that broke up the meeting. I thought the speaker had been making an impression upon his audience, but the sound common sense of the British working people was too much for him. That remark was the end of him; his audience laughed and disappeared. But if he had been compelled to hold his meeting in a cellar, he might have made some impression.

Another instance which I did not see, a friend told me about. A man drove up in a car and stopped to listen to one of these soap box orators. He left the engine of his motor running, making a little noise. A policeman came over to him and said, "You will 'ave to stop that engine. You are hinterfering with the heloquence of the horator." That orator was talking sedition but the policeman saw that he got free vent anyhow, and no doubt with the publicity he got he ended as the man did in the other case I mentioned. Darkness, ignorance and suppression are the mothers of sovietism and communism. Give these doctrines the light of day and publicity, and we can trust to the sound common sense of the Anglo-Saxon race that there will be no danger of our being troubled with communistic principles. But make martyrs of these people and there is something in human nature that lends itself to follow them, and you will be doing more harm by trying to suppress their doctrines than if you gave them access to the free air, where they will naturally dissipate themselves.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): The few speeches that we have just heard have proven to the house, I think, that the initiative taken by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) was quite timely. I did not have the advantage of hearing the hon. member, but I took my impression of what he said from the remarks of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Geary), whose accuracy and probity of mind I trust entirely.

There were two or three points made by the hon. member for South Toronto in reply to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre which ought not to be passed over

without some reference. With regard to freedom of speech and freedom of the press, that subject has been under discussion so often that I do not think it necessary to insist much upon it. I almost entirely agree with what my good neighbour (Mr. Neill) has just said about the advantage of letting people have vent for what they have to say, even if it is foolish. That is better than trying to suppress it.

I still more perhaps agree with the hon. member who spoke a moment ago, from South Timiskaming, I think. He hit the nail on the head, so far as agitation and propaganda among the labouring classes, and especially the foreign labouring classes, are concerned. There are two causes for this propaganda. He dwelt upon one—the lack of organization on the part of some sections of our labour world, and the lack of encouragement given to labour organizations either by employers or by the public at large. Quite a number of people in this country seem to imagine that syndicalism or labour organization is a mere matter of class concern for the labourers. That is an entirely wrong view. It is a matter of public interest, of social concern, of public safety for the whole nation. Under modern conditions of life and labour, the whole nation—I will go further—the so-called possessing classes, have a direct and immediate interest in seeing that labour is properly organized and in a position to deal with a sense of collective responsibility either with employers, or with the public at large, or with parliaments, governments, and so forth. I well remember in my young days when, in such organizations as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for example, the policy was to prevent or stifle any such things as labour unions. Well, there was among the vast number of employees of that company at that time a spirit far more inimical to the company and to society at large than there is now. Why? Because some few men saw the reasonableness of the employees' position. May I name one? The late Lord Shaughnessy. He, having had the advantage —I call it advantage—of beginning work at the foot of the ladder, had a heart and a mind big enough not to have forgotten the days of poverty, the days of humbleness, the days when he was under the load of authority and wealth which made itself so heavily felt by the labour classes. Instead of fighting that spirit of organization among the employees, he encouraged it. Of course, I admit that large employers of labour by adopting a friendly attitude towards organized labour often get their men to agree to certain conditions which they might not accept if their employers were hostile to them. But there is not the slightest doubt that since the spirit of syndicalism has spread out, since labour has organized itself in a sensible manner and a sense of responsibility has grown up among the labouring classes, it is easier to settle labour problems.

Now, in regard to the intrinsic and political right—I call it political in the very broad sense of the word—of people holding the doctrine of communism to express their views, well, that is a very broad question. There are many people nearer to the capitalists than to the communists, or people not belonging to any set class, who believe that the doctrine and practice of capitalism, as existing to-day in America especially—and I make no distinction between Canada and the United States in this regard—are just as baneful, just as opposed to the basic principles of natural law, just as contrary to the essential laws of prosperity, of the economic balance, of social and distributive justice, as may be the doctrine of communism. It was found long ago in such countries as England and Germany, for example, that communism is the direct and natural and logical result of the excesses of capitalism. Well, if it is wrong for people to hold the doctrine of communism, it ought to be just as wrong—at least many people would think it just as wrong—for others to hold the doctrine of capitalism. Where would that lead us to? Would the member for Winnipeg North Centre be entitled to raise a movement among the people he represents to get the public bodies of this country to suppress papers or organizations which hold the doctrine of capitalism? And yet he would be just as entitled under the constitution of our country, interpreted in a broad way, in asking for the suppression of capitalism, for the suppression of newspapers and of public meetings holding the views of capitalism, as the member for South Toronto and myself may be allowed to propound the view that communism should be suppressed and that the expression of view of those who hold that doctrine should not be made public.

Mr. GEARY: Will the hon. member excuse me? The only point I made was that the action of the police commissioners of Toronto was based upon disorder arising from the advocacy of communistic principles in a langugage they did not understand. I was neither condemning nor approving their action.

Mr. BOURASSA: I thank my hon. friend. That brings me to another point—language—which should not be lost sight of, but before I touch on it I want to deal with another

point, that of due respect for courts of law. Here again it is very difficult to draw the line. It is often said that this parliament is the highest court of the land. There is not the slightest doubt that all jurisdictions in the land, whether civil or criminal, whether federal or provincial, hold their powers from this parliament or from the local legislatures. They are amenable to the supreme action of either this parliament or the provincial legislatures. That so long as parliament or the provincial legislatures do not think proper to change the law, individual judges should not be insulted or attacked or unduly criticized because they administer the law as it stands, I quite agree. But should we go the length of saying that no adjudication by any court should be open to criticism or attack on the floor of parliament or of any legislature? Then in what manner could we operate upon public opinion to have such laws changed? When you read history you find that no judicial powers—I mean on matters of importance—have ever been changed by the proper authority, let it be king or parliament, until abuses had repeated themselves from time to time, until excesses of authority had been committed by tribunals, and therefore until those abuses and excesses had been denounced by public opinion in one manner or another. Is it not a fact that criminal jurisprudence in England was largely amended in the last century, and for the better of society as well as for the safety of the subject, thanks to the unceasing campaign—many people called it slander—which "Labby" carried on through his paper Truth, when for weeks and weeks, and months and months, he published judgments rendered by courts of assize, police courts or magistrates in England sending men to gaol for eight days for real crimes, and others to the penitentiary for two or three years for offences which were considered trivial or unimportant by the people generally. The mere fact that the uncertainty of English justice, that the partiality of English judges, was put before the English public week after week by Truth had more to do with the amendment of English criminal jurisprudence than any other agitation to this end.

Mr. FORKE: Didn't they send Labby to gaol for his freedom of speech?

Mr. BOURASSA: Of course, he was sent to gaol, he was covered with fines, but nevertheless after a while his views prevailed. I do not think there is a single responsible public man in England to-day, whatever opinion he may have of the late Henry Labouchere personally, who will not admit that it was through that campaign—I repeat, as it was called—of slander—

Mr. FORKE: My only point was that speech was not always free in England.

Mr. BOURASSA: Quite so. It is the same everywhere. And speech cannot altogether be free. I simply want to make it clear that if a member of parliament or a Canadian citizen believes there is a tendency in the application of the criminal or the civil law which will be detrimental to the country, or work against the individual or political liberties of the subject, I fail to see any other means of arousing public opinion and of bringing parliaments and legislatures to the point of amending their laws than by denouncing such judgments as they deem wrong.

Now I admit it is a question of degree; it is a question of tact; it is a question of opportunity. It is very difficult to draw the line. The only point I want to make is this: in spite of any written rule of this parliament, I lay down the broad principle that under the British system of government, and preserving what is best in that system, you cannot accomplish anything unless you take some risks, personal and political, and appeal to public opinion as against set rules, as against systems of policy, and even at times as against the authority of judges. But—and I repeat it for the second or third time—it must be done with tact and discretion; nevertheless it is very often a duty to be performed, and as regards the views held by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I think that hon. gentleman did his duty when he pointed out the danger of certain jurisprudence which had its beginning in the days of the war and which threatens to perpetuate itself.

With regard to the use of foreign languages in publications or in public speech, I would point out that here again we have a very broad question of policy. I would be the last man to charge the good people of Toronto with more narrowness of mind than others. In this respect, not belonging to the province of Ontario, I am happy to repeat, and from a purely disinterested standpoint, what the hon. member for South Toronto has said. As an individual I can render testimony to the breadth of mind of a large proportion of the individuals of all classes inhabiting the city of Toronto. This may surprise my good neighbour (Mr. Neill), who seems horrified. I know some of my good Ontario Grit friends would not agree with that, but I claim to be a living witness to the fact. I believe I have denounced the views, political and social, held by the majority of the people of Toronto, in the city of Toronto, and before various bodies—universities and clubs—more often perhaps than any other member of this house.

Mr. MANION: And were applauded.

Mr. BOURASSA: Yes, and when I was not applauded I was listened to. In fact, all the broken sticks I have received in the varied course of my public life for saying just what I thought, I have received in my native province and not in the city of Toronto.

Mr. McGIBBON: They are generous minded down there.

Mr. BOURASSA: No, I will not say they are generous; I want to say exactly what I think. I think the majority of the individuals in Toronto are broadminded. But I am afraid that the concern which they have as a community, a collectivity, to be known as the standard city of loyalty has developed among them a public spirit which is not always in keeping with the breadth of mind, the intelligence and the culture of the individuals. I am afraid that their manifestations of political thought and of public life are very often the cause of the bad reputation which that city enjoys. I believe that is a fair view to take of the city; at all events I say what I feel. There is not the slightest doubt that, having an eye to "French dominated" Quebec, another eye to these new provinces of the west where armies of "foreigners" are invading these sacred precincts of the British Empire, the people of Toronto feel that they have a greater responsibility laid upon them collectively to preserve the rights of the king and the integrity of the empire than the king himself feels, and certainly than all the millions of the people of England and Scotland assume. I have felt that every time I have had occasion—and I may say I chose the occasions—to go to Toronto; I felt it more vividly after I came back from London. I have never experienced a change of atmosphere so sudden and so powerful. What the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has said I have experienced time and again. I remember going with the late Joe Martin to a public meeting in his constituency of St. Martin's, one of the London ridings. There a public orator began by stating quite frankly that he was neither communist nor socialist, but he denounced the naval policy of the then Liberal government—a Liberal government, mind you. Someone interrupted him: Well, we have need of a strong navy; to which he asked: Why?—Well, to defend our country.—Defend our country against whom?—Against the Germans.—Why defend us against the Germans?—To keep our king and parliament.—Why, our king is a German anyhow; why have two German kings, one in Potsdam and one in Buckingham? Have only one in Potsdam and it would be less costly to us. And so far as we labourers are concerned, the German labourers are far better treated than we are.

Mark you, these words were uttered in London in the presence of several policemen and about six weeks before the outbreak of the Great war. But no one felt hurt; no one was scandalized. There were a few people who heckled him but not in any bad spirit. They seem there to think that their loyalty to the king and their attachment to their institutions are solid and genuine enough to resist the effect of any word spoken or written to the contrary. Some of our good friends in Ontario, on the other hand, appear to be so little sure of their loyalty as to be afraid to have anyone challenge it.

Of course, when you come to the foreigner it is another question. I think the hon. member for South Timiskaming (Mr. Lang) has said the truth and the whole truth. I know a good deal about the various foreign elements which have come to our country in the last twenty-five years and are scattered throughout the western provinces and in northern Ontario, and comparing their state of mind with the state of mind of our own people in the province of Quebec, I think I can draw this conclusion: the more you attempt by force to make them British or even Canadian the less you will succeed. The French Canadians became thoroughly, and I might say radically, attached to British institutions the moment the British ceased to endeavour to make them British by force. So long as the representatives of the British crown and government endeavoured either by force or by diplomacy to impose the English language upon them and to deprive them of their rights, or their undue privileges as the British called them, in matters of school, church organizations and civil law, the French maintained a spirit, I will not say of disloyalty, exactly, but of resentment towards British rule. They looked upon that rule as something imposed upon them. They were sceptical of every attempt on the part of some few representatives of the crown to smile upon them; they always thought that there was behind the screen something which meant either their absorption or the denial of some of their privileges. But the moment the British, after nearly a century of political and at times physical struggle, renounced the idea of imposing their views upon the French Canadians, that moment did the French Canadians become the staunchest upholders of British rule. Not because it was British; you could not

expect that from them; but because British rule as applied in Canada, after it had been made adaptable to the needs of this country, contains a germ of liberty and equality which they prized. In that sense they became more British than they had been French in the past. It will operate in the same way in connection with the newcomer, provided you do not turn the whole machinery of parliamentary law, of judicial authority and police repression upon them and say, "You must be British; you must speak English; you must talk this way and not the other way." You will never make them British or Canadians in that way.

It may be said that it is an inconvenience for police officials not to understand the languages used in public papers or at public meetings. Of course there are inconveniences in all systems; but I claim that this inconvenience is less vital than the blunder and the crime of leaving aside those broad principles of liberty, including liberty of speech in any language, in order to enable a policeman to understand what has been said or written. Let us do what they did in Austria and in Russia; let us have interpreters who will tell us what has been written or said, and if anything really criminal has been stated in any publication or in any speech let the principles of law and order which are applied to English or French speaking citizens apply to these other Canadians who speak in their own language. To say that you are going to force a community to print a paper in English or in French and so prevent a Canadian citizen from using in public or private speech the language he has learned, the language he is entitled to use by natural law and by a broad application of the highest principles of British liberty, it is a mistake. If you encourage that kind of jurisprudence, if you encourage that sort of legislation, you should begin by erasing some of the finest and noblest pages of Canadian history, which have become engraved in the hearts and minds of all true sons of Canada, whether their origin be French, English, Scotch or Irish.

A few years ago I happened to be travelling in the hills of Wales, and there I found some of the old-timers, old shepherds and old farmers who remembered their school days when they had received strokes of the rule on their hands because they dared speak their native language in school. My hon. friend from Rosetown (Mr. Evans) will understand me. Their struggle for the right to speak their own language was maintained from the conquest of their country by the English in the twelfth century down to the last years of last century; and finally, after six hundred years of stubbornness, the English understood that they had gained nothing by enforcing that rule. Now the Welsh people can use their own language in pleading before their courts, in their political or literary societies, and also in their municipal councils and so on. Have they become less devoted to the British crown? I do not think so.

To-day in that country of which my friend the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) is a worthy son there is a revival of the Scotch language and the Scotch nationality under way. Does that constitute a threat to the unity of the British empire? I do not think so. I believe that anything which gives greater opportunity and wider scope for the mental, intellectual or moral growth of a people and all its component elements is for the good of the country and for its political safety. For heaven's sake let us endeavour to be reasonable in this regard and let us not follow the narrow-minded policy which is in force on the other side of the line. Have they succeeded in furthering the moral unity of their country by imposing upon their children the most backward and narrow system of education in existence to-day throughout the civilized world? They have not. There is less moral unity in the American nation to-day than existed previous to the war, and the reason is that they endeavoured to get their people to become what they called one hundred per cent Americans. The people revolted mentally against that attempt. To-day the German-Americans, the Italian-Americans, the Hungarian-Americans, the French-Americans and the Polish-Americans are less one hundred per cent Americans than they were before the war, because their understanding of the natural law and their sense of human dignity have revolted against this system.

This is a point which was brought out very well by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre; and I think the hon. member for South Toronto, if he remembers his close personal contact with the French and other peoples during the war, must realize that if we want moral and political unity in this country it will not be achieved by making foreign-born Canadians English-speaking or French-speaking by force; it will not be achieved by days of imprisonment, by fines or by threats of what may happen if they dare use this or the other language, or if they dare oppose a certain social or political theory which may be held by other people. If we impress upon them that this country

is more free than the country to the south, more free mentally, morally and intellectually; if we impress upon them that there is a place in Canada for every group of people to grow according to its racial or intellectual tendency provided the whole community is united in a few basic principles of national unity, we will get much further. Of course they must accept also the Canadian constitution, Canadian law and what I would call Canadian communal life; but if we take the broad attitude I have described, I think we will attain far better results than by letting it be known that such decisions as that rendered in the case brought up today by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre reflect the cool judgment and determination of either Canadian public bodies or the Canadian people at large.

Mr. GEARY: I rise to a question of privilege, not to object to what my hon. friend has said but rather to correct him, since I believe his impression is erroneous. In the action of the Board of Police Commissioners of Toronto I understand there is no condemnation of the use of any particular language. To my knowledge there are two excellent journals published in Toronto, one in the Yiddish language and the other in the Italian language, both weekly publications bearing very excellent reputations. With regard to the use of any particular language, a great body of respectable citizens in Toronto are of the Hebrew race; they use their language as they please without question, and so far as I know that point never has been raised. What my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre took issue with was an edict or order of the Board of Police Commissioners directed against communist meetings carried on in a foreign language, and made on the ground that they provoked disorder and the police could not understand what was going on. I neither condemn nor defend that action, because I do not know the circumstances. At this point I might say to my hon. friend from Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) that perhaps she was right in her expression of surprise during the course of my previous remarks. As a matter of fact I did not know of the agitation to which she referred, but since then I have been informed by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Lawson) that a great deal of discussion pro and con has been carried on in Toronto. Meetings were held and it was a matter of some public interest. I suppose through absence I was unaware of that and so made the statement I did. The hon. member was probably right in correcting me; I should have known.

[Mr. Bourassa.]

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand the hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. GEARY: I am speaking on a question of privilege.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: On a question of privilege also; my information is quite different from that of the last speaker.

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (North Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, as I represent the Porcupine district, I think it is my duty to say a few words. I intend to be very brief, but statements have been made this afternoon which I believe should be corrected. I have in mind more particularly some of the utterances made by the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) in referring to the contents of The Thunderer. As a Catholic, I say that this paper should be permitted to carry on its propaganda because I believe it will make people of that faith better Catholics than they were before, after reading such trash. I am convinced also that 99 per cent of the protestant population of Canada who happen to read that paper will become more broadminded on religious matters than they were previously.

I do not desire to make any extended comment upon the communistic paper which was published in the Sudbury district, but I believe that judgment has defeated its own ends; it has become a boomerang to communism. I feel sure that only a very few members of this house have read that little paper or knew about it before it was mentioned in this discussion.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre mentioned the lot of the miners in northern Ontario. As a citizen of the Porcupine district I know of the conditions there and I believe the lot of the miner will compare favourably with that of any other worker in the industrial life of this country. The minimum wage paid to the miner in that district ranges from $4.60 per eight hour shift upwards. Most of the Finnish people are working under contract and many of them make as much as $7 to $10 per day. Many of the miners in our section are directly or indirectly interested in the mine stocks, but that may not be a sign of prosperity; many of them own automobiles, which may not be a sign of prosperity; but in South Porcupine, Schumacher and Timmins a large proportion of the miners own their own homes, which is a sign of prosperity. The bank managers tell me that there are millions of dollars in savings deposits which belong to the miners, so I believe their lot is a pretty good one.

I agree with the statement made by the hon. member for South Timiskaming (Mr.

Lang) that there would be no communism in our section of the country if labour were properly organized. The hon. member mentioned the word "capitalism". I hold no brief for the capitalist because I represent every section of the population of my constituency, but I must say in all sincerity that without capital our section of the country would not have the prosperity and advancement we are experiencing at the present time. Following the words of the hon. member I really believe that the miners themselves are to be blamed. We have found it almost impossible to organize them because the man working at the Hollinger mine does not want to be organized with the man working at the McIntyre mine, and so on. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was up in our section of the country a few years ago and he told the people at that time that organization was absolutely necessary. We have one organization in Iroquois Falls, and it is working quite well as the newsprint manufacturers in that section of the country are satisfied to work in cooperation with the labour element. The hon. member for South Timiskaming said that it was rather surprising we had not more communism in our section of the country, and I believe that the proper way to counteract any activities of that kind would be through proper organization.

Mention has been made of the disaster which occurred at the Hollinger mine in February of last year. Judgment has been rendered and I believe every member of this house will bear me out when I say that it is a positive fact that the company was not responsible for that disaster and that it certainly was not premeditated. I happened to be in Timmins during that time and I heard many fiery utterances which were made against the management and against the government, but I feel sure that 95 per cent of the population of that section of the country were satisfied with the verdict which was rendered after the inquiry had been held. New legislation has been passed and new means afforded for preventing a similar disaster.

That is all I have to say about this matter, Mr. Speaker, but I thought it was my duty to correct some of the statements which were made

Mr. SPENCER: In view of the importance of the forty minute rule, and the statement made to the house with regard to the length of the speech of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, is the house to understand that Your Honour has given your decision or that you purpose making your ruling at a future time, as has been requested by several hon. members?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no doubt in my own mind as to the correctness of the ruling itself, but in view of the expressions of opinion of experienced members of the house, I am quite ready to consider the matter further.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was not here, but I fully agree with Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. BENNETT: I was here, and I wholly disagree with Your Honour's ruling.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose last evening we were considering an amendment moved by the Minister of Finance to paragraph 4 of resolution, No. 3. The amendment reads:

That paragraph 4 be amended by striking out clause (e) and substituting therefor the following:

(e) one cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over one dollar per share, but not more than three dollars per share;

(f) one-fourth of one cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over fifty cents per share, but not more than one dollar per share;

(g) one-tenth of one cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price of fifty cents or less per share.

Mr. LAWSON: Mr. Chairman, immediately prior to the rising of the committee last evening I was endeavouring to point out that 74 per cent of all stocks traded in on the Standard mining exchange were stocks selling at a price under $3; that the rate of taxation, even under the amended proposal made yesterday evening by the Minister of Finance, resulted in a rate of taxation varying from 10 per cent to 3/100 of one per cent; that the small investor was penalized by having to pay in tax to the government a much larger percentage on his investment than was the man of larger means, and that the new taxation as proposed, calculated on the basis of one day's trading on one exchange by eleven brokers, meant an increase in tax of $20,228.32.

I stated last night that I would endeavour to make a recapitulation in view of the suggested amendment of the Minister of Finance; but unfortunately the data from which such a recapitulation can be made is not available in this city, and hence I shall have to quote another figure which I do with the full realization that it will be to some extent reduced by the new proposal of the Minister of Finance. It has been conservatively esti-

mated that the imposition of this new tax would produce, on shares of Ontario mining companies alone, an annual amount of $5,000,000. That amount of $5,000,000 would equal approximately 40 per cent of all the dividends paid by all the silver and gold mines operating in Ontario last year. The result of the imposition of that tax will be, I believe, to drive the financing of all new mining properties into the hands of the organized concerns and to prevent the ordinary prospector and the small investor from sharing the profits which may accrue from such investment. I endeavoured to point out that its effect, by reason of curtailment of market, would be to curtail the mining industry, and I would call attention to the fact that if the mining industry is curtailed, the effects are wider than the results merely on that industry. Last year, in seven out of the twelve months, the mines produced the greatest amount of tonnage carried on our railways, and during the high peak in the month of October, they produced 5,426,255 tons. In most, if not all of the provinces of this Dominion, we have a Transfer Tax Act, but every one of them has been based upon the principle that there shall be the same per cent of investment paid in tax by the small investor who invests in the small priced issue as shall be paid by the large operators who can afford to invest in the higher priced issues, and that the same per cent of tax shall be applicable to mining stocks which are the lower priced issues as is applicable to industrial stocks which are the higher priced issues.

The question whether there should be an increase in the amount of tax imposed by the Dominion upon the transfer of shares is one of individual opinion. At the moment I am not directing the attention of the committee so much to the quantum of the tax as to the inequality of the rate of tax in this proposal. To my mind it would be just as logical for the government to argue that the whole ascending scale of percentages imposed in connection with income tax should be reversed as it is to impose the scale of taxation now proposed, because in the result it would be exactly the same. In effect by this proposal the government says to the small investor who buys the cheap issues, the lower priced issues: You, by reason of purchasing that lower priced issue, should pay in tax to the government a larger proportion on your investment than should the large corporation. Last night we were treated to some vain boastings by hon. members opposite as to the advantages conferred on mining in this country by this beneficent government. It will be interesting to observe by what argument the government will attempt to persuade the mining industry that it receives any benefit from the imposition of this unequal tax, or by what reasoning it will endeavour to convince the small investor that he is not being discriminated against in favour of organized wealth. Surely this proposal has not had from the government the thoughtful consideration which it deserves. If it has had consideration, then one can only conclude that this is another evidence of an unfair burden of taxation being imposed upon the masses, and a remission of taxation upon the wealth of this country. If it has been considered at all, this is further evidence of allegiance by the government to that modern and expressive, though ungrammatical plagiarism "Them that has, gits."

Mr. MANION: I do not intend to delay the passing of the resolution. I intended to stop in time to let it pass if I was the only speaker.

Mr. ROBB: It is nearly six o'clock, and I think other hon. members desire to speak. I believe I shall be able to show that the tax as now presented is reasonable to the nation as well as to those who speculate in these stocks. We can, however, discuss that later. I want to take advantage of the few moments that we have before six o'clock to say to the committee that I shall move to amend the Excise Act, being chapter 60 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, by repealing subsection (a) of section 219 and substituting therefor the following:

On every pound of malt manufactured in Canada, subject to excise regulations with respect to coomings and absorption of moisture in warehouse as provided by the order in council of the seventh day of February, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-one, three cents: Provided that malt may be removed from a malt-house to a distillery in bond, and the duty on such malt may be remitted upon proof satisfactory to the department that such malt has been used solely for the production of spirits, in which production no other material than malt is used; and provided further that malt used, in any licensed bonded manufactory, in the manufacture of malt extract or other similar medicinal preparation approved by the department or in the preparation of any malt food product approved by the governor in council may have duty thereon remitted under such regulations as the department establishes;

In this way it will appear in Hansard and the votes and proceedings. The object of the motion is this: in the manufacture of malted milk there is an excise tax on malt and as there is a considerable industry desir-

ing to establish itself in Canada to manufacture malted milk, they have represented to us that we should relieve them from this tax. We are therefore going to wipe out the tax for that purpose.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend is not going to ask the house to pass the resolution in regard to the Special War Revenue Act to-night?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. MANION: I wish to point out what I think is an inequality in this tax. I shall do so by quoting a few figures I have compiled myself. For example, 1,000 shares of Noranda at to-day's price of $54 amounts to $54,000 and the tax upon it is $30. On the other hand, 1,000 shares of Kirkland Lake at, say yesterday's price of $1.02, comes to $1,020 and the tax is $10. This bears out the criticism offered by the hon. member for West York. It does not seem a fair method of taxation whereby you tax a small dealer to a much greater extent in proportion to his deal than you tax the larger dealer.

Mr. ROBB: Not the small dealer, the small priced stock.

Mr. MANION: The small priced stock purchase. He is a small dealer in that he buys or sells small priced stock. On the other hand, I do congratulate the minister on this, that he has very much improved matters so far as the penny stocks are concerned, but even yet the penny stocks are being charged rather heavily. For example, take 1,000 shares of Columbus Kirkland, currently selling at 1½ cents a share. That deal would amount to $15, and the tax would be $1, whereas in the Noranda deal which I instanced, 1,000 shares selling at $54 a share, the tax would be $30. In addition, there is a commission on the Columbus Kirkland deal of $1.50 and an Ontario tax of 30 cents, making total charges of $2.80. It is true that only $1 of that is chargeable to the Minister of Finance, but it must be remembered that a lot of these penny stocks do become the parents, so to speak, of first-class mining stocks. My hon. friend who took his seat a few moments ago gave some examples. I will mention only one or two. Teck-Hughes, which is one of our outstanding gold mines, was selling a few years ago at 10 and 15 cents a share; it is now selling around $9 a share. McIntyre a few years ago was selling at 15 and 20 cents a share; to-day it is selling around $16 and $20 a share. Sheritt-Gordon within the last few years was selling at 60 cents a share; it is now selling around $8.50. So these small penny stocks that are largely traded in are sometimes the cause of the development of a large mining interest.

I want to put on record before six o'clock one other point in regard to industrial stocks, which I think is worthy of the consideration of the Minister of Finance between now and Monday, when he may possibly have to make some changes. Take an industrial stock, although really it is a mining concern, like Smelters. One hundred shares of Smelters at yesterday's price of $420 would amount to a $42,000 deal. The tax on that is $4, according to the minister's figures. One hundred shares of Cosgrave Brewery at $3.50 a share would be a $350 deal, and the tax on that is $2. There is a tax of $2 on a $350 deal, and a tax of $4 on a $42,000 deal, in the same number of shares.

Mr. ROBB: How would it be to put them all on the same basis as with the sales tax?

Mr. MANION: I do not think the sales tax would be fair at all. The minister has spoken of that in the past. I understand, but I do not think it would be fair because these shares change hands so frequently. We think that the sales tax should be wiped out altogether, but, at any rate, as it is presently applied it is fair to this extent, that when you buy a suit of clothes you make that purchase and you keep the suit, paying the sales tax only once, but these stocks change hands again and again and it would not be a fair method to apply the sales tax to them. One way in which it could be done—I am speaking for myself—would be a percentage tax on the value of the deal, although I have not worked out any percentages. I may say a few more words in regard to this matter when it comes up again, but I thought in the meantime the minister might give it his consideration.

Progress reported.

SPEAKER'S RULING ON POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, before you finally arrive at a conclusion with respect to the point of order which was raised this afternoon, there may be an opportunity for some further discussion?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. I will let the hon. gentleman know further with respect to the matter.

At six o'clock the house adjourned until Friday, May 10, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, May 10, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Eighth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills—Mr. Brown.

AIR MAIL SERVICE

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): I desire to lay on the table of the house the remainder of the file with respect to air mail service, containing copies of air mail contracts asked for by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Ernst) and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart).

DOMINION OF CANADA GUARANTEE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. G. R. GEARY (South Toronto) moved:

That the petition of the Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, presented on the 8th May, praying for the passing of an act to change the name of the said company and also to increase its capital stock, together with the report of the Clerk of Petitions thereon, be referred to the select standing committee on standing orders for the purpose of considering the suspension of standing order 92 in relation thereto.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REFUNDING OF MATURING OBLIGATIONS

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the Canadian National Railways to provide for the refunding of certain maturing financial obligations, and to issue substituted securities therefor guaranteed by the Dominion as to principal and interest, but not exceeding $18,000,000, the aggregate face value of the original securities.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

GERMAN REPARATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to a Canadian Press despatch from Paris, among the statements contained in which is the following:

It was confirmed to-night that the plan for revision of reparations payments by Germany proposed by Owen D. Young of the United States at the reparations conference would leave Great Britain nothing for the dominions or for arrears of interest on debt. It would award that country just enough from Germany to pay the United States from now on.

There is also the following statement:

The absence of direct representation for the dominions at the conference is considered by the British delegation as all the greater reason for not yielding on the question of the dominions' share of German reparations. The delegation is practically certain to reject that phase of the Young proposals which would reduce the German payments to the dominions to zero.

In view of the effect which this would have on Canada's interests in this matter, will the Prime Minister lay on the table a statement showing the terms upon which the present payments are made, the arrears if any that exist, and the amount received to date, together with any information regarding the new suggested arrangements, so that we may have an opportunity of studying the proposals.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My impression is that the information which my hon. friend asks for has already been given to the house, but I will endeavour to see whether it is not available in a form in which it can be again tabled.

UNITED STATES TARIFF REGULATIONS

FILLET TRADE AND DRIED FISH INDUSTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. G. ERNST (Queens-Lunenburg): I desire to direct the attention of the government to a Canadian Press despatch that appears in this morning's papers—I am reading from the Montreal Gazette of this morning's date. I do not purpose reading the whole despatch but merely two paragraphs:

Paragraph 717 of the existing or old law—

This has reference to the proposed United States tariff regulations or revisions.

Paragraph 717 of the existing or old law, imposes a duty of 2 cents a pound on "fish, fresh, frozen or packed in ice—such as halibut, salmon, mackerel and swordfish," with one cent a pound on other fish "not specially provided for".

The new bill keeps substantially the same rates but adds a provision for 2½ cents a pound on fish which is filleted, skinned, boned, sliced or divided into portions. It also provides for 2½ cents a pound on dried and unsalted fish, of cod, haddock, hake, pollock, and cusk and 1¼ cents on other dried and unsealed fish.

In view of the very serious effect such a provision must have on at least two branches of the fishing industry in Canada, namely, the fillet trade and the dried fish industry, I would like the government to lay on the table of the house all conventions between this country and the United States with respect to fisheries

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Of course my hon. friend understands that the officers of the department are not in a position to supply any definite information as to the effect of the changes mentioned by my hon. friend, but I am told that if these changes are as stated in the press they cannot seriously affect our trade at present. The officers of the department have looked into that report and they do not believe such changes can have a very great effect, but of course we cannot do anything in the matter. This is only a newspaper report; nothing definite has been done and as yet this has not become the law of the United States. With regard to my hon. friend's request, I am quite ready to comply with it.

TORONTO BUILDING TRADES STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Toronto-Scarborough): I would like to ask the Minister of Labour, or in his absence the Prime Minister, whether the strike at present in progress in Toronto in the building trades is in course of settlement.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am afraid I cannot answer my hon. friend's question, but I assume that a strike in the building trades would be primarily a matter for the consideration of the provincial government.

Mr. HARRIS: Then I might ask the Prime Minister if the Minister of Labour is participating in the deliberations having to do with the settlement of the strike.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sorry I cannot answer that question, but perhaps I might make a further reply to my hon. friend's previous question. A moment ago I said that a strike of this kind would come primarily within the jurisdiction of the provincial government; as a matter of fact I believe it would come entirely within the jurisdiction of that government. However, if both parties concerned requested the good offices of the Minister of Labour under the Conciliation Act he would be in a position to take action, and I am sure he would be ready to lend whatever good offices might be in his power.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REPORTED ERECTION OF GRAIN ELEVATOR AT PORT HURON

On the orders of the day:

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): On Wednesday last the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Fansher) asked me a question based on a despatch appearing in the press with regard to the construction by the Canadian National Railways of a grain elevator at Port Huron, Michigan. I undertook to obtain the information requested and I am now in a position to say that the construction of a grain elevator at Port Huron is being undertaken by private interests on the Canadian National lines in the United States; it is being financed by United States capital to take care of United States grain. The Canadian National Railways are cooperating to the fullest possible extent in the matter, and those interested desired to erect these facilities in their own country.

Mr. G. R. GEARY (South Toronto): Does the minister know the proposed location of the elevator well enough to tell me where it is to be eercted?

Mr. DUNNING: Port Huron, Michigan, is just across the river from Sarnia, Ontario

Mr. GEARY: Will the elevator be near the tunnel entrance or further up the river?

Mr. DUNNING: I cannot say exactly; I know it will be on the Canadian National lines and that is mainly what I am interested in, since we will get the traffic. I cannot give the details to my hon. friend.

NOVA SCOTIA FISHERIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): On April 29 the hon. member for Cape Breton North-Victoria (Mr. Johnstone) asked certain questions of importance. I was not in the house at the time, and his questions escaped my attention. The other day when the hon. member referred to the questions again I made a reply but had something else in mind; I thought he was referring to some other questions on the order paper. The hon. member asked as to the policy of the government in regard to steam trawlers and also as to what was the intention of the government with regard to the fishermen of the community of Ingonish, in his constituency.

Answering his first question I may say that the policy of the government with regard to steam trawlers is contained in the bill which

was introduced by myself and read the first time on February 14, which bill is still before the committee on marine and fisheries. As to the intention of the government with regard to the fishermen of Ingonish, it has been represented to the department that the dealers in that community were offering a very low price for fish and that they were buying fish by count. After inquiry as to the dealers in that locality we made representations to them suggesting that they should buy the fish by the pound and pay the fishermen a reasonable price. Of course the house will understand that we have no power to dictate the price of fish; we have made representations to these dealers but up to the present no answer has been received.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee sat last we were considering vote 133, and were dealing with the following item:

Tabusintac—wharf extension, $3,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There were one or two questions asked by my hon. friends which I promised to answer. One question was asked by the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. MacLaren) in connection with Lorneville. The hon. member asked why the total appropriation of $11,300 had not been fully expended. I have looked into this matter and I find that the estimate of the cost of removing 11,250 cubic yards, scow measurement, was $1 per yard, and it was estimated that that work would take up the whole of the appropriation. Whether the engineer's estimate was high or whether the contract price which we got for the work was low, we were able to have the work done at 65 cents per cubic yard, with the result that the total expenditure for removing very nearly that amount of material only came to about 65 per cent of what we had anticipated. I am told that it is probable that some work will be done the cost of which will come out of the general vote.

Mr. MacLAREN: I pointed out to the minister that the work had been found to be incomplete and not carried out to such an extent as to enable the work to serve the purpose for which it was intended, to make a safe refuge from heavy weather. The minister stated that he would read the report of the engineer, and I had hoped that the engineer would be recommending that some further work be done.

[Mr. Cardin.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: In the latter part of December, before the work was completed, a report was made by the engineer, and if my memory serves me aright that was the last report we received. He said, he would probably ask for a further amount to complete this next year, but apparently there has been no further request from him. I would call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the actual dredging done was within 115 cubic yards of the 11,250 cubic yards which had been estimated and for which the appropriation was made last year.

Mr. MacLAREN: Do I understand the minister to say that he expects to make arrangements to continue the work and complete it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would not say to complete it, but further work is going to be done and I expect that it will be provided for out of the general vote. Since the hon. member asked the question the other evening I have inquired into this matter, and I have the engineer's report of September 22, reading as follows:

> Your letter of 30th July, authorizing dredging to be undertaken by Mr. James S. Gregory at Lorneville. I have to report this dreging was begun on 3rd August and completed on the 22nd August, 1928. The work has been thoroughly inspected and has been found to be left in satisfactory condition. Mr. James S. Gregory, the contractor, has executed the work to my satisfaction and in accordance with the terms and spirit of the contract. I find that he is entitled to receive payment for the removal of 11,134.9 cubic yards, scow measurement, class B, at 65 cents, a total of $7,237.69.
>
> Yours obediently,
>
> Geoffrey Stead,
> District Engineer.

The engineer has furnished a plan which I shall be glad to show to my hon. friend. This plan shows that the work was done around the inside and that there is a certain amount of work to be done additional to what was authorized and for which he suggests that he would ask for an estimate. However, no request for an estimate has been received, but I am sure that part of that work can be done out of the general vote.

Mr. MacLAREN: I hope that will be sufficient. I am sure that the desire of the minister is to have the work carried out so that the result will be satisfactory, and I would ask him to request the engineer to look over that area again and consult with the people in the neighbourhood. There was a certain amount of dredging done but the work is of little value. Perhaps the additional work may correct that, but I think

it would be well if the minister would instruct the engineer to interview the people who are using this shelter and obtain their views on the situation.

Mr. ELLIOTT: When we found that we did not have the additional request which the engineer had anticipated making, we issued instructions that a report be made as to what work will be required this year and as to whether or not it can be done out of the general vote. The hon. member is evidently under a misapprehension in thinking that because only $7,312.50 was spent last year out of an appropriation of $11,300, the work was not completed. The appropriation of $11,300 was based on a cost of $1 per yard for 11,250 yards, whereas the work was actually done at a cost of 65 cents per yard. The report from the engineer, which I take to be correct, shows that the work was well done.

Mr. MacLAREN: That is not the view of the people who are trying to make use of this shelter, and I think that practical experience in a case of this kind is a very valuable test. I am under no misapprehension, as the minister thinks, because I was not considering the amount of money which was spent; my point is that the dredging has not been done in such a manner as to make the shelter suitable and available for the purposes intended. I am basing my views on the knowledge and experience of the men of the locality, who can give a very valuable, practical expression of opinion. I do not, however, want to say too much now, because I really think the minister intends to have something done. I would ask that, apart from the engineer's opinion and some soundings that have been taken, he consult with the men of the locality. They inform me that the work has not been done in accordance with the conditions of the locality so as to make it a serviceable, safe refuge.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Would my hon. friend mention anybody in the locality with whom he would suggest that I confer?

Mr. MacLAREN: It is about a year since the people interested spoke to me in regard to the matter. I cannot give the names offhand, but I will look into it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend and I are endeavouring to arrive at the same goal; we want this work properly done. My information is as I have given it. If there is a complaint, none has come to the department. The only statement the department has is the report showing that the work not only is satisfactory, but has been done at a very low price. If my hon. friend will give me the name of anybody he would like the engineer to confer with when he visits the locality, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. MacLAREN: The people complained to me, and I suppose when they did so they were depending upon me to bring the matter to the attention of the department, as I have done. It may take a few days but I shall be pleased to get some names and forward them to the minister.

Mr. GEARY: Has the department dredged out the harbour and left a shoal outside guarding it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: What my hon. friend suggests is that further work be done around the edges. It is the work around the edges that, it is stated, has not been completed.

Mr. MacLAREN: It is not quite that. They say, first that the dredging has not gone near enough to the pier so that at low tide vessels cannot remain near the pier; and, second, that the dredging is being done in an irregular way so that there are hillocks through this space. If a boat happens to be anchored on the top of a hillock, it may turn over when the tide goes down.

Mr. HANSON: Unfortunately I was not in the house when the item with respect to Escuminac was under consideration. I think it was some days ago that it was under discussion, and I have not been able to find it in Hansard. I should like to know what is the situation at Escuminac. It may be recalled that this work was started, I think as long ago as 1924-25, and that we have been since then making annual votes of about $50,000. This year I notice an amount of $40,000 is being required, and I should like to know whether this completes the work or just where we stand. My information is that what was predicted in the house some years ago has actually happened, namely, that no breakwater can be built at that point and remain there because of ice conditions. I have information now to the effect that the ice has actually lifted the works; that they are more or less of a wreck, and that the contractors are greatly exercised as to who is to bear the loss. Would the minister give a comprehensive statement as to the situation?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required to complete the work now under contract.

Mr. HANSON: That is only the part under contract. Of course this has been built, as the minister knows, in sections, one contract for each section. How much more is to be required in addition to this $40,000 to complete the whole work as projected? My recollection is that the minister's colleague,

the Minister of Health, who was Minister of Public Works at the time the project was undertaken, stated that this work was to cost a quarter of a million dollars. Nearly all, if not all, of that amount must have been voted by the house. That is the first point I should like to have elucidated.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend is quite right in stating that the work was to be done in sections. The last section is the one for which this $40,000 is required; this will complete the contract for that section. Of this amount, $23,000 is a revote. There is no appropriation at the present time for any further section or for any further portion.

Mr. HANSON: How many more units are to be built in order to complete the whole project which, I understand, originally consisted of five different units?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The original project evidently contemplated doing eventually all that is shown in red and yellow on the map that I have under my hand. My hon. friend has no doubt seen it.

Mr. HANSON: I am familiar with it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The parts marked in red on the map have been contracted for, and this is to complete the last part of what is marked in red.

Mr. HANSON: Contracted for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes; they were thought to be the most urgent. No contract has so far been entered into for the balance, and no estimate has been inserted for it. The work that has been done is the work that it was thought should be done first. As to how soon afterwards the balance will follow is a matter for future consideration.

Mr. HANSON: I quite agree. I should like to know how much, including this appropriation, will be expended, and also how much money will be required, according to the engineer's estimate, to build the portion which has not yet been contracted for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We have no estimate for the cost of the balance. The cost of this last section is $69,000.

Mr. HANSON: Would that be the total expenditure to date, including the $40,000? There is something obviously wrong about that, because we have voted several sums of $50,000 for this project, with all due respect to the minister, I think his information is incomplete.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have not under my hand the total expenditure in that vicinity. All I can say is that the present contract is $61,729 and the probable total cost of the work as shown by the details I have under my hand is as follows:

Amount of contract..	$61,729
Inspection, contingencies, etc.. ..	7,271
Total..	$69,000

Mr. HANSON: That is obviously for only one unit.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps my hon. friend will permit me just for one moment. In 1926-27, 310 feet of this breakwater was built under contract with the Burpee Construction Company, and the amount of the final expenditure was $44,672.56. With the $69,000 that will make about $113,000.

Mr. HANSON: Obviously that is not the whole story. There was $50,000 voted by this house prior to the general election of 1925 as a direct consequence of a bargain which took place before a by-election held in that county about the year 1923. I am giving this information to the minister because he was not in the department then, but the deputy minister knows the facts.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend will readily understand that I know nothing about any bargain that took place in any by-election or in any general election.

Mr. HANSON: I would like to know how much this project has cost the country so far, and how much it will cost when completed. I venture to suggest that the figures will be very startling. In addition, predictions were made which have already been fulfilled that no breakwater would ever stand the ice conditions at that point. I made a sporting offer to the Minister of Public Works of that day, the Hon. Doctor King, that if he would get a statement over the signature of Mr. Gray, who was then the district engineer in the city of St. John, that the structure proposed by the government would stand the ice conditions, there would be no opposition to the vote from this side of the house—from me at all events, because I realize that the fishermen require a shelter—but the minister was never able to get that undertaking. The prediction made by those who knew the conditions has been amply fulfilled. The ice has lifted up part of the work that has already been completed, and I want to know what the government are going to do about it. Are they going to make the contractor suffer the loss that has been sustained by reason of these ice conditions, or will the government sustain the loss? In my humble opinion it is not fair to put the loss on the contractor, because the government engineers and departmental officers had been fully

warned about the ice conditions before the vote was ever passed and before the project was undertaken.

What is the whole project estimated to cost? I remember distinctly that prior to the federal election of 1925 the then Minister of Public Works, the Hon. Doctor King, estimated that it would cost $250,000. The work was started in units estimated to cost $50,000 each, and the separate units were proceeded with year after year. I do not recall just how much work was done, but it is apparent from the minister's figures that he has not the whole data before him. I am satisfied that more than two units have been completed.

I would like an expression from the minister with respect to the ice conditions to which I have referred. The only excuse that could be given for not making a complete statement would be that litigation was pending, in which event I certainly would not want to prejudice the government's case by pressing for a statement here. I do know this, however, that information has reached me that the predictions that were made with regard to this whole project have been already fulfilled, that the work could never stand the ice conditions in the Northumberland straits or in the gulf of the St. Lawrence, where this work happens to be. That is very unfortunate, but it is nevertheless true. I want it distinctly understood that I am not opposing this vote if it can be demonstrated that the work will stand against the ice conditions but if the ice conditions are as I believe them to be, and as I have been informed, then I tell the minister that this is just so much money wasted.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In the first place, I am advised that the total estimated cost was not $250,000 as my hon. friend said, but $200,000. That was some years ago. As to the contract to which my hon. friend refers, where the ice conditions, storms or something of that kind rendered it more difficult for the contractor to perform his work, I think my hon. friend will be one of the first in the house to agree that that is something that cannot always be foreseen.

Mr. HANSON: Forewarned is forearmed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Not necessarily. There are certain things that all the forewarning in the world cannot provide against. The precautions that were taken under these specifications were the precautions that the engineers considered reasonable under the circumstances, and they were carried out. A claim has been made, I understand, and is receiving consideration, but as to what will be done about it, no decision has been made, and I am unable to inform my hon. friend what the decision will be.

Mr. HANSON: I am not going to ask the minister to tell me what the judgment of the department is, but I would point out to him that all these ice conditions were brought to the attention of the department when the project was first announced. The department and its engineers were amply warned from this side of the house that the ice conditions were such that it would be practically impossible to maintain the structure as planned and laid down by the engineers. What was then said is in accordance with what has actually happened. I understand that there has been very considerable damage to the structure by the ice conditions, for which the contractor is in no way responsible and for which he should not suffer. In any decision which the minister may arrive at, I would like to assure him that if the facts are as I understand them, there will be no criticism from me at all events—I am speaking only for myself—provided the contractor is treated fairly and squarely and decently, and provided the minister does not load on the contractor the cost of the damage occasioned by the ice conditions, unless it can be shown that he was guilty of negligence or malfeasance in the execution of his contract. I would ask the minister to give this matter his attention, because this work will run into a quarter of a million dollars before it is done if the whole work is completed. That is a large sum of money to pay for a fishermen's shelter. If it were a matter of $15,000 or $25,000, it would not be so much, but this is a quarter of a million dollars of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. STEVENS: To win a by-election.

Mr. HANSON: Yes, the vote was certainly made for the purpose of influencing a by-election as far back as 1923 or 1924. There is no doubt about that; this certainly is the payment of an election debt. But I am not so much concerned about that, because all that is over and past long ago, and we are dealing now with things as they are. I repeat that this large expenditure should not be gone on with, much as this shelter may be needed by the limited number of fishermen to whom it will be available, unless the government is absolutely certain, on the best engineering advice it can obtain, that the conditions to which I have referred will not recur. They have occurred, and that is justification enough for the attitude that has been taken on this side of the house in regard to this vote in recent years. I ask the minister to look into the matter personally before he spends one dollar of this money. May I say I am not interested in the contractor at present, for he

has passed his responsibility on to the subcontractor. Nor am I personally interested in the subcontractor—he is not a political supporter of mine, he is a supporter of the government. I know him; he is all right, he is a decent fellow. I want him to have fair play in the settlement of any claims of his which may now be pending before the department in relation to damage done by reason of ice conditions. That is as far as I wish to go.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not want to prolong the discussion,—

Mr. HANSON: I do not either.

Mr. ELLIOTT: —and I do not propose to get into an argument with my hon. friend. He is much more familiar with local conditions and with what took place there in connection with the elections than I am. But if his prophecy and the prophecy of his friends was a warning against something that was going to happen as a result of ice conditions—I take it he agrees to that; he nods his head—then his prophecy has not been fulfilled, because the claim made by the contractor, if my information is correct, is that the damage is not in any way due to ice conditions, but rather to storms.

Mr. HANSON: I may be all wrong, then.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This "I told you so" may be so easily stretched to cover something that never was intended originally that I do not want to leave my hon. friend under misapprehension any longer. With regard to the claim of the contractor, and that is always a difficult matter for the man in charge of the department, I make no promise—my hon. friend will readily understand that I cannot—as to what will happen to that contractor; but I hope when he gets through that he and the people whose money we are spending will both feel that the fair thing has been done in the matter.

Mr. HANSON: That is fair enough.

Item agreed to.

White Head—dredging, $20,500.

Mr. HANSON: Is this White Head island in the county of Charlotte? There are a good many White Heads, you know.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I understand it is in the county of Charlotte.

Mr. HANSON: Are there two items in respect of the same White Head?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. One is dredging and the other a breakwater.

[Mr. Hanson.]

Mr. HANSON: How many yards of material are intended to be moved in this dredging? And is this re-dredging; has it ever been done before by the government?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The first item, $20,500, is asked to be provided towards dredging a channel 100 feet wide extending shorewards from low water at ordinary spring tides, about 725 feet, and a basin in front of the public wharf about 200 to 250 feet wide and 200 to 300 feet long, to low water ordinary spring tides. It is contemplated that it will be necessary to remove 27,000 cubic yards of sand and gravel at $1.50 per cubic yard at an estimated cost of $40,500. The next is a breakwater at Gull Cove. The amount of $10,000 is required to construct a breakwater 153 feet long, and from 17 to 25 feet wide, for the protection of the 28 motor fishing boats employed in the cove.

Mr. HANSON: I have no doubt the work is required. Has the channel ever been dredged before? I think the minister will find that years ago it was. Perhaps he has not the information before him.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have not the information.

Mr. HANSON: I think the estimated cost of $1.50 is very high, unless there is rock there, which I do not think there is. For the information of the committee I would point out that this is an isolated island out in the bay of Fundy containing a fishing settlement. They have a great many weather conditions to contend with, and I would be the last one to deny them the facilities they ought to have if they are to carry on their work and be protected from storms. But $1.50 for that dredging is not what I should like to pay for it on a commercial basis. I hope the minister will keep that in mind when having the work done. Is it to be done by the government's own dredges or by Mr. Gregory's?

Mr. ELLIOTT: By contract.

Mr. HANSON: It will go to Mr. Gregory then.

Mr. ELLIOTT: To the lowest tenderer.

Mr. HANSON: He is the only man who is in the business in St. John.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is the St. John Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company.

Mr. HANSON: I am not sure that they are in the dredging business now.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, they are.

Mr. HANSON: Perhaps it is just recently.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend can rest assured that the same care will be taken to see that this is done at a reasonable cost as is exercised in all cases.

Mr. HANSON: That is the only warning I would give the minister. I may say that the great rise and fall of the tide there is an important factor in the cost of dredging, but even then I have no doubt the work can be done for less than $1.50.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If somebody tenders for less than that he will get the work.

Item agreed to.

Woodward's Cove—Breakwater extension, $20,000.

Mr. HANSON: Before the New Brunswick items are carried I wish to call the minister's attention to the necessity for some dredging in the river St. John at the Oromocto shoals, nine miles below the city of Fredericton in my Constituency. The soil is alluvial and rapidly fills in, and there has been no dredging done in the locality since previous to the war, I think 1912. These shoals form bars which at low water in the summer season render navigation very difficult. There is a daily steamboat running there, and at times she finds it pretty difficult to navigate. Has the minister before him in his records any recommendation with respect to dredging on the Oromocto shoals? I have not made any formal representations to the minister or to his department because I find usually they do not pay much attention to me in that respect.

Mr. ELLIOTT: You are entirely wrong.

Mr. HANSON: They are always very courteous, but I never get any action, so I have concluded it is not worth while. But I do now very seriously urge upon the minister the necessity and desirability of having such work done on the Oromocto shoals during this present season. I think it could be paid for out of the general vote. I do not ask for any large appropriation.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: There is a general vote of $30,000 at page 43.

Mr. HANSON: There is a miscellaneous vote for the maritime provinces, I understand.

Mr. STEVENS: Dredging, maritime provinces, $650,000, page 44.

Mr. HANSON: Yes, harbours and rivers generally, $650,000. These of course are sufficient to take care only of the small repairs to wharves; I should not expect dredging to be done out of this money. But there is an item somewhere—

Mr. ELLIOTT: The item of $60,000 is not for dredging. The item that would cover the question raised by my hon. friend is for dredging in the maritime provinces, $650,000.

Mr. HANSON: Out of that item I hope the minister will use a sufficient sum on the Oromocto in the coming year.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be glad to look into it.

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Harbours and rivers, Quebec, $1,826,970.

Amos—wharf repairs and improvements, $1,350.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Amos is away in the north country. Is the government undertaking to build wharves on these interior rivers?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is not a new wharf, and the work is requested by the district engineer for the proper maintenance of the present structure.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: On what river is it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This work is for the proper maintenance of a public wharf to accommodate traffic to and from Amos, which is on the Harricanaw river.

Item agreed to.

Anse au Griffons—wharf, $20,000.

Mr. HANSON: Is this new?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is a new wharf. The engineer's report states that 120 fishing boats operate from this place and the work is to provide proper facilities for the handling of trade, which would double in value with adequate accommodation. It is in the county of Gaspé.

Mr. GEARY: Are all these Anses in Gaspe?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think they are.

Mr. HANSON: How many items are there for Gaspe?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I could not tell you.

Mr. HANSON: We had a list of the post offices there; there were some eighteen, and I suppose there would be eighteen items for the county.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is one of the counties with extensive shore lines, and a great many places where the fishermen have been working under particularly hazardous and difficult conditions. We have had to refuse at least two-thirds of the requests made. They do not think they are too well treated. I believe we are doing pretty well.

Item agreed to.

Berthierville—reconstruction of icebreakers, $5,800.

Mr. GEARY: What is this?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This has been requested by the district engineer for the past three or four years, and is required for protection against the spring ice shoves which menace the road and buildings along the river front. It is to reconstruct in concrete two icebreakers already there, 27 feet by 21 feet at the base, and 14.4 feet by 9 feet at the top, with a height of 20 feet.

Mr. HANSON: Is that the gin mill?

Mr. POWER: It must be the match factory —something equally inflammable.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Is it on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Bradore bay—wharf, $25,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Is this new?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. McGIBBON: What constituency?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Charlevoix-Saguenay.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: What is it required for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Wharfage accommodation has been requested by the residents of the locality and by the Clarke Steamship Company for a number of years to provide for growing traffic which is at present greatly handicapped. Three steamers call regularly, and water is the only means of transportation for a population of about one thousand. The exports are estimated as follows: fish, fish oil and furs, $300,000; general merchandise and provisions, $250,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Is that an outlet for the Saguenay river?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is about 770 miles below Quebec on the north shore of the gulf of St. Lawrence.

[Mr. Hanson.]

Mr. GEARY: Is that the whole cost or just a start?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Just a start.

Mr. GEARY: How much will it cost?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is towards the wharf, which is estimated to cost $55,560. In order to render it of value, however, there will have to be a freight shed as well, worth $5,000.

Mr. HANSON: And breakwater?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No breakwater is proposed.

Item agreed to.

Cabano—wharf repairs, $2,400.

Mr. HANSON: Is this on Temiscouata lake?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. HANSON: Do any steamboats operate on that lake?

Mr. POULIOT: I am not the Minister of Public Works but I might give a short explanation with regard to this item. Cabano is a big place on the shore of Temiscouata lake, which is 27 miles long and over a mile wide. On the other side of lake Temiscouata there is a farm settlement called Squatek, which consists of 700 or 800 people. A big mill has been erected at Cabano by the Fraser Company, which cuts the wood on the eastern shore of the lake.

Mr. POWER: For which company is this wood cut?

Mr. POULIOT: I do not know, but I do know that my hon. friend from York-Sunbury is the attorney for the company.

Mr. HANSON: The company does not use this wharf at all; the company builds its own wharves and does not ask the government for help. This is a public wharf for the good of the community. I am not objecting to the item, but I want to know if any steamships operate on that lake. I have been there a good many times without seeing any steamships, although I understand a ferry operates across that lake, which is long and narrow as my hon. friend has said.

Mr. POULIOT: It is also very deep.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My information is that the wharf is used for small vessels carrying supplies for the lumber camps in that district, and the engineer reports that repairs are necessary at Cabano because of the dangerous condition of the flooring on the wharf.

Mr. HANSON: I am not objecting to the item but I wish to know if there is any public traffic there. I want to correct the impression of the hon. member for Temiscouata that this wharf is used at all by the Fraser Company.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My information is that the traffic at this point is comparatively heavy; the ferry boats make from six to ten trips daily with passengers and freight and the exports and imports amount to approximately $190,000 annually.

Item agreed to.

Cap Chat—harbour repairs and improvements, $8,500.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Is this on Anticosti island?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, it is in Gaspe county.

Mr. HANSON: Is Cap Chat on the line of the Quebec Oriental railway which is about to be purchased by the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. POWER: No, it is on the north shore.

Mr. HANSON: Is there any railway communication at this point now?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Item agreed to.

Cap Chat —harbour improvements—The Canadian Paper Board Company to contribute one-third of cost, $25,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Is there anything for Anticosti this year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Nothing this year.

Mr. HANSON: Is this a revote?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. HANSON: Nothing was spent last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. HANSON: Will the work be proceeded with this year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That depends on whether the parties interested can satisfy us that the developments for which this sum is intended to provide facilities are sure to go on.

Items agreed to.

Charlemagne—dredging, $10,000.

Mr. HANSON: Where is that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is at L'Assomption, near Montreal.

Item agreed to.

Cross Point—wharf repairs, $1,900.

Mr. HANSON: Cross Point is immediately opposite Campbellton. I understand that a wharf has been maintained at Cross Point for a number of years.

Mr. MARCIL: Since 1904.

Mr. HANSON: And I presume this amount is intended to repair that wharf. In connection with the whole situation on the Baie des Chaleurs, would the minister tell us whether the dredging of the harbour at Campbellton and the other necessary dredging between Campbellton and Cross Point was completed last year? This is a large shipping point both for exports and imports.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Of course my hon. friend is aware of the item for Campbellton in the New Brunswick list.

Mr. HANSON: I was not here when that item was passed, and I would like to know if that is the estimate of what is required to complete the dredging at Campbellton or whether that is what is to be done this year.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is all that will be done this year.

Mr. HANSON: I would like to point out that there is a very substantial development in that part of the province, with a large paper mill being erected at Dalhousie and a very large sulphite pulp mill being erected two miles above the town of Campbellton. A very large amount of supplies will be brought in through Campbellton and it will be the point of shipment by water for perhaps eight months of the year if these companies utilize water transportation, so I think the government should do that dredging at Campbellton this year. It has been requested for quite a long time, and now it is really required; this is practically the only point in the province where there is any large development going on. This is one case where an expenditure of this kind can be fully justified and I submit that the work should be done now and not carried out piecemeal. That is my judgment in the matter and I would like to see the department give attention to this request that the dredging at Campbellton be completed at once. The officers of the department will tell the minister that this is the point of shipment for millions of feet of lumber during the open season and difficulty has been experienced in getting the ships to the piers by reason of the fact that the river fills in the channel, which must naturally recur from time to time be-

cause of the very nature of the river and of the deposits which are brought down annually. I hope the minister will give attention to this request.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I can only say that at present there is nothing in the estimates for Campbellton other than the item of $13,600.

Mr. HANSON: I understand that nothing was done last year.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, a good deal was done last year. This $13,600 is a revote because we spent only $16,628 last year out of an appropriation of $30,000.

Mr. HANSON: It is my recollection that only part of the work was done, and I would like to know why it was not completed. It might be more convenient to the minister if we could delay this matter until the vote comes up again, but possibly we could have the information now. The minister may have a very good reason why the contemplated derdging was not done.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Apparently they succeeded in doing $16,628 worth of work last year up to the 31st of March.

Mr. HANSON: Was that a contract?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That was under contract.

Mr. HANSON: Who was the contractor?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Felix Michaud of Buctouche. The contract was for 57½ cents per cubic yard, scow measurement, and that probably accounts for the difference. The contract was dated September 12, 1928, and completion was set for December 3, 1928, but apparently they were not able to complete the work. The time was not very long between September 12 and December 3.

Mr. HANSON: I do not understand why there was a delay in letting the contract, because the money was voted prior to June 1. I am interested in knowing whether Mr. Felix Michaud owns a dredge. This gentleman is the brother of the late member for Restigouche-Madawaska, a gentleman for whom we all entertained the very highest regard during the many years he was a member of this house, but who was peremptorily retired by the electors of that constituency in 1925. I would like to know who actually did the dredging work, as my recollection is that Mr. Felix Michaud is a very respectable farmer of Buctouche and has not hitherto been in the dredging business.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I understand that he has been in dredging business for many years.

[Mr. Hanson.]

Mr. HANSON: I do not understand so, and I do not believe it either.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I can only say that there seems to have been some delay.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to explain the situation at Cross Point. This is the most important wharf in my constituency due to the fact that all the traffic between Campbellton and Cross Point passes over this wharf. I think over five or six thousand automobiles passed over this wharf last year. The wharf was erected a long time ago—in 1904—and it was proposed to erect an interprovincial bridge at that point. The government of New Brunswick has undertaken to pay its share, the government of Canada is to pay one-third and we are waiting for the government of the Province of Quebec to agree to pay their third of the cost of the bridge. It is estimated that the bridge over the Restigouche river will cost about a million dollars; it will be very important work and is badly needed. Of course the wharf at Cross Point will be retained because there is very heavy traffic at that point. Champoux Brothers used to have a large mill at Restigouche but it was sold to the International Paper Company. The Madawaska corporation has purchased or leased this mill for four or five years and this year will conduct very extensive operations on the Matapedia and Restigouche rivers. I am in accord with the member for York-Sunbury when he says that Campbellton is the most important port in northern New Brunswick. An extensive development is going on at Dalhousie where the International Paper Company are erecting a huge pulp mill, and another mill is to be erected at Athol. In view of the operations being carried on at Campbellton, and in view of the intended operations at Dalhousie and Restigouche, I am sure the minister should give this matter more than passing attention and see that facilities are granted to this part of the country, which includes territory in both provinces, so that the trade may be carried on.

Mr. HANSON: Will the minister say that the dredging will be done this year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Where?

Mr. HANSON: At Campbellton and Cross Point. It is all the same thing.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We will make every possible endeavour to do it, and I am rather hoping that it will be done this year.

Mr. HANSON: There is no reason why the minister could not give an undertaking that it will be done if parliament provides the money.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We cannot always get dredges to do the work, and we sometimes get tenders which look a little high. I do not think the hon. member realizes the difficulties in connection with these different contracts.

Mr. STEVENS: Do your best.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will do the very best I can; that is all I can say to the hon. member.

Item agreed to.

Donnacona — harbour improvements — The Donnacona Paper Co. to contribute one-third of cost, $50,000.

Mr. HANSON: This will be new work?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. HANSON: I think this vote requires considerable explanation.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required to go toward the construction of a long wharf out to deep water in the St. Lawrence river, mainly for the shipment of newsprint, pulp, roofing and agricultural products. The Donnacona Paper Company has been urging these harbour improvements for a number of years, and several schemes have been studied. This wharf will also be used as a coaling station and general operating base for the government ice-breakers and will be available as a shelter for river craft between Cap Rouge and Pointe Platon. It is claimed that this structure will hold the ice and prevent jamming at Cap Rouge, thus preventing the disastrous floods from Cap Rouge to Sorel. The whole work will be very expensive, and it looks as if the total would run into the vicinity of a million dollars, to be divided between the company and the government. The following letter has been received from the chief engineer of the province of Quebec:

A letter has been received from the Acting Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries enclosing copy of memorandum, dated 12th April, 1929, from Mr. N. B. McLean, of the river St. Lawrence ship channel engineering staff which deals with the points raised as to the influence of this proposed structure.

Mr. McLean is of the opinion that the wharf would not interfere with traffic or ice conditions;

(2) That the wharf would hold a large section of batture ice in place, preventing it floating off during the high water to jam later at Cap Rouge;

(3) That the wharf would make a place of shelter for ice-breakers and commercial vessels. At present when ice-breakers are working at Portneuf, it is necessary to shelter in the batture ice, which is not always safe.

In order that the wharf may be of the greatest advantage to ice-breakers and commercial vessels, Mr. McLean suggests that the outer end of the wharf be built out to the 30-foot contour line shown on the chart, copy of which he attaches. He further suggests a berth 500 feet in length, dredged to not less than 25 feet, should be provided on the upper and lower sides of the wharf inside the headblock, and that the depth at the outer face of the headblock be not less than 25 feet, all depths at low water.

The district engineer in his report calls attention to the fact that Donnacona is situated on the river Jacques Cartier on the north shore of the St. Lawrence river, in the county of Quebec West. Previous to 1911, Donnacona consisted of timber and farm lands; now it is one of the most important pulp and paper centres of the province of Quebec. In 1912 a sixty-ton newsprint paper mill was erected by the Donnacona Pulp and Paper Company, with a 60-ton groundwood pulp mill and a 30-ton sulphite paper mill, giving employment to 800 men. Since then the company has increased its plant so as to have a daily production of 220 tons of newsprint, 200 tons of groundwood pulp, and 60 tons of sulphite pulp, giving employment to about 1,600 men. The company has not yet completed its program of extension and if necessary accommodation by navigation is provided at Donnacona, it is the intention of the company to double the capacity of its mill, to produce at least 500 tons of newsprint per day, meaning an additional population of about 5,000 inhabitants. The company owns and operates another groundwood pulp mill at Pont Rouge, producing about 5,000 tons per year.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Is this a public wharf?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. HANSON: That is a very rosy picture to paint in the face of present conditions.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is the only condition on which we would be spending the money.

Mr. HANSON: Will the minister, before he spends this money, say that he will bind the Donnacona Company to build a plant turning out 500 tons of newsprint per day? Because if he does so I am satisfied the money will never be spent.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In matters of this kind appropriations have been held up because the development has not been started, and before we commence this work the government will be satisfied that its expectation in regard to the development that is to take place is assured.

Mr. HANSON: I am satisfied that the work will not go on this year under present conditions.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Then the money will not be spent.

Mr. HANSON: I wish to know whether the building of these piers and works and the expenditure of this public money will take away from the Canadian National or the Canadian Pacific a freight tonnage which they now possess, and whether that is the policy of the company? That is what happened in relation to Matane and still worse, it was for a foreign company in Erie, Pennsylvania. This government spent a large sum of money to build a pier at Matane and, if my recollection is correct, the Hammermill people did not contribute anything, but the direct consequence was a reduction in tonnage from that point to the national railway. What effect will this have upon the Canadian railways?

Mr. ELLIOTT: If my information is correct, this will take nothing away from the Canadian National railway. The object is to encourage the creation of new business.

Mr. HANSON: What about taking tonnage away from the Canadian Pacific?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It will not.

Mr. POWER: Perhaps I should be the last to rise in the house to defend any project initiated by the Price Brothers company. The Donnacona Paper Company belongs to Price Brothers, and for many years members of the Price family have been in distinct and energetic antagonism to the principles which I represent in the constituency for which I sit in this house. But at the same time, common justice compels me to say that in this case at any rate there is a good deal to be said in favour of the passing of the item. I do not think it is intended to go on with any further newsprint production. The hon. member for York-Sunbury was, I think, quite right in saying that no newsprint company at the present time wishes or would be allowed to increase the production of newsprint, but I understand there is to be a mill utilized for the purpose of using the waste products, slabs, et cetera, of some of the other mills. I am not quite sure what the product is. It is a species of fibre board, but I do not think it is along the lines of insulex and other fibre boards that are being made. It is proposed to bring the waste material from other mills belonging to Price Brothers on the St. Lawrence river and rivers in the north country to Donnacona as much as possible by water and to export the finished product by water to the old country. That, I understand, is the project which the company has laid before the minister and which it intends to carry out. If such be the case, there will be no question of taking away tonnage from either the Canadian National or the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is this a settled policy adopted by the government that they will provide large amounts for wharves and repairs provided that some industry contributes one-third?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Every case has to stand or fall on its own merits. For years this practice has been followed with a view to encouraging industries which perhaps would not come here at all or would not go on with the development which they contemplate unless the government were sympathetic in regard to wharfage facilities and dredging.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Last year the estimates contained one or two items of the same nature and evidently they have been dropped.

Mr. ELLIOTT: They were not gone on with because the project had not reached the point where we were satisfied that it was going on this year. For that reason they were dropped.

Mr. GEARY: Does the department get any security for the performance by the company of its promise to pay?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We take a guarantee bond from them.

Mr. GEARY: A company bond?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Dundee—improvement to drains, $7,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: What has the government to do with the improvement of drains? I thought that was a matter with which the municipality or the province had to deal.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In this case it was represented that the government had responsibility because the construction of the dam at its outlet had raised the level of lake St. Francis.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Where is Dundee?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Chateauguay-Huntingdon.

Item agreed to.

Grande Anse (Gaspe County) — wharf, $15,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Is this a new item?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. MacNUTT: What is it for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This work is to provide facilities for the loading and unloading of fishing barges, one hundred in number, which at the present time have to be lightered under great difficulties.

Item agreed to.

Grondines—completion of wharf, $18,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: There was no vote last year. Would the minister explain how he is going to complete a wharf on which no work seems to have been done last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is Sir Lomer Gouin's birthplace.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The proposed work is to complete the construction of the wharf commenced in 1923-24 by the addition of an extension 120 feet in length and 30 feet in depth, to be cribwork substructure with a concrete wall superstructure, the space between the walls to be filled with stone ballast and surfaced with crushed stone macadam, and the whole extension to be provided with a slip to enable boats to use this approach.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: It is really an enlargement of the wharf?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Has business there grown so much that this is required?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is what the engineer reports.

Item agreed to.

Lake St. Louis—dredging, $50,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I suppose this is a work that has to be gone on with nearly every year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Work has been done nearly every year, but we are pretty nearly finished now.

Item agreed to.

Little Montreal river—dredging—the provincial government to contribute a like amount, $15,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Where is this?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is in Laprairie-Napierville.

Item agreed to.

Marsouins—wharf, $5,500.

Mr. GEARY: What is this for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is to construct a small wharf or landing pier 75 feet long and 27 feet wide, a short distance from the outer end of the jetty on the eastern shore of the mouth of the Marsouins river. In his annual estimates District Engineer Amiot reports as follows:

It is requested that the slab jetty located on the eastern shore of mouth of river be protected by an outside crib of 75 feet by 27 feet. This crib can also be utilized as a landing and will protect and facilitate the entrance to the harbour.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: What county is this in?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Gaspe.

Mr. GEARY: Are there any boats there at all? How much will this wharf be used?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am unable to give my hon. friend the number of boats, but there are tugs used in connection with the lumber industry. The exports of lumber amount yearly to $80,000, and the imports of goods and general merchandise to approximately $30,000.

Mr. GEARY: Where is this place?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is a village twenty-five miles below Ste. Anne des Monts on the south shore of the gulf of St. Lawrence in the county of Gaspe.

Item agreed to.

Matane—harbour improvements, $33,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): This is a very large sum. What is it for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is required for the following improvements:

(1) An extension to breakwater 300 feet in length by 25 feet wide in stone filled open faced cribwork, $22,000;

(2) Repairs and improvements to town wharf consisting of driving protection piles along west and north faces of outer end, $5,000;

(3) Laying a double two-inch flooring over present flooring on outer end, $1,500; and renewing stringers and planking on older part of wharf, $2,500, or a total of $9,000;

(4) To complete renewal of superstructure of older portion of east breakwater on a length of 140 feet by width of 27 feet which is in a dilapidated condition, replacing stringers, planking and cap pieces and reinforcing outer end, $2,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I understand that Matane is only a small place. What would be the trade for the port, and what would it consist of? When we are spending $33,000 of public money there must be some justification for it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The main industry is lumbering. I will give my hon. friend an extract from the district engineer's report.

Matane is a large and ambitious village situated on the south shore of the gulf of St. Lawrence, 60 miles east from Rimouski. It is the shiretown of Matane county and the industrial and the business centre of the portion of the county located along the gulf shore. The Canada Gulf Terminal Railway, which joins the Canadian National railway at Mont Joli, has its terminus and main office in Matane. The population of the village itself is 3,500 inhabitants; with the parishes, it is approximately 7,000.

The main industry is lumbering. The Price Bros. Co. has a 15,000,000 feet board measure yearly capacity mill operating at that place; the Hammermill Paper Co. of Erie, Penn., which bought, a year ago, the timber holdings formerly operated by the Canada Gulf Terminals Railway, is also operating a saw-mill and more particularly a pulpwood plant of an approximate yearly capacity of 25,000 cords.

He goes on:

Matane harbour has become the shipping and distributing point for the many lumber, logging and cutting camps, and saw-mills are operated on the north shore from Bersimis down to Moisie.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I notice again that a large sum of money is being spent presumably for the benefit of Price Brothers. I understand they are the large operators there. We are developing a better harbour for them at an expense of $30,000.

Mr. HANSON: Not Price Brothers; the Hammermill people.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I do not think this expenditure is justified.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): As a matter of curiosity, in what estimate does this vote of $30,000 for 1928-29 appear? It says "1928-29, $30,000." Matane does not appear in the main estimates of last year. Is it in the supplementaries?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I should think my hon. friend is incorrect, because I have here a revote of $25,000 of $30,000 in the estimates of last year.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I have been following the figures given here and in several cases they are wrong. In the main estimates for last year Matane does not appear at all.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It must be in the supplementaries then. Has my hon. friend the supplementaries before him?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): No.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend can take it as pretty certain that these contracts to which I have referred, and which cover the greater portion of this expenditure, would not have been entered into if we had not had a vote last year.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): In several cases the figures are wrongly stated in the vote for last year.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): In which constituency is this money to be spent?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Matane county. Do you want the name of the gentleman who represents it?

Mr. DIONNE: I know this place very well, for the one good reason that I was born there. The following figures will give some idea of the amount of business done at this point:

Price Brothers & Co. Ltd.	
Lumber shipped.. 10,543,000 B.M.	
Lath.. .. .. .. 4,047,800 B.M.	
R.R. ties.. .. .. 7,387 pcs.	
General freight received:	
Price Brothers & Co. Ltd..	300 tons
Hammermill Paper Co. (pulp shipped).. 33,439 cords	
Freight unloaded and loaded at Matane by coasting traders:	
Rose-Helene (Capt. Z. Castonguay)..	3,027
A. Renaud (Capt. Ls. Castonguay).. ..	2,750
Legere (Capt. T. Piuze)..	3,340
Gilly (Capt. W. Guimond)..	3,000
Marco Pola (Capt. C. E. Heppell)..	2,025
Toussaint, Odilus, Pucelle d'Orléans Heppel Transportation Company	4,000

And there is—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. DIONNE: And there is a lot of other business transacted at Matane.

Item agreed to.

Mechins—wharf extension and repairs, $20,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: This is a new item, apparently.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): In many instances the references are wrong.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I hardly think my hon. friend is correct. This amount of $20,000 is required to complete payment to Messrs. Clouthier & Gaudreault in connection with their contract for the reconstruction and extension of this wharf, for repairs to the flooring and fenders on a length of 191 feet and towards a further extension of 200 feet.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Are Clouthier & Gaudreault the same contractors as are doing the work at Matane?

Mr. ELLIOTT: They are the same.

Mr. DIONNE: Mechins is 45 miles from Matane. There is no railroad. The wharf is under construction. It is one of the finest places along the St. Lawrence for a harbour. After the construction of this wharf shelter will be provided against the heavy storms along this coast and it will enable the people to land there at any time, because there will be at least 25 feet of water at low tide.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How much of the vote last year was spent?

Mr. ELLIOTT: $10,872.80.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Was this work done by tender and contract?

Mr. ELLIOTT: All but $1,600 was done by contract.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): How many tenders were received by the government, and what was the amount of each?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Only two tenders were received: Cloutier & Gaudreault, $36,378, and Ludger Lemieux Limited, $38,434. The $1,600 worth of repairs to the flooring were done by day labour.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): How is it that both contracts at Matane and Mechins were done by the same contractors? Is the government following the same policy that obtains in Nova Scotia, that of giving all contracts to one group of individuals?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does my hon. friend really mean that, in regard to contracts let by tender? Does he think that is a fair statement?

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Is the same policy followed in Nova Scotia?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The same policy is followed in both places.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): In Nova Scotia we know exactly what has happened. We find that at two points the contracts were held by the same group of individuals.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think there is anything unusual about that, where the man is the lowest tenderer. The lowest tenderer may get two contracts, and in fact he is more likely to get both in the same vicinity than in places widely apart. But if my hon. friend means to suggest that any preference was given to contractors tendering for work done under this department he will find that the contractors of this country will not back him up in such a statement.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): In the past the contractors of Nova Scotia have not been backing me up, nor have they backed up anyone else but themselves and the government they support. So far as Nova Scotia is concerned I do not believe that, in the case of one or two contracts, the lowest tenderer got the award.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Will the hon. gentleman refer me to any place where the lowest tenderer did not get the contract?

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): A contract was let at Port Maitland this year.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The lowest tenderer got the contract; he was the lowest by many thousands.

Item agreed to.

Montmagny—improvement to protection walls, $30,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Was there a supplementary vote last year in regard to this?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is a revote.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What is meant by "protection walls"?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is a revote from 1928-29, and is required to improve the banks of the river at several points near Montmagny to prevent flooding and consequent damage.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Why was no work done last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There was a good deal of delay getting releases from some of the persons whose lands were affected.

Item agreed to.

Natashquan—wharf repairs and extension, $19,300.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: This is on the gulf of St. Lawrence and it is a place in which I take a little interest in that some years ago I had to do with the service there. Last year there was a vote which does not seem to have been spent. Perhaps the minister will tell us what the condition is at Natashquan.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Of this amount $18,000 is a revote. The money is required to com-

plete the construction of an extension to the wharf under contract with Mr. Joseph Gagnon. The amount spent last year to March 31 was $10,581.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): There is in the supplementary estimates a large amount which has not been expended.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In the main estimates last year there was an amount for wharf repairs of $1,500, and in the supplementary estimates, for wharf extension, $38,000, making a total of $39,500. At the time these estimates were prepared the probable expenditure to March 31 was reported to us to be $21,500. Actually, only $10,581 was expended.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: In the Auditor General's report there is no mention of Natashquan as having received any expenditure last year.

Mr. STEVENS: That is the year before.

Mr. ELLIOTT: When the estimates are being prepared, in the early part of February and sometimes in January, it is difficult to tell in a great many instances how much will be expended before March 31, so that we have to arrive at the best estimate we can.

Item agreed to.

Newport—wharf replacement, $10,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Where is that?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Gaspe.

Item agreed to.

Norton creek—dredging—the provincial government to contribute a like amount, $28,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Where is this and why are you spending all this money on a creek?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is in Chateauguay-Huntingdon, and is required to complete excavation work begun in 1912-13 and continued in 1913-14 and 1914-15. It was suspended during the war. The object is to enable this creek to take care of the spring floods.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Does the minister really think this is something which should be done by the Dominion government? I happen to know something about this work and I understand it is really for the purpose of assisting in the drainage of the country; it is not in any sense a harbour improvement, as I understand it, or anything in which the Dominion government should take an interest. This is work which, if they think it should be undertaken, should be done by the county or by the provincial government. I would like the minister to say whether this work is not really for the purpose of draining that part of the country.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is something to be said for my hon. friend's contention, and I went over this matter with a good deal of care when we were considering the estimate. Of course, in these years when flooding is much more troublesome than in previous years we are meeting with claims from all over the country, but it is pretty difficult to get over the contention that we should carry on the work we have already started and on which we expended $18,816, especially if the provincial government is ready to assist. The previous work at this point was done with no contribution from the provincial government, and in nearly all these cases there is something which has been done by the Dominion government which is urged as one of the reasons why the particular damage has occurred.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: The minister should be able to give a better reason than that. We have the Rideau river right at our doors here, and every year there is trouble in connection with the flooding of that river. Would the minister consider an application for half the cost of necessary works to take care of that condition if the Ontario government paid the other half?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The minister must consider every application coming from any source, and if a precedent has been established by this government it is difficult to refuse such an application particularly if the provincial government says, as in this case, that part of the work was done by the Dominion government years ago with no contribution from the provincial government, and that all the work done previously will be wasted unless a further expenditure is made. In this case the provincial government is willing to bear half the expense, and in this way perhaps we can make useful the expenditure which was made in former years. With regard to the proposition of my hon. friend, I should be very glad to give consideration to it, and if we are bound by any precedent established in previous years, as is the case here, I should think we would have a good deal of difficulty in refusing such an application.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I have no desire to hold up the committee on a matter of this kind, but I believe this to be a danger-

ous policy, and if the minister stays in office very long I believe he will have a great deal of difficulty with other cases as a result of adopting it.

Mr. POULIOT: I have just one word to say with regard to this item. This is the second instance in which the provincial government has contributed an amount equal to that contributed by the federal government for dredging. I remember that some time this spring the Premier of the province of Quebec said that the sum of $5,000,000 should be spent for dredging the St. Charles river near Quebec, and I wonder if the government of Quebec has offered to pay half that amount.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not remember receiving any word to that effect.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: The hon. member for Temiscouata has raised the question of the St. Charles river, and I am grateful to him for having done so. I have known of the conditions existing in the St. Charles river for a number of years; some work has been done there and I believe about $2,500,000 has been spent on that work by the federal government.

Mr. POULIOT: Then the balance should be provided by the province of Quebec.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Just let me follow up my argument. Over $2,500,000 was spent on the St. Charles river, but when the Tory government came into power in 1911 they saw fit to suspend this work and since that time the greater part of the work done has been destroyed. The citizens of Quebec are very anxious that this work should be proceeded with, and I understand that at a banquet in Quebec not long ago Mr. Taschereau said that this work should be proceeded with and that his government would certainly contribute to the cost. More than that, the city council of Quebec would be quite willing to share the cost. I think this fact should be mentioned and the government asked to continue the work which they undertook to carry out under a written agreement between the city of Quebec and the federal government.

Mr. POULIOT: Then I would make another suggestion; the provincial government should not be the only body called upon to contribute. I suggest that the Royal Trust Company, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, the Sun Life Assurance Company, Barclay's Bank and La Caisse d'Economie, of which Mr. Taschereau is a director, should also be called upon to contribute to this work.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I am sorry my hon. friend does not take this question seriously, because the work on the river St. Charles should not be made a joke. The citizens of Quebec believe this work should be proceeded with, and as I said a moment ago I know that the provincial government would be willing to contribute to the cost.

Mr. POULIOT: I am quite serious in the matter, and in addition I would suggest that when the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency dies a monument should be erected to him on the banks of the river St. Charles.

Mr. McGIBBON: If I might interrupt this family quarrel I would like to ask if this is a principle which has been laid down by the government and if so whether they are following that principle in other provinces. I understand that in this case money is being spent to drain land. Is this private or public land?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We endeavour to carry out the same policy throughout the country wherever we have started work of this kind, and I think there are some places where we would not be carrying on this work had we not started it in previous years. I think we are doing similar work in one place in Manitoba and at another point in Ontario, where we were confronted with practically the same situation.

Mr. STEVENS: Then this would be a good time to stop.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps it would not be a bad time to stop this work in all these places. I am not going to enter into a discussion on this point, but in nearly each case there is the difficulty that some Dominion work, a railway or some other public work, is linked up with the matter. I do not recall that this is the case at this point, but I have no doubt that whoever started this work in the first place did so with the idea that it would assist navigation or do something which was part of the obligation of the Dominion government. At any rate the same practice is followed throughout.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister had better include those two items in what the Prime Minister calls "vicious" principles.

Item agreed to.

Peribonka—wharf repairs, $3,500.

Mr. GEARY: One has to study geography to know whether or not there are any other places in the province of Quebec where a wharf might be required.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I can furnish the hon. member with a list of many scores of requests for wharves which have been absolutely refused. We have granted only those requests where the residents seem to be undergoing a certain amount of hardship on account of not having accommodation.

Mr. GEARY: Is it on account of that province being on the St. Lawrence river?

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I do not think Peribonka is on the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, that is on lake St. John.

Mr. GEARY: I am not complaining in regard to these votes, but one is struck with the number of places which seem to require this sort of work.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If the hon. member will compare the proportion of the total expenditure and the number of different works he will find that there is not a larger percentage attributable to this province than to any other, either in amount or in number. In the constituency of Gaspe, Charlevoix-Saguenay and Bonaventure there are many settlements which have no railway accommodation.

Mr. GEARY: It is largely a question of serving the communities along the St. Lawrence which are not served by railways?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Quite so.

Mr. GEARY: I am not speaking in a critical tone at all, but I wanted to know how it happened that so many places seemed to have only water communication.

Mr. MARCIL: The province of Quebec has over 2,000 miles of coast line, and if you leave the railway and go down to the limits of Labrador you have practically one thousand miles of shore line on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. Quebec is one of the important maritime provinces of the Dominion. From Murray Bay to Labrador there is no railway and from Matane to Gaspe there is no railway; the only means of communication is by water, and the majority of the people make their living from the water and must have protection for their boats.

Mr. FRASER: Are these to be temporary or permanent structures?

[Mr. McGibbon.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: There will be some timber used, but the structure will be as permanent as it is possible to make it.

Mr. MacNUTT: I have a pretty good knowledge of the life of underwater timber construction in Nova Scotia, and if the timber differs in other provinces as it does in Nova Scotia, I think the day has arrived when treated timber should be used for these smaller wharves. I realize that the larger structures are built with creosoted timber, but in view of the enormous cost of maintaining our wharves in the maritime provinces I believe some consideration should be given to the greater use of treated pilings. Has the minister given this feature of the matter any consideration?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Wherever limnoria are present we endeavour to have the timber treated, but as far as we know there are none in this particular district to which we are referring. Wherever the engineers consider that creosoted timber should be used we endeavour to employ that class of timbers. In some cases it is difficult to get it without going outside of the country, and we are making some progress in encouraging the treatment of timber in Canada.

Mr. GEARY: There are a great many wharves along the river-front at Sarnia, and I should like to know whether there is a government wharf among them. Is it the policy of the government to provide water transportation or communication by means of government wharves wherever the people require it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think the hon. member is correct; I do not believe there is a government wharf at Sarnia at the present time. However, there has been considerable expenditure at Sarnia with very excellent results. We have provided for the elevator there, and there has been a great deal of dredging done.

Mr. GEARY: Will it be the policy of the government from this time on to provide water communication where required, irrespective of what the town may be or where it may be?

Mr. ELLIOTT: You cannot lay down one rule which will apply to every case. You must consider whether or not the town has railway facilities and whether the people are using the waters for pleasure only. I think the best answer to make would be to say that you must consider every case on its own merits and try to overcome those cases of hardship where the people are suffering through lack of accommodation.

Item agreed to.

Port Lewis—dredging, $15,600.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Where is Port Lewis?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Chateauguay-Huntingdon.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Is it on the St. Lawrence river?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is on lake St. Francis.

Item agreed to.

Richelieu river—improvements, $150,000.

Mr. McGIBBON: Will the minister give us some explanation of this?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount of $150,000, of which $83,000 is a revote from last year, is required to continue a scheme of improving navigation on the Richelieu river, the dredging part of which was commenced in 1928 under contract with Les Chantiers Manseau. The contract amounts to $96,904. Last year we were able to expend only $11,000 out of the amount that was voted.

Item agreed to.

Riviere au Tonnerre—wharf, $50,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Will the minister explain about this? It is a new work.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This work was requested by District Engineer Sabourin in a report dated September 22, 1928, and by various petitions from the residents ever since 1915. The annual traffic at this point is reported to amount to about $90,000. This amount of $50,000 is required towards the construction of a wharf composed of an approach of the pier and bridge type 675 feet in length by 16 in width, and an open-faced cribwork headblock, 425 in length by 30 feet in width and having a height at the outer end of 35 feet with 20 feet of water at low tide.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: How much will it cost altogether?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The estimate would be about $110,000 altogether.

Item agreed to.

Riviere des Prairies—improvements, $40,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): This is a new vote. What is it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is required toward the restoration of navigation in Riviere des Prairies by providing a 12-foot channel from Bout de l'Ile to the village of Riviere des Prairies and the construction of a wharf at the village. This work has been requested since 1910 when the channel, formerly kept in good condition, was allowed to fill in.

Item agreed to.

St. Antoine de Tilly—dredging, $64,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will the minister explain this item? It is a large amount of dredging.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount of $64,000 contains a revote from last year of $28,500. It is in the county of Lotbiniere. This work was requested by District Engineer Grandmont in his annual estimates. Owing to insufficient water in the channel leading to the wharf at this place, the boats can land only at high tide, which makes it very inconvenient as there is no railway connection at this locality, the only means of transportation being by water. There are two regular lines of steamers calling at this wharf four times a week when water conditions permit. There are now under contract with the National Dock and Dredging Corporation, dredging operations for deepening the channel, 150 feet wide leading to the government wharf, involving the removal of 35,402 cubic yards scow measure of clay, sand and gravel.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Could the minister give us offhand the quantity of dredging to be done in Quebec during the present year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I could not give that offhand, but the total appropriation for Quebec under harbours and rivers is $1,826,970 and, if my memory serves me aright, it is a lower percentage of the total amount than in a number of previous years.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I notice there are some large sums for dredging, for instance $20,000, $30,000, $69,000. I also note under item 141 an amount of $600,000 for dredging for Ontario and Quebec. Could the minister give the committee offhand the amount that is to be expended for dredging alone in Quebec? This is a very large amount of money for that purpose, and I feel that we in Nova Scotia are not receiving a like amount, although we have a great deal of sea coast and our harbours and rivers are more important to us on account of our fishing industry.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): When there are these large amounts for dredging, why not increase the large amounts instead of inserting the small items? What is the object in doing it in this way?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I quite agree with my hon. friend, but this practice has prevailed for years. We may be very frank in the committee with regard to the reason for it. It is that the Department of Public Works is the only one that does not receive large lump

sums to expend as the other departments do. I am not sure that the house is not entitled to pass upon these various small items. Of course it takes up a great deal of time, and I am not objecting to that; but there is a feeling in the department that if we had the freedom to put in a larger amount for harbours and rivers generally, and not put in so many separate little items for $1,000 or $1,100, it would be in the interests of the country as a whole and would undoubtedly save the time of the committee. I am entirely in the hands of the committee. We are simply following what has been the rule in the past, and I felt that it was not fair to put these small items into the general vote.

Mr. McGIBBON: It is a pretty good rule, and you had better stick to it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It makes the passing of your estimates much more difficult, but it has this advantage, that everybody knows before the money is voted where it is to be spent. I have no serious objection to that practice, but it would leave much greater discretion to the officials of the department and to the minister if these small items were bulked in the general vote. I submit very respectfully to the committee that with the business of the country increasing, with business being done to-day at places where it amounted to practically nothing a few years ago, the general vote must of necessity be increased much beyond what we have attempted to increase it this year.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am not objecting to these smaller items being put in separately. I am objecting to the large amount in the general vote, and then when an emergency arises and people want a little bit of dredging done at some important place the owners have to pay for the dredging themselves. I would rather see this large general vote broken up into smaller items so that we might know how the money is going to be spent. With such a large amount as this for dredging, one would think that private people would not have to pay for any emergency that has to be done. I have no objection to the practice of putting these small items in separately; I think it is right.

Item agreed to.

Shelter bay—dredging, $10,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Where is this?

Mr. ELLIOTT: In Charlevoix-Saguenay. This work is requested by the district engineer in his report dated June 19, 1928. It is to provide sufficient depth of water to permit steamers and barges to land at the north side of the wharf. The traffic amounts to some $2,550,000 annually, handled by three steamers and about seventy-five lake barges.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is this wharf private or public?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The Ontario Paper Company, Limited, own the wharf at this place.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is a private wharf?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Templeton—dredging, $43,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is this a private or a public wharf?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is a private wharf. This dredging is required to provide sufficient depth of water to enable boats to reach the wharf which is to be constructed by the International Fibre Board, Limited, and provide shipping facilities for the boats of the Canadian International Paper Company to reach the booming area with their logs.

Item agreed to.

Valleyfield—dredging, $50,000.

Mr. McGIBBON: Would the minister give us an explanation of this vote?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required to continue the dredging of a channel three miles in length by a width of one hundred feet and to a depth of fourteen feet, from deep water in lake St. Francis to the government wharf, with a turning basin at the wharf 650 feet by 700 feet. This project was commenced in 1924 and continued in 1925, 1927, 1928 and 1929.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How much has been spent on it so far?

Mr. ELLIOTT: $177,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How much is it intended to spend?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The total will be $403,000.

Item agreed to.

Yamachiche river—dredging, $20,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What is the purpose of this dredging?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is required to pay the balance owing to the National Dock & Dredging Corporation in connection with their con-

tract for dredging completed during 1928-29, to provide for the dredging of a turning basin having an area of some 56,000 feet to enable boats using the channel to turn.

Item agreed to.

Yamaska river—dredging, $12,200.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is this for the same purpose?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is dredging in the river. It is under contract now.

Item agreed to.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: When dealing with the Ontario harbours and rivers vote to-night, we want a general item held over so that any Ontario members who are not here at the moment may have an opportunity later to discuss anything they like on the vote.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 90, for the relief of Harry Babington Millward—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 117, for the relief of Wallace Evered Gillespie.—Mr. Anderson (High Park).

Bill No. 132, for the relief of Myrtle Virginia Maulson—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 133, for the relief of Claude Le Cheminant—Mr. Spence.

Motions for third readings agreed to on division.

ALLA CHRETTER

The house in committee on Bill No. 116, for the relief of Alla Chretter—Mr. Ross (Kingston)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children involved in this case?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I had all the facts the other night, but the hon. gentleman did not make any inquiries and I am sorry I have not that information at the moment.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We shall have to ask that the bill stand. It was understood that while no details would be discussed on the second reading they would be, if necessary, in the committee stage.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): There was a child in the case of the first bill, which the hon. member allowed to go through.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In that case the petitioner was the father and perhaps it is easier for the father to look after the child. In this case the petitioner is a woman.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am almost certain there are no children.

Section stands.

Progress reported.

ALICE GLADYS BARKEY

The house in committee on Bill No. 135, for the relief of Alice Gladys Barkey—Mr. Spence—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What about the children, if there are any?

Mr. SPENCE: I have not the record here.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is just as well to get information regarding any children that have to be provided for.

Mr. SPENCE: I will get it if you wish.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 carry?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think we should have information with respect to the children.

Mr. SPENCE: I will furnish the information later on.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that section 1 shall carry?

Mr. MARCIL: I think it desirable that the information requested should be furnished by the sponsor of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Those in favour of section 1 being carried will kindly say aye.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Aye.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: A few of us who objected some time ago to the passage of these bills in this way were practically asked not to delay the business of the house. We protested quite sincerely that we were not attempting to block the business of the house but that we were desirous of seeing this work done in a little more decent manner than had been the case in the past, and we have adhered to that principle since. However, I think the least that can be done is to have

the sponsors of the bills prepared to answer a few questions which may be asked, and one question I have wanted to emphasize is whether or not children are involved and, if so, whether those children are being cared for. True, the Minister of Justice informed us that it is not within the competence of parliament to grant the custody or demand the maintenance of the children, but even if that be so under the existing interpretation of the British North America Act I still say it is within the competence of parliament to refuse to grant a divorce until such time as the children are cared for, and I think I am quite within my rights in asking this question. I know we cannot do very much in these cases, but if an outstanding case is brought forward where children are being neglected, we might refer that case back to the committee for reconsideration.

In the meantime I want to emphasize the fact that in this house we are occupying a most anomalous position. As far as the state is concerned the chief reason why marriage is recognized is that there may be care for the family, yet here we are in a position where we cannot give effect to this principle which lies at the very root of marriage. That sort of thing should not and cannot continue very long. That we should recognize the union of two people and yet not be in a position to see that their offspring are cared for is hard to understand. Judging from the communications which have been coming to me from different quarters it is only beginning to dawn upon the people of Canada what an outrage has been perpetrated here throughout the years, and I do not think society as a whole will agree to permit a procedure to continue whereby we simply throw the children on the streets. In many instances these children are cared for by children's aid societies and other philanthropic institutions; we are not asking too much when we request this information.

Mr. SPENCE: If my hon. friend will permit me to do so I will give him the information.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I will get it in a moment. I think we are not going too far when we require that the sponsor of the bill be prepared to give us at least an outline of the case or to tell us something about the children.

Mr. SPENCE: I have no hesitation in giving the hon. gentleman the information, but I had simply forgotten to bring the evidence down with me to-night. There is one child in this case, living with the mother, and by order of Mrs. Patterson, a Toronto police magistrate, the father pays $5 a week for the maintenance of the child.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

IRENE MABEL USHER

The house in committee on Bill No. 160, for the relief of Irene Mabel Usher—Mr. Ross (Kingston)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What about the children?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): There are two children in this case, aged thirteen and fourteen.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is any provision made for them?

Mr. BOURASSA: I think the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is of extreme importance. I was not here the other day when the Minister of Justice gave his opinion with regard to the jurisdiction of this house with respect to what I might call the civil consequences or results of a divorce granted by this house, but I think that opinion is incontrovertible, and it exemplifies the absurdity of the whole situation. Of course, the principle of divorce is just as bad in the case of married people without children. But as I have already stated my position in that regard, I need not go over it again.

But when it comes to the question of children I know of no civilized and so-called Christian country on earth where the dissolution of marriage or the separation of married people, what we call in French, séparation de corps, which is allowed in the province of Quebec,—you call it in English, separation a mensa et thoro—nowhere is it allowed without the court giving its decision with regard to the children, deciding which of the separated parties, the father or the mother, shall have the custody of the children and what means shall be taken to provide for their maintenance. That is done everywhere. I know of no country, whether it be the United States, England, France, Belgium, Germany or any other country the legislation of which I know anything about, which does not always look

after the children. It is essential; it is the duty of the state, as represented by the jurisdiction created by the government, to adjudicate upon such matters, to consider what will become of the children. The responsibility of the state towards the child is greater than its responsibility towards the man and woman who cannot agree to live together and are asking for a separation. If it is the decided opinion of the government, or of the Minister of Justice, who is the legal adviser of the government, that this parliament is not empowered judicially or constitutionally to carry out its primary duty towards the child born of a marriage dissolved by this parliament, then this parliament has not the moral right to pronounce any divorce in cases where there are children, until and unless some means have been found to provide for the children, as they are provided for by regular courts of justice in any country where such separations or divorces are granted. This only shows that the problem cannot be solved until we have amended the constitution in such a manner that the power which has jurisdiction over the marriage will have the whole jurisdiction. So long as we exercise one jurisdiction here and the other jurisdiction is exercised by another power over which we have no control, we will never get satisfaction. Some harm may be done in cases where only two individuals, the parties to the marriage contract, are concerned, but it is much more strongly exemplified where there are children.

At times I hear some suppressed laughter in the house, but I would ask the members of this house to remember that this is one of the most serious questions before the country. It is concerning the thoughtful people of Canada much more than thoughtless people seem to imagine. Not very long ago the Anglican synod—quite a respectable body, I think—gathered and expressed its opinion with regard to this matter. Two of its most respected and high placed members, the Bishop of Ottawa and one of his colleagues, have issued a document which is one of the most comprehensive pronouncements on this question I have read for a long time. They called the attention not only of the members of their own church but of all thoughtful Canadians to the threat to the country arising from the disquieting increase in divorces from year to year. If that is a threat in itself, surely it is a much greater threat when we dissolve a family and, as the member for Winnipeg North Centre has just said, throw the children on the street and leave it to haphazard to decide how they will be taken care of, to which of the parents they will be given, whether to the worthy one or to the the unworthy one.

I am not a believer in the doctrine of the state taking the place of the parents in the matter of education, whether it is family education or school education; but when the state takes upon itself the responsibility of breaking the family tie, surely it should do something for the preservation of those members of the family who are incapable, either morally, physically or legally, of protecting themselves. We decide that the marriage is dissolved, the man goes where he likes and the woman does what she wishes, and no provision is made for the children; we wash our hands of all responsibility towards the children. This is an extremely serious aspect of the question, apart from all the circumstances surrounding it. When we consider the basic principle of the indissolubility of marriage, we must not forget that this other principle is just as important.

I assume that it will take some process of education to bring home to the people of the country a realization of the harm which was done at the time of confederation with regard to divorce. The power which performs the operation of breaking a family tie has now to admit that it is incapable, that it is impotent to perform what is considered in every civilized country as the primary duty of the authority which pronounces divorce—to take care of the children. It seems to me that the least we could do would be to say that before a divorce is granted, in cases where there are children concerned, such procedure should take place as was spoken of a moment ago by the member for Parkdale. The hon. member mentioned a case where a court of justice in Ontario had decided, before application for divorce was made, as to whom the child should be given and as to the allowance to be paid to the mother or the father, as the case may be, for the maintenance of that child. I say that it is essential that no petition for a divorce should be received by this parliament in cases where children are concerned until such procedure has taken place before a regular court of justice. That seems to me to be the least we could do. Finding out that we cannot ourselves exercise that duty, we should say to the parties who ask for divorce, "In case you have children you must go before a court of justice and have it decided as to what will become of the children, how they will be taken care of, and to whom they will be given." It seems to me that that is an extremely reasonable proposition, and if we still believe in the necessity of the maintenance of the principle of the family tie, it is about time that we retraced our steps as far as that aspect of the question is concerned. Therefore I think

that in connection with this bill or any other bill involving children in regard to whom no judicial decision has been obtained in the province in which reside the parties in the case, no such petition should be received, and no such bill should be passed upon. It may be said that this suggestion is late; but it is never too late. Let what amount those parties have deposited be remitted to them; let them put themselves in a proper position in that regard before they ask for divorce from this parliament, and parliament should not grant a divorce until the whole case has been covered as it should be.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): This is a case where the mother about nine or ten years ago contracted a filthy disease from her husband. She separated from him; for nine years she has been living apart and supporting her children and she wishes so to continue.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There again is the question whether or not the parties should be given the right to marry again. If they are diseased the danger is obvious, and the sponsor of the bill should put a question mark as to whether we should turn them loose on the community.

Mr. MARCIL: I want to approve every word that has been uttered by the hon. member for Labelle. It is bad enough to divorce people, but if parliament is going to continue to act as it is doing now, separating these people and making no provision whatever for the children, it is a most heartless procedure to follow, and I am sure public opinion in general would back us up if we insisted that people coming to parliament asking for divorce should at least prove to the committee that provision has been made for the care of the children. That can easily be done by an application to the courts as is done in the case of judicial decisions in Quebec, where no such separation is granted unless a decree is issued by the court providing for the children. Surely parliament should look after these poor innocent children, minors, who are left practically on the street. The suggestion made by the member for Labelle is worthy of consideration. This bill should be allowed to stand.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

ANNA ESTELLA DENIKE

The house in committee on Bill No. 161 for the relief of Anna Estella DeNike.—Mr. Ross (Kingston)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

[Mr. Bourassa.]

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children in this case?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I can find no evidence of any children.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

ELIZABETH SPAIN

The house in committee on Bill No. 162 for the relief of Elizabeth Spain.—Mr. Ross (Kingston)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What about the children?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): There is one child in this case.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What provision is being mode for it?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I find this in the transcript of the evidence:

My husband was up for non-support, he had not supported our child since she was three years old, and Magistrate Brunton at Toronto —he is dead now—he told my husband he must pay me so much a week to help support our child. He didn't do it, and Major Brunton had him up in front of him. That is how I happened to know where he lived.

Mr. MANION: She is looking after the child?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Yes.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

LOUISA HITCHMAN

The house in committee on Bill No. 164 for the relief of Louisa Hitchman.—Mr. Ross (Kingston)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children in this case? I think we ought to give the sponsor time to read the case.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): No issue.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

ALLA CHRETTER

The house in committee on Bill No. 116 for the relief of Alla Chretter.—Mr. Ross (Kingston)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): There is one child, born at Gallipoli.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: How old is the child?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Eight years old.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In whose custody is the child at the present time?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): With the mother.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 177, for the relief of Claude Frederick Burgin.—Mr. Geary (for Mr. Lennox).

Bill No. 181, for the relief of Mary Addie Linton.—Mr. Geary (for Mr. Lennox).

Motions for second readings agreed to on division.

JEANIE MATHIESON HOWELL

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Toronto-Scarborough) (for Mr. Edwards, Ottawa) moved the second reading of Bill No. 195, for the relief of Jeanie Mathieson Howell.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would the sponsor of this bill state the ground on which divorce is sought?

Mr. HARRIS: This divorce case was unopposed. There were no interruptions by the members of the senate committee; the evidence was presented by counsel, and there was no collusion between the parties.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I cannot hear at this end, Mr. Speaker. I asked what was the ground for divorce in this case. There was one bill for which the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Edwards) was sponsor that was of a very exceptional kind. I should like to know if this is the case.

Mr. HARRIS: I understand that the ground in this case is similar to that in many other of these divorce cases, misconduct.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I object to that sort of answer. We are here dealing with legal matters if we are dealing with anything. I have heard hon. gentlemen stand in this house and talk about the "usual statutory grounds". I am not a lawyer, but if I understand the situation aright, there are no statutory grounds. Divorce is granted according to certain practices which prevail in the senate, and I say that there are several grounds upon which divorce has been granted. I asked a straight question, what is the ground upon which divorce is granted in this case? I think I am entitled to an answer.

Mr. HARRIS: The information I have is that there was evidence of misconduct.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the second time on division.

GORDON ASHUR TRUE

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Toronto-Scarborough) (for Mr. Edwards, Ottawa) moved the second reading of Bill No. 199, for the relief of Gordon Ashur True.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle)): I have been absent for several sittings during which these manufactured divorces have been passed, but I understood when we agreed after the declaration made by the Prime Minister to let the ordinary procedure, hasty and indecent as it is, go on for this session in order to give the government time to think over the whole situation, that at least the ordinary rules would be observed. One of them was that each bill should be called; that is being done. And I also understood that when the sponsor of any of these bills was not here it would not be called. I thought that that had been agreed to. Now, two or three of these bills have been called, although the sponsor is not present.

Mr. STEVENS: He is ill and unable to be here.

Mr. BOURASSA: Suppose it was another matter—

Mr. STEVENS: It is a matter of courtesy.

Mr. BOURASSA: It is something more than a matter of courtesy. It is not a matter of courtesy to the member directly concerned, because I think that most hon. members take very little interest in the bills and know very little about them. One hon. member whose name has been connected this evening with several of these bills had to look after them when called. I do not blame him for that; I know it has been the custom. But that is precisely why we want to remedy this state

of affairs, and it seems to me that when the sponsor is absent somebody else should be in a position to explain what the sponsor himself is supposed to explain. It seems to me to be more than a matter of form. Take another class of bill. I do not object to a member moving the second reading in the place of the sponsor, but at least the substitute sponsor should be able to state to the house what the original sponsor is supposed to know. Any member taking the responsibility of presenting a measure to the house is supposed to be able to give to the house an explanation of the bill. If he is absent, and somebody else moves the second reading, the latter is supposed to be able to supply whatever information may be required by the house. There again a practice that I think was clearly understood should cease is left to go on again in the same old way. I am not doing this to hurt anybody, but I simply desire to express my opinion.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Childish.

Mr. BOURASSA: No. It may look childish to the hon. gentleman, but everyone is entitled to have his point of view respected. I think the hon. member should pay a little respect to the opinions of others. It is the trouble of some people that they are impatient with those who differ from them. I respect the point of view of any member who differs from me, and I am entitled to the same respect from him. I submit to the house, first, the rules should be observed in this as in other cases; second, when practically an arrangement has been made with the government that certain things should be done, then that arrangement should be observed. Therefore while there is no desire on my part to retard the passing of these bills, I think the ordinary rules should be applied as it was stated they would be applied.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, as very much importance seems to be attached to the information which should be in the possession of those who sponsor these bills coming from the senate, I am sorry that in many cases they are not able to furnish the particulars which the house should have as a matter of simple justice. I raise the point now, sir, so you may give us a ruling on it at another sitting, as to whether when the sponsor of a measure is not present in the house that measure can be proceeded with except by unanimous consent.

Mr. SPEAKER: No exception can be made to the rule unless by unanimous consent. If the point is raised, I should say that the hon. gentleman who moved the second reading of this bill is out of order. But certain amenities are observed in the parliament of Canada. We have the word of the hon. gentleman who moved the second reading of the bill that the real sponsor, the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Edwards), is ill and cannot be present. On two or three different occasions of late we have taken the word—as we should take it—of those who ask to be substituted for the original sponsor. Of course, if the hon. gentleman insists on his point, it will be tantamount to refusing to accept the word of an hon. member. I leave it to the house. If the point of order is raised, certainly the original sponsor should move the second reading of the bill; but, as I have stated, there are certain amenities that should be observed, I would not say for the good government of Canada, but to facilitate our dealing with the ordinary matters that come before the house. Do I understand that the point is raised?

Mr. MARCIL: No, I was anxious to know what the rule of the house was.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule is very clear.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Was the procedure any different when the hon. member from Bonaventure was in the chair?

Mr. MARCIL: The rules have been very materially changed since then. I am quite willing to accept the declaration made by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then if the point is not pressed the bill may receive second reading.

Mr. BOURASSA: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of personal explanation I want to make it clear that my objection is not to any member moving the second reading in the place of the original sponsor of the bill who is ill and out of the house. My objection is to the fact that the gentleman who takes that responsibility is not in a position to explain the matter. I want that to be clearly understood.

Mr. HARRIS: If the hon. gentleman will give me a few minutes I can furnish the explanation, but as the hour of nine o'clock is approaching I must ask the house to accept a very brief explanation. In this particular case there was misconduct on the part of one

of the parties. The one child of the marriage is being taken care of by the father and is in the custody of the mother-in-law, who is well able to provide for and take care of the offspring.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the second time on division.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

The house in committee of suply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 135, harbours and rivers, Ontario, $2,633,300. The details will be found on page 41.

Beaverton—reconstruction of harbour works, $2,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Mr. Chairman, some of the Ontario members who are not here to-night would like to be given an opportunity to comment on certain of these items. If the minister will agree to leave the item "harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $75,000", on the understanding that any of these items might be discussed by Ontario members, we are prepared to go on with the rest.

Mr. ELLIOTT: All these items are comprised in one vote; it would be impossible to proceed if that were done. And it may be some days before I shall have an opportunity again to be in committee. Would it suit the hon. member's purpose to have "harbours and rivers generally" in the Dominion left open?

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: That is item 140?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Yes, certainly, on that understanding.

Item agreed to.

Hamilton—harbour improvements, $212,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the reason for this increase?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Extensive work has to be done there if the harbour is to be utilized by ships coming into the canal, and even this amount will not suffice. The $212,000 includes a revote of $48,000; $29,000 is to provide for the contract of the Russell Construction Company for repairs to the revetment wall, and it is intended by contract to do the dredging of the channel and the slips in the proposed new terminal for the Canada Steamship Lines Limited. It is also to serve the Otis-Fensom Elevator Company when they construct wharfage. There will also be dredging of the channel and slip in connection with the proposed new 1,500-foot wharf to be built in 1929 by the Steel Company of Canada, one-third to be paid by the company. The estimated cost is $100,000, the department's share being $66,667. A very large traffic is to be provided for.

Item agreed to.

Kingston—dredging, $7,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What part of the work was left undone last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This revote is required to complete the contract with R. G. Weddell for dredging in front of the university and hospital dock on an area of 17,500 square feet with an average cut of three feet, involving the removal of 1,900 cubic yards place measure of class A material. The apropriation for last year was $14,200. The work done to March 31 last amounted to $5,258.61.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I think a good deal more will be required there. For the last few years we have had from ninety to one hundred grain-carrying steamers harbouring there during the winter, and in addition to that the second extension to the dry dock will certainly bring large vessels. The minister should be prepared to carry out a good deal more dredging because the harbour is considered pretty safe for winter storage of these ships. They are tied up to the causeway and in various parts of the harbour eight and ten deep. I would point out however that following a storm a year ago the stays were removed, and although they were put back I do not think the engineers will say that they are now fixed with any degree of permanency, because they were stirred again this year.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What was put back?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The stays to which the steamers are moored in the winter. These stays were pulled up in the great storm a year ago, and as I say they were put back, but there is no great permanency about them; they came loose again this year. I think the engineer's department should consider some better means than this, because it certainly is not very pleasant having eight or ten large steamers which are held abreast loosened in the winter.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The hon. member is aware that representations have been made with regard to this and other matters relating to Kingston, and I may say that arrangements have already been made with regard to tying posts and other facilities of a similar character.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): When we come to the vote for dredging the minister might tell us how much was spent last year and where, and what proposals are under consideration this year regarding further expenditure.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be glad to give that information.

Item agreed to.

Sarnia—dredging, $70,000.

Mr. SPENCE: What is the explanation of this item?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The work is required to accommodate the heavy grain traffic and relieve the congested condition of this harbour. A new elevator with a capacity of 1,000,000 bushels was constructed at this point in 1927 and is to be enlarged to a capacity of 3,000,000 bushels. Over 10,000,000 bushels of grain are handled at this point every season. These improvements were requested by the Sarnia Elevator Company, Limited, in December, 1928.

Mr. SPENCE: Did the government build the elevator?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. SPENCE: This is for dredging?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Toronto—dredging, $29,000.

Mr. MATTHEWS: Is that for the western channel?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Item No. 137, harbours and rivers, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Craven dam—in full and final settlement of claims, $25,000.

Mr. FRASER: What is the explanation of this item?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is asked to be provided in full and final settlement of claims on behalf of certain land owners for damage alleged to have been done their farms below the Craven dam in Saskatchewan. The claims arose through the breaking of the dam built by the Department of Public Works, resulting in a flood which caused this damage.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $10,000.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I suppose any claim against the government arising out of damage to property along the rivers, which damage might be caused by the washing away of government boulevard property, might be provided for out of this item?

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend is correct in that assumption with this exception, that if it were a large claim it could be hardly cared for out of this item because the practice has been not to take large amounts out of these general votes.

Mr. ADSHEAD: But I suppose if the minister granted a small claim which might be established to his satisfaction it could be cared for from this item.

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Item No. 138, harbours and rivers, British Columbia.

Crooked, Pack and Parsnip rivers—improvements, $3,500.

Mr. FRASER: Would the minister tell us why the total vote last year was not spent, and how much of it was spent?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Of the $3,500 voted, $1,445 was spent.

Mr. FRASER: What work was done for that amount?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Last year we carried on the removal of boulders and the building of wing dams to improve the river channels, chiefly at the Harriston riffle, some nine miles downstream from Summit lake. The expenditure was approximately $1,500.

Mr. FRASER: Is the work proposed for next year approximately of the same character?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The work now proposed consists in the main of improving existing channels by removing rock, boulders and gravel bars. The remainder of the work will be in clearing the banks of overhanging brush, sweepers and so on.

Item agreed to.

Digby island—repairs to float approach, $5,700.

Mr. BRADY: I should like to have a few particulars about this item.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The amount of $5,700 is to provide for repairs to the float approach.

Mr. BRADY: Is that the breakwater?

Mr. ELLIOTT: To construct a triangular shaped pile work breakwater 20 feet by 20 feet, 30 feet wide at the base; the proposed work to be built alongside the approach to the float.

Mr. BRADY: What is the purpose of the breakwater?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The breakwater is required to give a much needed protection to the float which is exposed to southerly gales. The float is used for departmental purposes by the officials of the government wireless station as a landing when going to and from Prince Rupert, and by the children when going to school.

Item agreed to.

Fraser river—improvements, $300,500.

Mr. BARBER: Is that to be spent at the mouth of the Fraser river?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, it is practically all to be spent at the mouth of the river.

Item agreed to.

Glenannon—wharf, $6,400.

Mr. FRASER: Could we have some particulars with respect to this item?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required to construct a wharf 248 feet in length at the east end of Francois lake at a point known as Glenannon, where there is no landing at present for the tugboat and five gas boats handling supplies, logs, and so forth, for 29 logging and tie camps operating on the lake. The proposed work is asked for by the loggers, ranchers and tie contractors operating on the lakes, who claim that they are handicapped by the lack of a wharf. The annual lumber cut is valued at $180,000 and the population to be benefited numbers about 250.

Mr. FRASER: Will that work be done by day labour or by contract?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It will be done by contract if we can obtain a satisfactory price.

Mr. FRASER: Have you called for tenders as yet?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, we do not call for tenders until we get the vote.

Mr. BRADY: I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that last year the residents around Francois lake, through their board of trade, requested that something be done to give assistance in the matter of wharf accommodation. The lake is about 90 miles long and most of the traffic from that country passes up and down the lake. I spent about three weeks travelling up and down that country and found that requests had been made that a wharf be placed at MacDonald landing and also at one or two other points along the lake. The Burns Lake board of trade, representing that great district, presented their views on this matter. After obtaining full particulars of these requests I visited Victoria and presented them to Mr. J. P. Forde, the federal engineer, and he promised me that he would send in one of his men to investigate the conditions. I happened to be at Burns Lake when Mr. Forde's engineer came there and I assumed that he had come in at the request of the board of trade at Burns Lake, but I found that he had travelled these thousands of miles at the request of the secretary of the Liberal association at Endako. The question arises in my mind as to why a federal engineer should be sent in at considerable expense at the request of one man and the request of the main body of the people concerned should be ignored. I have been in this house three years and the more I examine into the Public Works department the more I realize that the sooner it is taken out of the realm of politics the better it will be for the development of Canada. I do not blame the Minister of Public Works as I think the fault lies with the men whose duty it is to present to the minister the needs of these outlying districts. Water transportation is the only means afforded to the people on this lake of transporting their produce to the Francois lake crossing where the ferry is. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that there is the greatest need on Francois lake for at least four wharves. On the opposite side of the lake is MacDonald landing where there is a large agricultural settlement, and they have no means of taking their products down to the lake and over to Burns lake where the railway is. From the Stellato river, where Glenannon is, down to Nadina, a distance of 90 miles, there is not a single wharf on that great inland lake. I have gone to the min-

ister repeatedly and I have found that he has given me consideration, but the unfortunate thing is that the information he acts upon is from a quarter that I do not believe in nine cases out of ten expresses exactly the needs of that district. While I am on my feet I want to draw attention to the situation that exists at Stewart.

Mr. ELLIOTT: May I ask my hon. friend a question? I have no doubt he has followed the interests of British Columbia very carefully. Is he not aware that this year they are getting a much higher percentage of the Public Works appropriation than they have for many years, and they are certainly not getting it in ridings that are not supporters of friends of my hon. friend. I just wanted to know whether my hon. friend knew that.

Mr. BRADY: I am thoroughly familiar with the conditions. I have been in this house for three years and I know that section of the country very well. In the past three years there has been the greatest neglect in the matter of public works for the Skeena constituency. We are living on the Pacific coast; we have an immense coastline and the main need of the people who are living along that coastline is wharves. I grant that the government has done something this year, but it is a belated gift. There are two great needs in the matter of wharf accommodation along the northern British Columbia coast. A couple of years ago there was in the estimates an item of $40,000 for a new wharf at Stewart. That, however, was taken out of the estimates. Why that was done I am not going to explain, although I could give a very good reason. What is the condition of the Stewart wharf to-day? I have before me the results of a four-days visit that I paid last September to Stewart. I took with me the leading citizens of that town in order that they might corroborate what I was writing down in regard to the congestion on the government wharf there. I know the minister has in his possession from the federal engineer, and Captain Saunders at Digby, reports regarding the Stewart wharf. Nevertheless the conditions at Stewart to-day are such that it is imperative that the Public Works department build a wharf there. The Premier mine have a practical monopoly upon the government wharf; their ore is passed over it. There is congestion from one end to the other. I found on that wharf tons of machinery that belonged to the Premier mine and that had been lying there for months. I found that when the Canadian National steamers and the Union steamers called there, the congestion was so great with all kinds of produce for the Marmot mine, the Premier mine and other places that is was impossible for the passengers to go down by the gangway and with impunity pass to their automobiles to take them to Stewart or to Hyder. The explanations given to me by the federal engineer as well as by Captain Saunders have been contradicted by every captain of the Canadian National and the Union steamships and also by the captains of the ore carriers, such as the Mogul and those boats that take the ore from that place. This is what the captain of one of those steamships said to me: after a wire had been sent to Ottawa "Your wire is only a joke compared to what you should sent in." In other words, that particular section is the most important mining area in the whole of northern British Columbia. There is the Premier mine, the Big Missouri, the Marmot mines, the Silverado, the Prosperity,—a whole great section which is comparable with anything either in Ontario of Quebec. What happened was this: a new wharf was built by Mr. Crawford for his own special purpose, for coal and other things, and it did not in any way relieve the congestion at the government wharf. When I went there I was told that Crawford's wharf and the wharf built by the Premier at the Marmot, were able to relieve the congestion on the main Stewart wharf. That is not the case. I do not want to compel the Minister of Public Works to do anything he should not do, but I contend that the most necessary thing in that section to-day is that a wharf should be built at Stewart to meet the requirements of that fast growing mineral area.

Mr. FRASER: When the minister made the observation that British Columbia was getting somewhat better consideration in this estimate this year than last year, he left the impression that British Columbia generally was getting the benefit of that increase.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I did not say "last year"; I said "other years". Take it for the last fifteen years.

Mr. FRASER: The impression I got was that we were getting a larger appropriation this year for works of this kind throughout British Columbia as compared with last year. Let me point out that the increase in the vote this year as compared with last year comes in three particular places: There is $100,000 for dredging the north arm of the Fraser river. Then there is $300,500 for improvements to the Fraser river, which is $100,500 in excess of last year. Then there is an item of $124,500 for dredging the First

Narrows, so that apart from these votes there is for the rest of the province $712,300, as compared with $774,000 last year. The hon. member for Skeena is certainly correct when he says that a lot of these places in the northern country are not getting the consideration they deserve. I have in the central part of my constituency Quesnel lake, and on the whole of the ninety miles of its shore line there is not a single wharf. I would ask the minister to have his engineers investigate the conditions in these and other places in that new and growing district, for I feel sure that the information he will get from them will cause him to give greater consideration to these outlying places.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Just to clear this matter up, let me say that I am not finding fault with the criticism; I think I would be very unfair did I not express my appreciation of the tone of the criticism that has characterized the passing of these estimates. But I do think it is unfair to the people of the other provinces and to this department for the hon. member for Skeena and the hon. member for Cariboo, in view of these estimates for British Columbia, to get up here and suggest that these estimates for public works are gauged largely by considerations of political patronage. I have taken the trouble to ascertain the percentage of the total appropriation for harbours and rivers that the province of British Columbia has received in past years, and I find that from 1914-15 to 1921-22—those were war years—British Columbia's percentage of the total expenditure was 2.24; from 1922-23 to 1927-28, British Columbia's percentage was 2.41, and for this year her percentage is 3.60 of the total appropriation. I do not think that any hon. gentleman will object to any one item in these estimates if he is fair. I would rather have expected my hon. friend from Skeena, who in season and out of season, every time this committee has sat, has asked for floats at Prince Rupert and has spoken of the great amount of credit he would give to this government and to this department if they saw fit to provide those floats, to express his appreciation now that those floats are provided for in the estimates, but he has never referred to that fact at all. He does not know the percentage of the total appropriations which British Columbia is now getting as compared with what that province usually gets, that its percentage is now half as much again as it has been for many years. There is nothing my hon. friend can say to which I will not give consideration, but I do believe that he tries to seize every opportunity to make a little political capital for himself and his friends in that part of the country. I would ask him if he thinks it is fair, in view of what these estimates show, or if he thinks he is advancing the interests of Skeena, to make the criticism he made here to-night when not one of those ridings in which these appropriations are being expended is represented by a Liberal.

Mr. BRADY: I think I should reply to the remarks that the minister has just made. He says that I take every opportunity to make a little political capital. I want to tell him this, that I have never once in this House of Commons or outside of it uttered one word for the purpose of making political capital. I resent that statement coming from the hon. Minister of Public Works. I went through my constituency last recess, travelling by day and by night for four and a half months, to find out just what the conditions were so that I might present them, first, to the engineers of the Public Works department, and secondly, if it were necessary, to the minister himself.

The minister says that I have never said anything about the Prince Rupert floats, that I have never congratulated him upon providing them. Mr. Chairman, I have no reason to congratulate the minister on doing something which should have been done three years ago. There has not been one winter for three solid years during which thousands of dollars have not been lost to the fishing fleet in the port of Prince Rupert. Even this very year when I went back at Easter, there were a score of boats swept from their moorings and many thrown upon the opposite side of the harbour causing damage amounting to thousands of dollars, and yet the minister says, "Why didn't you thank me?"

Mr. ELLIOTT: I did not say that.

Mr. BRADY: The minister said that I was not grateful for what he did.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is better.

Mr. BRADY: So far as the appropriations in these estimates are concerned, they were essential, not this year, but three years ago, and these necessary works have been kept back all that time. I think I know the reason why. I have stated in this house, and I intend to repeat it until I get what I want, that the public works of this country should be outside the influence of any member of parliament and of any defeated member of parliament. There are great needs in the northern part of British Columbia to be filled of which the Minister of Public Works

is not yet aware. He states that British Columbia's percentage of the total appropriation for this year is 3.60. Does he forget that there has been a wonderful development in northern British Columbia in the last three years?

Mr. ELLIOTT: And in the other provinces too.

Mr. BRADY: I admit that, but I contend that there is an obligation upon the Department of Public Works to provide these wharves and other improvements for that section of the country where the great majority of the people live, not in the interior as in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario, but right on the Pacific ocean. Wharves to them are as essential as roads in the province of Ontario. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Public Works misunderstood my remarks.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps I did.

Mr. BRADY: I think you did, sir, because if I had chosen—I did not think it necessary, as it was your duty—I would have thanked you for four or five of those. But, sir, there are many necessary public works in my part of British Columbia not yet provided for. Remember, I am speaking now to the Minister of Public Works. If the minister could get one of his engineers to make a thorough investigation of the needs of that vast constituency, and give him an honest, exact report, he would find that what I have said to-night can be absolutely verified. I will give you an instance, sir. Take Port Clements on Queen Charlotte Island. Port Clements to-day is the centre of the traffic from the south and the east end of the island. The provincial government have built a road whereby the whole of the traffic from east and west moves to Port Clements. Now, I ask the minister to instruct his engineer to proceed there and investigate conditions, and I believe he will find at Port Clements a great need for a new wharf and also for additional protection of the local fleet.

This is the first time that I have been told that anything I say in this house is for the purpose of making political capital. I spent over twenty-eight years of my life in teaching the youth of the empire, and I do not want now to retrace my steps, I do not want now to be placed in the position of being told that I am coming to Ottawa for one purpose only—political capital. I entered into the political world not for that purpose, and I say to the Minister of Public Works that I have never yet spoken one word in this house nor outside of it, and I hope I never shall, that is not intended for the good of the people and for the good of the country.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If Mr. Chairman, I misunderstood my hon. friend. I am very sorry. The public works engineers who are charged with the responsibility of going all over the country to make reports upon the requests received—and they are numerous and sometimes very difficult to deal with—I believe are making a fair and honest endeavour to send in reports that will best serve the interests of the various parts of the country concerned, and I do not think my hon. friend should have referred to the fact that if our engineers would send in honest and exact reports the department would do something different from what they have done. Our engineers are in a difficult position, they are working very hard, and I believe they are doing their work well.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, I should like to have one word more in regard to this matter. I am very glad indeed that the minister has brought it up. He says that British Columbia now has 3·60 per cent of this vote. I wonder how he justifies allotting that proportion of the vote to British Columbia. I wonder if he takes into consideration that we have thousands of miles of coastline and thousands of miles of shoreline in our inland waters, not only so far as rivers are concerned but also with respect to the immense lakes all over the interior of the province. If he would take the coastline and the shoreline of our inland rivers and lakes he would find that British Columbia is getting a pretty small percentage of the total vote devoted to the harbours and rivers of the Dominion.

I also want him to remember that the northern part of British Columbia is rapidly filling up with new people, and it would be in the interests of the colonization of that country if the Minister of Public Works would give a little more attention to the needs of the settlers who are going in there. I say this to the minister with the idea of assisting him in the work that he is performing for the Dominion. I would point out to him that the engineer in charge of that district lives in the town of Nelson, which is pretty near the southern boundary of the province. That engineer is expected to look after the work of his department in the northern part of British Columbia, four or five hundred miles away from his main office. What possibility is there of that man giving attention to the necessary

work over all that great expanse of country when he is situated four or five hundred miles away? I submit it is about time the minister stationed a public works engineer in the northern part of British Columbia. For his benefit and information I would suggest that a first-class place for such an engineer would be in the city of Prince George, which is pretty well in the centre of all that territory. I make this suggestion knowing the country to be covered, knowing the necessities of these people are growing every day, and also knowing that the need for wharves all over that country cannot possibly be taken care of by engineers situated four or five hundred miles away. I suggest it is about time the minister stationed an engineer at Prince George to look after that work.

If the minister has increased the appropriation—and I admit that his figures are probably correct—I would suggest to him that if he would take a little time to travel through the province of British Columbia—and we should all be very glad to see him there—I guarantee that after he has reviewed the local conditions he will set aside for next year a much greater appropriation than appears in these estimates.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister has enunciated a new policy to-night, that is, he has suggested that any of us to whose constituency a grant is given should rise in our place and say: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Not at all.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Well, we should be grateful anyway. But there is a little danger in doing that, Mr. Chairman. On one occasion my constituency received a little grant, but when tenders were called for the contract went to a Conservative and the money was never expended. So there is some danger, I say, in getting up and saying "thank you" for these little grants, because after all the money may never be spent.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Wait until the money is spent.

Item agreed to.

Halcyon—wharf construction, $7,600.

Mr. GERSHAW: Is this a public wharf?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is proposed to replace the existing decrepit floating wharf with a new structure, 240 feet by 16 feet with a turning platform 32 feet by 32 feet, and an approach thereto. It is in West Kootenay. I have no doubt my hon. friend knows it is where the hot springs are located.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $65,000.

Mr. FRASER: I wish to direct the attention of the minister to the condition of the wharf at Sicamous in my district, along the Shuswap lakes. The minister used the term "old and decrepit" in connection with a certain wharf under another item. I want to tell him that according to the reports I have heard regarding this particular wharf it is old and decrepit and very much in need of reconstruction. I would suggest that the minister take a part of the $65,000 and provide us with a new wharf there.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In the general vote there is $650 allotted for certain work at that point. It will not go very far.

Mr. FRASER: I cannot imagine that such a sum would reconstruct a wharf.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is for a new shed and wharf repairs.

Mr. FRASER: My information is that the old wharf is so old and so badly shaken that it is hardly worth repairing, and before the department gets into trouble as a result of the wharf falling down and killing someone a new wharf had better be built.

Mr. BRADY: In the matter of harbours and rivers, is there anything for the Stickine river, which is in a very bad way as regards dredging?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I repeat what I have said a number of times, that this general vote is not used for dredging.

Mr. BRADY: Very well.

Item agreed to.

Nicomen island—protection work and dyking, $35,000.

Mr. BARBER: What protection work was done prior to this last vote This amount is a revote. Prior to last year what was done in the way of protecting the bank at Nicomen?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Our expenditure to date on 1,650 feet of mattress work built in 1923-24 and 500 feet recently completed by day labour is $41,000. That is all the information I have.

Mr. BARBER: Is this work which is going on now supposed to be of a permanent nature?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is supposed to be as permanent as you can make work of that kind.

Mr. BARBER: I visited this particular place in Nicomen island during the Easter recess and saw the nature of the work that was being constructed. I think the department are also

aware of it; they know the conditions there. The bank is soft, almost perpendicular, and the engineers went back about eight feet on top of the bank and sloped it, covering the surface with straw, upon which they are laying one layer of rock. A portion of the west end of the 1,000 feet is of quicksand bottom, and I think the minister will agree that during freshets the work will not stand very long. This is a very important question which has been before the department for some time, and those of us who are well acquainted with the particular trouble on the Fraser river at that point believe that the proper thing to do is to remove the cause. The cause of the erosion of the bank on the north side of the river at Nicomen island has been set forth by the engineer in a letter which I received from the deputy minister on February 1 of this year, in which he says:

> After the observations made during last year's freshet, I believe the main cause of the erosion of the south bank of Nicomen island is due to the movement of the deep water channel of the river towards the north. This is being caused by two factors. The first is the cutting of the river into the south bank above McDonald's bar, which has been very severe during the past years, and is still active, even at low water stages of the river. This cutting has formed a very sharp curve of this bank which guides the current during the lower stages of the river over towards Nicomen island more directly than ever before. The second is that the materials from this bank cutting—consisting of gravel and sand from above-mentioned high bank—have been deposited along the northerly side of McDonald's bar, thus extending the bar towards Nicomen island, and naturally pushing the deep water channel over towards the island.

The engineer reported in regard to the matter and action was taken in 1913 along that line. In that year this same engineer, under the same officers of the department, reported favourably on cutting a channel on the south side so that the main body of the river would be carried down and diverted from the Nicomen island side. In answer to a question of mine certain information was given on February 27, as reported at pages 534 and 535 of Hansard. This work was recommended by the present engineer, and the statement appears in Hansard that the object was to divert the current from Nicomen island, where the bank was eroded. This channel, known as the King Edward cut, was proceeded with; it was some 5,600 feet long and 150 feet wide and cost the country $87,225.40. This cut was never completed and therefore there was no relief given, although they came within about 1,600 feet of completing it. In answer to a question as to why this work was not completed the reason given was the high elevation of discharge and also the running ice which endangered the plant.

I waited upon the deputy minister last year in regard to this matter and he informed me that he did not think it good business to do any more dredging at this point, that it was simply throwing money into the river and that the channel had completely filled in. Last October I went to that district and, with some of the residents, proceeded up this channel in a gas boat; and with a 12-foot pole we could not find bottom. I agree that at the upper end there has been some slight filling in, but the channel appeared to be in almost the same condition as when the dredge left it. As I say, we consider it will be good business to complete this work because, as the minister stated, a large amount of money has been expended in order to protect that bank. We are spending this year another $40,000, which will give only temporary protection. In 1927 the engineer pointed out that it was very necessary that the banks of Nicomen island be protected; he said that the bank then was within 100 feet of the dyke built by the provincial government about four years previously. Last year a portion of the dyke was washed out, and in the opinion of some of the provincial engineers and those who reside in that district this work will not stand the heavy freshets. On November 9, 1928, the deputy minister wrote me as follows:

> Our efforts to induce the river to follow a cut at this point in the past were expensive and, as you are quite aware, produced no result. While those efforts were well intended the non-success only makes us more hesitant to undertake any further expenditure there.

I would ask the committee how any results could be expected with this channel completely isolated during low and medium water. During the construction of the channel the material was thrown into the centre of the river; a sort of dyke or bar was thus formed and at the east end of the work the gravel is some fifteen feet high.

As I said before, the engineer has been favourable to the completion of this work. He visited this district on March 16, 1927, and I have in my hand a letter which was written the next day by a member of the party who met and accompanied the engineer to that spot. He says.

> Mr. C. C. Worsfold, resident engineer, arrived at McDonald's Landing, Nicomen Island, yesterday at noon under instructions from Ottawa and received delegation of farmers on board Samson and proceeded across river to the head of old dredge cut which was never finished.
>
> The piece of dredging the farmers want done is 1,700 feet long, an average cut of 7 feet

deep, 120 feet wide. This means nearly 50,000 yards of gravel to be removed. These are Mr. Worsfold's figures; cost $15,000. He said if we could get that through it would save the erosion at McDonald's Landing, which has been greater this winter than ever before. He gave us the impression when he left that he would report favourably on the scheme.

I took this up with the department here, and I have in my hand a letter from the deputy minister in which he quotes the resident engineer as saying:

If this cut were made this spring before the freshet in the river, Mr. Worsfold does not think it would relieve the bank this year as it would certainly take two or three freshets for the new cut to scour out sufficiently to carry sufficient volume of water to relieve the banks of Nicomen Island. . . . .

That letter was written in March, 1927. I desire to point out to the committee the importance of this matter, because on Nicomen island the provincial government has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars. They have constructed a new piece of dyke some 100 yards back of the present dyke, and are also constructing a new and permanent highway. Back of these dykes we have not only the highway but also the line of the Canadian Pacific railway.

I hold in my hand a letter sent to the Minister of Public Works by the provincial Minister of Works of British Columbia, in which he states:

I understand that a grant of some $40,000 has been passed for the work in question and that your engineer has been instructed to carry out a certain amount of protection work on the banks of Nicomen Island.

It has, however, been pointed out to me, not only by our engineers, but by residents on the island, that the channel on the Fraser which was dredged some years ago should be completed. I understand that there is a difference of opinion on this that your engineering department may not consider the work necessary as far as the channel is concerned. However, I will not dispute this but would point out that when the channel was excavated, known as the King Edward cut, a certain amount of material was left in the river which had the effect of diverting the water towards Nicomen Island, and gradually each year the banks have eroded to an alarming extent.

I would, therefore, ask you to seriously reconsider this matter and if, on your engineer's advice, you cannot do any work on the channel, that a larger appropriation be made to protect the banks of Nicomen Island, for our engineers feel that the appropriation which you have made will hardly do the necessary work.

If you will consult the correspondence on the subject you will notice that this department was assured by your government that if we would carry out certain dyking works your government would carry out the necessary river bank protection. Such an arrangement was carried out by your government but not to the fullest extent, for as results have proven our dyking works were taken out by the flood, and further protection in the same place has had to be extended.

I just wish to urge upon the minister and upon the department the importance of removing the cause of this trouble at Nicomen island. As the minister said, it is impossible to put up anything in the nature of a permanent protection of such a bank, so I would urge the government to consider removing the cause of this trouble at a very early date. In addition to the $40,000 which is provided for this work another $50,000 will be required, and it will be money well spent to open up and complete this cut, which I believe is from 1,200 to 1,500 feet in length.

Item agreed to.

Powell river—breakwater, to complete—The Powell River Co., Ltd., having already contributed their share of cost of work, as agreed upon, $3,400.

Mr. ADSHEAD: If my information is correct, this is what is known as a company town, and I would like to know the policy of the government as to making available for public use wharves on which public money is expended. There was a similar case last year in connection with Anticosti island; a large vote was put in to cover dredging at a point where the public were not even allowed to land. Will the public be permitted to use this wharf?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is a public wharf.

Item agreed to.

Victoria—improvements to Ogden Point piers, $46,000.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Is this money to be spent on the approach or on the pier?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This vote is to be used for:

(1) Building of concrete parapet walls approximately six feet high across the ends of both piers to prevent seas washing over same into freight shed;

(2) Construction of four large creosoted pile dolphins near the corners of the two piers as protection to ships manoeuvering into berths;

(3) The provision of floating fender logs moored to existing bollards by heavy chain, along four faces of piers.

The estimated cost is:

(1) Parapet walls, $11,000.
(2) 4 creosoted pile dolphins, $26,000.
(3) floating fender logs, $9,000.

Item agreed to.

William Head—quarantine station—repairs to wharves, $6,100.

Mr. FRASER: Would the minister give us some information as to the meaning of the last item "appropriations not required for 1929-30, $326,739.74"? It appears in every vote.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is the total of items which were either completed or the money not spent. I could give the hon. member some details if he desires.

Mr. FRASER: I am not interested in the details. Were the items completed or not spent?

Mr. STEVENS: It is just an accounting term.

Mr. FRASER: Did I understand the minister to say that they were items completed or not spent?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Works which were either completed or money not spent.

Mr. FRASER: I am more mystified than ever. How could the work be completed and the money which was voted for it not be spent?

Mr. ELLIOTT: In certain cases the money was not spent; it is purely a matter of accounting.

Mr. STEVENS: It is absolutely meaningless.

Mr. FRASER: Last year under harbours and rivers there was a total appropriation for British Columbia of $774,739.74, and out of that amount $326,739.74 was not spent.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will give the hon. member some examples which will perhaps assist him. Arrowhead, improvements, $1,100 appropriation; amount expended $1,197.77. That is completed. Boswell, wharf repairs, $3,500. The expenditure was $2,096.28. This item was not completed and it is so marked. Brighton Beach, repairs to float, $1,100. This work was completed with an expenditure of $1,025.87, and there is no need of a revote. Brownsville, wharf reconstruction and extension. The appropriation was $4,000 and the amount expended was $3,547.41. Work completed.

Mr. MANION: The differences are all added together and make this figure?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, it is not the differences; these total amounts are added and they are called "appropriations not required" under our bookkeeping arrangement.

Mr. STEVENS: They are disposed of.

Mr. FRASER: Do I understand the minister to say that out of the vote of $774,739.74 the amount of $326,739.74 was not spent?

[Mr. Fraser.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: Oh no, a great deal of it was spent. There are a number of cases where only a part of the vote was spent, but in many cases it was all spent.

Mr. FRASER: What about the $326,739,74; was any part of that spent?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The greater part of it was spent.

Mr. FRASER: I would like to know what part of it.

Mr. STEVENS: These words have been appearing in the estimates for years. I do not think anybody has yet properly explained them, and I do not think anybody ever will. It is simply a bookkeeping item inserted by the accountants of the department for their own guidance. On one occasion we spent a whole day trying to find out what it was and we knew no more about it when we had finished than we did before.

Mr. FRASER: If we cannot get any more information than we have now, I think we might as well let the matter drop.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am willing.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—dredging—maritime provinces, $650,000.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Will the minister give us some particulars of what dredging is to be done in the maritime provinces?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Part of this has not been allocated yet. A certain portion of it has. The engineers at the time these estimates were prepared gave us certain information. So far as our own dredges are concerned, the statement is as follows:

Plant to Operate	Total
Dredge No. 1 (Fielding) and plant, tug Helena	$95,300
Dredge No. 2 (St. Lawrence) and plant, tug Fredericton	60,900
Dredge No. 5 (Northumberland)	59,200
Dredge No. 9 and plant, tug Rona	55,200
Dredge No. 11	34,200
Dredge No. 12	42,000
Dredge No. 13, and plant, tug Canso	61,800
Dredge No. 15	6,700
Dredge No. 16	6,800
Dredge No. 115 and plant, tug Lisgar	83,900
Maintenance of plant not to operate	24,100
Dredge No. 4 and tug Sogenada—Operation and maintenance provided for in Ontario and Quebec vote.	

Dredge No. 1, Fielding, and tug Helena are recommended to be used at Miramichi bay, Bathurst and Loggieville; dredge No. 2, St. Lawrence, and tug Fredericton at East-

ern harbour (Cheticamp), Inverness county; dredge No. 4 and tug Sogenada is to operate in the maritime provinces provided she has completed work in the Magdalen islands.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): The minister has not the places where they are all to work?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is not settled yet.

Dredging—Ontario and Quebec, $600,000.

Mr. ROSS (KINGSTON): I suppose the same answer may be given in regard to this item. I should be glad if the minister would give us some details as to where these dredges worked last year and what part of the expenditure was in Ontario.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The details are as follows:

Estimated cost of operating and maintaining departmental dredging plant during 1929-30

Plant to Operate	Operation	Maintenance	Total
Dredge No. 4, tug Sogenada and plant	$43,200	$19,700	$62,900
Dredge No. 110, International, tug Witherbee and plant	45,100	15,700	60,800
Dredge No. 116, Progress, tug Storm King and plant	44,700	11,600	56,300
Dredge No. 117, Quebec, tug Hercules and plant	49,190	13,600	62,790
Dredge No. 121, St. Louis, tug Cliffside and plant	19,700	9,300	29,000
Dredge No. 123, tug Monitor and plant	33,200	14,800	48,000
Dredge No. 126	9,400	3,200	12,600
Dredge No. 127	6,500	2,050	8,550
Dredge Q and R No. 1, tug Peel and plant	40,600	9,550	50,150
Dredge Harricana and launch Gwen	16,760	2,510	19,270
Total			$410,360
Maintenance of plant not to operate			7,090
Total			$417,450

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): That is all right, but what work was done by these tugs last year in Ontario and at what places?

Mr. ELLIOTT: These are the details:

Place	Cost
Amherst, Quebec Magdalen Island	$37,633 78
Barachois, Quebec	5,889 53
Beauharnois, Quebec	14,072 10
Chatham, Ontario	40,278 07
Colonie des Greves, Quebec	3,124 67
Quebec, Magdalen Islands	4,073 07
House Harbour	1,702 64
Ile Sainte	787 70
Kingsville, Ontario	5,685 06
Lachine, Quebec	34,282 74
Lake Demon-Tigny, Quebec	12,251 96
Lobster Cove, Quebec	1,642 96
Matane, Quebec	41,257 81
Magdalen Islands	8,667 35
Pointe-au-Pic, Quebec	2,236 99
Port Burwell, Ontario	58,979 57
Red Cape, Quebec	434 42
Rimouski, Quebec	1,178 79
River du Loup, Quebec	215 10
Rondeau, Ontario	9,171 17
Saguenay river, Quebec	71,712 89
Siscoe island, Quebec	5,195 39
Sorel, Quebec	1,241 00
Ste. Catherine's Bay, Quebec	2,323 03
St. Jean, Isle of Orleans, Quebec	3,410 09
St. Laurent, Isle of Orleans (Slipway)	2,778 59
St. Laurent, Isle of Orleans (Government wharf)	4,883 58
St. Laurent, Isle of Orleans (Chantiers)	2,147 09
St. Sulpice, Quebec	20,086 36
Vercheres, Quebec	1,132 32
Dredge No. 109, Goderich, Ontario	2,068 32
Haileybury-Ship Yard Maintenance	196 35
Pattern warehouse, Ottawa, Ontario	1,909 30

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Are these works in the public harbours, and are they all purely government works?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, all purely government works.

Item agreed to.

Cape Breton telegraph and telephone lines—general repairs and improvements, $8,000.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Where is this telegraph line?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We are letting vote No. 142 stand, and I can give my hon. friend the information he desires on that item.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

OPIUM AND NARCOTIC DRUG ACT AMENDMENT

The house in committee on Bill No. 4, to amend and consolidate the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act—Hon. Mr. King—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This bill being of a technical character, it was decided when it was before the house on a previous occasion to refer it to a special committee. This committee held a number of sittings at which the bill was carefully considered section by

section, and in addition, those who are engaged in the legitimate traffic in drugs appeared before the committee and made representations—I refer to representatives of the retail and wholesale druggists. These representatives were also permitted to be in contact and consultation with officers of the department and with the officers of the Justice department who drew the amendments as recommended by the committee. The bill as now presented I think meets the objects and desires of the departmental officers, and I think also clarifies any misunderstanding or doubts that might have existed in the minds of members of the committee or of those engaged in the legitimate traffic. I have an amendment to move to section 6 when we come to it, something that has come up since the committee adjourned. I will explain it when we reach the section.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

On section 4—Importing or exporting drug without license.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Are we not going to take up this section clause by clause?

The CHAIRMAN: If it is the desire of the committee, we can take up the subsections separately, but I called section 4.

Mr. HOWDEN: The hon. member for East Calgary was a member of the special committee, and I think we were agreed on every clause as it went through.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The first subsection deals with the penalties, and there are two features in connection with the penalties to which I objected in the committee and to which I still object. Section 1 provides that upon indictment an offender may be sentenced to imprisonment for any term not exceeding seven years, and in addition, at the discretion of the judge, he may be whipped. I object, first of all, to the practice of whipping. It is a relic of the dark ages when the rack and the thumbscrew were used to torture offenders. Secondly, this subsection does not fix any maximum penalty. In the case of penalties for any other offence, whether fine or imprisonment, there is a maximum penalty; it must not exceed such-and-such, but in this case there is no maximum penalty; it is left open to the judge to sentence a man to one or two or a hundred lashes as he sees fit. I think that is entirely wrong, even if you leave it to the discretion of the judge to order whipping, which, as I say, I look upon as a relic of the dark ages. Again, a man may be subjected to the penalty of whipping after a first offence. If you are going to whip at all, which I strongly object to, I do not think it should be inflicted as a penalty for the first offence. Give a man a second chance. I suggested in the special committee that that clause ought to be amended. I do not know how the committee of the whole house feels, but I would move, Mr. Chairman, to amend that subsection so that it will not be left to the discretion of the judge to order whipping.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman will have to submit his amendment in writing.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I know that my hon. friend from East Calgary took exception in the committee to the penalty of whipping, but the matter was very thoroughly discussed and it was ascertained that whipping is not a new section in this bill, or a new principle applied to this offence. Whipping already was applied at the discretion of the judge where the trafficker gave or sold drugs to a minor. We have extended that principle in order to provide a greater deterrent to those who are engaged in trafficking. From the information I have received from all parts of the Dominion since the bill was in committee, I am satisfied that those who are interested in the curtailment and suppression of this traffic are entirely in sympathy with the provision that whipping be left to the discretion of the judge.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Has the hon. gentleman any criticism of its being unlimited whipping?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is always limited by the judge.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Was the old section in that form? It seems extraordinary. Under this section might not a convicted person be sentenced to be whipped once a week during his imprisonment?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In the criminal code it is the same—the judge exercises his discretion.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Will the minister except whipping for the first offence?

Mr. KING (Koootenay): No.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The reason given in the committee for imposing the penalty of whipping for the first offence was extraordinary.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think the discretion can very well be left to the judge. I am satisfied that for the first offence the judge would not impose the penalty of whipping.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Did any other members of the committee object to the section?

Mr. ADSHEAD: I took exception; so did the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon).

Mr. LAPOINTE: And the hon. member for St. Ann (Mr. Guerin).

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Unlawful for physician, etc., to prescribe a drug except for medicinal purposes.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have an amendment to move to section 6.

Mr. MANION: That is the section on which we had so much discussion when the bill was before the house on another occasion?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. I beg to propose the following amendment as subsection 2 to section 6:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of the criminal code, or of any other statute or law, the court shall have no power to impose less than the minimum penalties herein prescribed.

Until recently we have had very little trouble under this section, as we were fortified by a judgment of the appeal court of Ontario that upon trial by indictment and conviction the minimum sentence was three months' imprisonment, and that the judge had no discretion but to impose this sentence. However, in the last week or two, since the bill was reported by the special committee, the appeal court of another province has decided differently, and ruled that under section 1,035 of the criminal code it is within the competence of the magistrate or judge to impose a fine and refrain from imposing imprisonment. Our officer makes this note:

> Proceedings by indictment are not taken against a professional man except under the most serious circumstances. As we are thus faced with two conflicting judgments, and as the intent of parliament is obviously that in such serious cases a minimum of three months' imprisonment should be awarded, the matter was discussed with the Department of Justice, who agreed that it would be advisable to place the matter beyond any doubt, and this can best be effected by adding a new subsection.

This is the subsection that I have just moved by way of amendment.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I think as the other members of the committee that considered this bill are not present, and this is a decided change in the section, it had better stand.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Then we will go on with the other sections.

Section stands.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Has the minister taken into consideration such a case as I brought to his attention on a former occasion? A practising physician administered a narcotic drug—I do not know under what circumstances—and a charge was made against him. If some person had not taken up his case that physician might have been whipped.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In such a case the judge would use his discretion. If the accused was found to be a regular trafficker, committing a crime worse than murder, and the judge decided that whipping was proper punishment, I do not think anyone would object. But ordinarily professional men are not proceeded against on indictment unless they are found to be really engaged in the drug traffic. The case referred to would not come under this section.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The evidence of the special officer engaged in the case would have been sufficient to render the accused liable to such a punishment, would it not?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Why not? I ask for information.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The judge, exercising his discretion, would see that this did not happen. Some of these matters must be left to the judge; we cannot possibly prescribe for every case.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I think the officers employed in the enforcement of this law should be specially qualified. In the case I have referred to they should not have entered such a charge against the doctor. If they are to have full control of these cases as in the past we may have some very unfortunate results.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have special officers in the department known as enforcement officers under the narcotic acts. Their agents throughout the country are the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the municipal and provincial police.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am quite sure that if they had consulted the municipal or provincial officers they would never have laid such a charge.

Mr. SPENCER: Are the provincial police throughout the Dominion cooperating fully with the mounted police in enforcing this act?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, we have had the hearty cooperation of the provincial and municipal police with the mounted police and our own officers in the enforcement of this act.

Progress reported.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS BRANCH LINES

PILKINGTON-NIAGARA JUNCTION

On the order:

House in committee on Bill No. 167, an Act to amend an act respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line between Pilkington and Niagara Junction, in the province of Ontario. (Withdrawal recommended by the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines).—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that Bill No. 167 be withdrawn and this order discharged.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent, of course.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING ORDER 37

RULING OF MR. SPEAKER ON POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SPEAKER: I promised on Wednesday to give a ruling on the question then raised with respect to standing order 37. I may be allowed to read my ruling to-night:

On Wednesday, the 8th of May, Mr. Robb, on the orders of the day being called, moved:

That Mr. Speaker, do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of ways and means.

Thereupon Mr. Woodsworth rose from his seat and said:

Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring before the house a matter that affects a considerable section of this country.

He then recited his grievances having reference to freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of assembly.

Having spoken forty minutes, I told him his time was up. The hon. member claimed that he was entitled under standing order 37 to speak beyond forty minutes. He was supported in this connection by other hon. members.

I have been requested to consider more deeply the objection raised. Accordingly, I have gone very carefully into the study of standing order 37, adopted by this house two years ago. If one reads carefully the new rule, it will be found that in order to limit the length of speeches which were unduly protracted, parliament came to the conclusion that a forty-minute rule should henceforward apply to the debates in the house.

Exceptions were, however, made to that rule and they are set forth in standing order 37, which reads as follows:

Standing order 37. Speeches limited to forty minutes, 22nd March, 1927.

No member, except the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition, or a minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister or a member making a motion of "no confidence" in the government and a minister replying thereto, shall speak for more than forty minutes at a time in any debate.

271a. The following resolution was adopted by the house on April 19, 1886:

"That the growing practice in the Canadian House of Commons, of delivering speeches of great length, having the character of carefully and elaborately prepared written essays, and indulging in voluminous and often irrelevant extracts, is destructive of legitimate and pertinent debate upon public questions, is a waste of valuable time, unreasonably lengthens the sessions of parliament, threatens by increased bulk and cost to lead to the abolition of the official report of the debates, encourages a discursive and diffuse, rather than an incisive and concise style of public speaking, is a marked contrast to the practice in regard to debate that prevails in the British House of Commons, and tends to repel the public from a careful and intelligent consideration of the proveedings of parliament."

It is argued that the hon. member, by addressing the house as he did on Wednesday, came under the exception "or a minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister."

My ruling hinges on the interpretation to be given to the words, "speaking in reply." Was the hon. gentleman speaking "in reply" to the motion, "that I do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of ways and means"?

He was, as a matter of fact, airing grievances which had no relevancy whatsoever with the subject matter, namely: resolution to amend the Special War Revenue Act by the Minister of Finance in the committee of ways and means.

It is a fundamental principle of parliamentary government that the redress of grievances is to be considered before the granting of supplies (vide Bourinot, p. 419). This principle applies with equal force when the motion is made for the Speaker to leave the chair to go into ways and means. Members may address the house on any subject of public importance or move amendments under the same rules as governed on going into committee of supply (vide Bourinot, p. 423).

Therefore the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre had unquestionably the right to speak as he did, on the motion made by the Minister of Finance—but could he speak more than forty minutes? Did he come under the exception provided for under standing order 37? In other words, was he speaking in reply immediately after the minister?

I have since given the most serious consideration to the interpretation of this standing order and as I said the whole question hinges on the meaning of the words "in reply" as they appear therein. What is a reply? According to the King's English dictionary, it is:

> That which is said or written in answer to what is said or written by another; rejoinder; response.

Therefore, Mr. Woodsworth, in order to speak longer than forty minutes, was bound to argue against Mr. Robb's motion.

His speech, in this as in any other instance, had to be relevant to the issue. Was it relevant?

He actually objected to the Speaker leaving the chair until a certain grievance be aired before the house. He gave a reason for his objection, namely, that unless the house heard what he wished to ask the government on the question of freedom of speech, the ways and means for collecting revenue could not be considered.

As I have said, under an ancient constitutional doctrine, the redress of grievances is considered before the granting of supplies or the consideration of ways and means; and members may then discuss various questions without moving any amendment. As Bourinot says, 4th edition, page 421, a great latitude is allowed on such occasions.

I have come to the conclusion that the expression of any reasonable grievance on the motion for the Speaker to leave the chair is a sufficient reply to bring a member's speech under the provision of standing order 37. I cannot conceive a case where he could then be irrelevant. It is not necessary that his observations should deal with the subject matter of the resolutions to be considered in committee. The member objects to anything being considered at all until he has had a hearing. Of course, if an amendment or a second reading of a bill, were moved, discussion should be properly confined to its subject matter. But there was no amendment in Mr. Woodsworth's case.

Standing Order 37 being a restrictive regulation, as such it must be given the broadest construction possible. In cases of uncertainty the benefit of the doubt must be given to freedom of speech in parliament.

I have considered the arguments from every angle and I have reached the conclusion that it is advisable to abide by the letter of this standing order. The ruling is that Mr. Woodsworth had the right to speak for more than forty minutes.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Monday, May 13, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar) moved:

> That the recommendations contained in the eighth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills, presented on May 10, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PEACE RIVER DISTRICT

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING SURVEY OF RESOURCES AND PURCHASE OF RAILWAY

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): I desire to table a return moved by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy), for all correspondence with reference to the survey which will be undertaken jointly by the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the British Columbia government into the resources of that country. I desire also to table a further reference moved by the hon. member for Peace River, for all correspondence between the Department of Railways and Canals and the Alberta government in reference to the joint purchase of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway.

In connection with both these returns I should say that delay was occasioned by reason of the need of securing the permission of the presidents of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways for the inclusion of certain personal correspondence. That permission has been granted, but I desire to say that this does not constitute in any way an acknowledgment of the principle that personal correspondence of that character can be brought down as a matter of right. In this case, however, both presidents were willing to have that correspondence included because of the nature of the correspondence and the information it conveys.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 214, for the relief of Eva Alexandra Grayson Smith.—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 215, for the relief of Ernest Gillespie Simpson.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 217, for the relief of Gertrude Helena Martin.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 218, for the relief of Laura Warren.—Mr. Speakman.

Bill No. 219, for the relief of Ethel Elizabeth Kelley.—Mr. Edwards (Waterloo).

Bill No. 222, for the relief of Mildred Muriel Lange.—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 223, for the relief of Linda Lydia Snowdown Pascoe.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 228, for the relief of William Treslove.—Mr. Thorson.

Bill No. 229, for the relief of Annie Letticia Smith.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 231, for the relief of Jennie White.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 233, for the relief of Gladys Evelyn Lawrence.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 234, for the relief of Daniel Ray Bouvier.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 237, for the relief of George Nelson Brown.—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 239, for the relief of James Duncan Gerard.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 241, for the relief of Violet Haney.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 242, for the relief of James Thompson Clark.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 245, for the relief of Alexander James Purse.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 246, for the relief of Wilfred Keith Black.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 247, for the relief of Henry Feldman.—Mr. Jacobs.

On division.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

CANADIAN NATIONAL STEAMSHIPS—SALES AND TRANSFERS

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine):

1. At what price were the Canadian Gunner, Canadian Harvester, and Canadian Settler sold, in 1926?

2. To whom were they sold, and have they been paid for in full?

3. At what price were each of the seven steamers, Canadian Aviator, Canadian Gunner, Canadian Harvester, Canadian Otter, Canadian Runner, and Canadian Sapper transferred from the merchant marine fleet to the Canadian National steamships?

Mr. DUNNING:

1. Canadian Gunner, $50,000; Canadian Harvester, $50,000; Canadian Settler, £17,750, less 2½ per cent commission.

2. Canadian Gunner, Canada Atlantic Transit Company, Toronto (a subsidiary of Canadian National Railways); Canadian Harvester, Canada Atlantic Transit Company, Toronto, (a subsidiary of Canadian National Railways); Canadian Settler, to the Arbour Shipping Company, London, England. The purchase price for the Canadian Settler has been paid in full; $30,000 has been paid to date on each of the other vessels—Canadian Gunner and Canadian Harvester.

3. Transfer price not yet established.

PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH—SOLDIERS' ADVISERS

Mr. ESLING:

1. What are the names of the soldiers' advisers under the Department of Pensions and National Health?

2. What is the salary of each adviser?

3. What advisers are on full time and part time respectively, and what was the profession or vocation of each adviser before his appointment?

4. What travelling expenses were allowed each adviser for the past fiscal year, and what office expenses were allowed each adviser for the same period?

Mr. KING (Kootenay):

Answer to No. 1	Answer to No. 2	Answer to No. 3		Answer to No. 4	
Name	Salary	Full or part time	Profession	Travelling expense	Office expense
	$			$ cts.	$ cts.
Macdonald, K. G....	4,120	Full.....	Barrister.....	647 20	191 61
Racette, C. E.....	3,000	Part.....	Clerk.....	35 00	433 69
Pettigrew, A.....	1,800	"	Barrister.....	3 00	435 00
Hamilton, H. F.....	3,000	"	Provincial Secretary, G.W.V.A.....	593 89	597 40
Johnson, H. D.....	1,200	"	Medical doctor.....	20 30	240 00
Askwith, C.....	2,000	"	Journalist.....	179 60	312 17
Conroy, J. V.....	3,600	"	District Secretary, G.W.V.A.....	196 78	1,102 56
Fremlin, E. N.....	2,400	"	Accountant.....	222 29	517 28
Bowler, J. R.....	3,600	"	Barrister.....	133 11	2,776 67
Rowan, F. J.....	2,400	"	Provincial Secretary, G.A.U.V.....	289 80	517 14
Petley, S. G.....	2,400	"	Provincial Secretary, G.W.V.A.....	403 85	493 06
MacKenzie, I.....	3,000	"	Barrister.....	113 35*	666 72
Sedger, G. H.....	2,400	"	Barrister.....	60 49	530 14
Hawkins, C. B.....	1,800	"	Barrister.....	178 56	419 09

*Including $23.45, which was paid to Mr. Bruce Boyd, who was official soldiers' adviser during part of 1928.

REFUNDS TO COAL IMPORTERS

Mr. CANTLEY:

1. Of the total amount of $1,060,096.16 reported on page 2121 of Hansard of April 29, as refunded to importers of coal during the year 1928, what was the amount refunded on coal used in the production or manufacture of iron and/or steel in each of the several provinces of Canada?

2. What was the amount so refunded on account of coal imported and used in connection with metallurgical processes other than the production of iron or steel in each of the provinces of Canada?

3. What was the amount so refunded on account of coal imported and used in connection with the production or refining of salt in each of the several provinces of Canada?

Mr. EULER:

1. $662,986.28.

2. For metallurgical processes other than iron or steel, nil; for production of coke, $383,072.96.

3. $14,036.92.

Note: To give fuller details would disclose the business of individual concerns which is contrary to the practice of the Department of National Revenue.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

DAUPHIN, MAN., POSTMASTER

Mr. MANION:

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents relating to the present postmaster at Dauphin, Manitoba, Mr. A. E. Iredale.

PICTOU COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CANTLEY:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and recommendations received at the office of the district engineer of the Department of Public Works, Halifax, relating to, or in any way connected with any work done in the county of Pictou by the Department of Public Works.

2. A return showing all appointments and/or dismissals made by or under authority of the said district engineer, with the causes assigned therefor, if any.

He said: This motion is incomplete; it should designate the years 1927, 1928 and 1929.

Motion stands.

PRIVATE BILLS

NIAGARA FALLS MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMPANY

The house in committee on Bill No. 22, to incorporate Niagara Falls Memorial Bridge Company—Mr. Pettit—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 6—Directors.

Mr. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) is very much interested in this bill. He is away at present but I know he will return in ample time to enable this bill to be dealt with, and I suggest, in fairness to him, that some of these clauses be allowed to stand so that he may be enabled to express his views.

The CHAIRMAN: That is for the committee to decide.

Mr. PETTIT: I think I have acted perfectly fairly in this matter; this bill has been before the house and has been adjourned six times.

Mr. BENNETT: I received a telegram in connection with this matter from the Premier of Ontario, and I understand that a similar telegram was sent to the Prime Minister by the Premier of Ontario. As I understand the matter, the state of New York is opposed to this bridge, and the province of Ontario

through its parks commission, is applying for the incorporation of a company of its own to deal with a bridge in that locality. This bill gives incorporation to the company and parliament has to deal with it because it happens to be an international waterway which is to be crossed. I understood that the hon. member for Lincoln, who is on the parks board, has certain observations to make to this house with respect to this bill, but due to a bereavement in his family he is absent at a time when he expected to be here. I have not discussed this matter with the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Pettit) and I have had no communication with the hon. member for Lincoln, but in view of the fact that the state of New York and the province of Ontario, the two communities affected, are both opposed to this legislation, it would seem to me that an opportunity should be afforded to the representative who happens to be on the parks board, and who is looked to to present their views to this house, to put his case before the committee. It will be a matter of more than passing curiosity why this parliament gives incorporation to a company which is not desired by either the state of New York or the province of Ontario.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): As the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) has said, a telegram was sent to the Prime Minister of Canada by the Premier of Ontario. This telegram was placed in the hands of the chairman of the railway committee, and he handed it to me, as I was then acting as chairman. The telegram was read before the committee when the hon. member for Lincoln was present, and it was fully discussed. Several amendments were introduced which I understood very largely met the objections raised by the hon. member.

Mr. BENNETT: Am I right in believing that an advertisement is pending for a bill on behalf of the parks commission itself to construct a bridge across this waterway?

I think hon. gentlemen will find that such is the case; that the province of Ontario is now advertising in the Gazette and in the newspapers asking for a bill such as this. I am only giving my recollection of what was said by one of the gentlemen from that department.

Mr. SPENCER: I have seen the advertisements.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is rather late for a private bill.

Mr. BENNETT: They were trying to get it through this session.

[Mr. Bennett.]

The CHAIRMAN: It is for the committee to decide whether or not we shall proceed with the bill. We are now on section 6. Shall section 6 carry?

Section agreed to.

Sections 7, 8 and 9 agreed to.

On section 10—Tolls.

Mr. DUNNING: Was this section amended in committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, in line 17 the words "governor in council" have been struck out and the words "Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada" have been substituted therefor.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 11 agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Sections 12 and 13 have been stricken out.

Sections 14 to 20 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported on division.

FLORENCE MAY FORBES

The house in committee on Bill No. 122 for the relief of Florence May Forbes.—Mr. Bell (Hamilton)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. SPENCER: Would the sponsor of the bill inform the committee whether there are any children in this case?

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): If my hon. friend will refer to the former proceedings, he will see that it was explained that the respondent had become a fugitive from justice two or three years before this unfortunate woman petitioned; that one of the children remained with her, and that two others were being cared for by relatives in England.

Mr. BOURASSA: It has been frequently said that parliament does not encourage divorce by collusion. This is supposed to be the rule. In the senate committee there is put to every petitioner for divorce a formal, what I might call a stereotyped, question to which the invariable answer "no" is given. Of course, if one reads the evidence in most of the bills, it is quite apparent that although there is not actual and absolute collusion, the party against whom the divorce is asked has generally placed himself or herself in such a position that the evidence will enable the committee of the senate to declare that adultery has been proven. That is quite clear from the evidence in most of the bills, but

in this case there is worse in the evidence itself. At page 10 of the minutes of evidence I find that this question was put to the petitioner regarding a conversation she had with her husband some time previously:

Q. Did he tell you anything else?
A. Yes, he said that I was far too good for him and I had better go home and take the children home to my mother. He said that he had done everything that he should not have done and he said there was no way out of it but for me to divorce him. But I could not, because I did not have the money, and our third baby was about to be born.

Here, therefore, we have clear evidence that prior to these divorce proceedings there was a meeting between the husband and the wife; that the husband advised the wife to ask for a divorce, making her a confession of the facts upon which the petition is brought to parliament. Then the wife adds that she did not take immediate proceedings because she did not have enough money.

The procedure adopted in this case is nothing out of the ordinary. Since we have been told that if these divorce bills pass it is because we, as members of parliament, neglect the duty of looking into them, I have made up my mind to look into some of them, so far as I can do so without disregarding my other duties as a member of this house, and conquering as best I can my instinctive feeling of revulsion and disgust at reading the evidence. What is testified to, quite honestly I believe, by the petitioner in this case takes place in many other cases that come before the senate committee. That is quite clear from the evidence itself. I think it is no exaggeration to say that nearly all these divorce cases are decided ex parte by the senate committee upon the evidence of the petitioner, whether husband or wife, and upon the evidence given by a police agent who is hired by the petitioner to make the case, such agent testifying to facts which are not corroborated by any other witness. It is also quite clear in many cases that the party against whom the petition is filed and against whom a divorce is pronounced, has lent himself or herself, whether husband or wife, quite openly to the research made by the police agent. I claim that this is divorce by collusion. Collusion may be proved at times, but not often, and that is true not only of divorce but of all other cases. It is very seldom that people who enter into collusion to evade a law will do it in such a manner that the evidence of collusion is easy to establish before a court of law. Collusion is generally the result of some action or inaction on the part of the individuals who enter into it.

This case I take as an example because it differs from many other cases in this, that the petitioner gives very candid and apparently honest testimony as to collusion. Evidently she had not been warned by her legal adviser that she ought not to bring before the senate committee any fact that would tend to prove collusion, which is so clearly shown in many other divorce cases. In this case you have the petitioner, under oath, and appearing on her own behalf, giving evidence of collusion before the senate committee. She swears that she was advised by her husband to ask for a divorce, and that her husband confessed to her the facts which enabled her to establish the grounds for divorce. I ask any fair-minded man if that is not prima facie evidence of collusion? I leave it to the house to decide whether or not we are justified in ratifying this decision of the senate committee after a fact like this is made clear in the evidence itself. This is not a case of presumption; it is not a case of the obiter dictum of anybody; it is not a construction being put on circumstantial evidence by anybody here or elsewhere; it is the very testimony of the petitioner herself, giving evidence under oath. I leave it to the house to decide whether or not this parliament, being the highest court of the land, as we are told time and again, should do what no other court and no other judge with a sense of judicial responsibility would do.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): Mr. Chairman, I do not know how the hon. member for Labelle or any other member could have succeeded so admirably in proving to this house that I and other hon. members have been right in advocating repeatedly that there ought to be a divorce court to deal with the question of divorce in this country, because we know perfectly well that it is not competent to members of parliament as a whole, and certainly of all members it is not competent to my hon. friend from Labelle, to say what amounts in law to collusion. If there ever was necessity for a demonstration of that, the hon. member has just given it. Here we have the case of a woman who is ruthlessly deserted by a man who has become a defaulter and has left her flat to carry on with her three little children. That man without any sugguestion or assistance from her writes to her and rather brutally says, "I have broken my marriage vows. I have left you flat. You can go out and get a divorce if you feel like it," and my hon. friend from Labelle says that that amounts to collusion.

Mr. BOURASSA: It was not a letter; it was a conversation which took place between the two parties, and which is related by the wife.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): Then so much the worse.

Mr. BOURASSA: Quite so.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): So much the worse for the man. If my hon. friend had chosen to read but one detached portion of the evidence he would have seen how on page 11 this woman pledges herself to the fact that there was no collusion between her and her husband to make this application for divorce. She takes that oath after all the circumstances were laid before the divorce committee, and after the divorce committee had been apprised of the fact that without any suggestion from her this man had walked out and left her flat to care for herself and her three little children. I would be very glad, if it were possible to do so, to leave this case to the judgment of my hon. friend from Lisgar, who checks up on these applications, or to my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre, who has interested himself in many of these applications, to say whether this chamber should not unhesitatingly endorse this application, because I am sure that of all the applications that have come before the house this session there is none more meritorious than this.

Section agreed to, on division.

Section 2 agreed to, on division.

Bill reported on division.

MARY MELVINA GUERIN

The house in committee on Bill No. 95, for the relief of Mary Melvina Guerin—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. BOURASSA: Mr. Chairman, on this bill I wish to direct the attention of the committee to two facts. First, the parties are Roman Catholics. They were married according to the rites of the church and to the laws of the country before a Roman Catholic priest. Some years ago a similar case came before the house. Thereupon most of the representatives from the province of Quebec pointed out that such a marriage could not be dissolved under the laws of their church and of their province. They opposed that bill both on moral grounds and on legal grounds. The same arguments that were then advanced by several members, including, I believe, the present Speaker of the house—I am not sure as to that—apply in this case. There are four children born of this marriage. Those children are Roman Catholics. If we grant this divorce we place those children with regard to their church, their social ties, and so forth, in the most awkward and obnoxious position. We do them an injury of which they cannot at present—they are all under age—measure the consequences.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would the hon. member pardon my interjecting? In the case of annulment, as granted occasionally in the province of Quebec, are not the children placed in a very awkward position, because they are then rendered illegitimate?

Mr. BOURASSA: I am glad my hon. friend has brought up the point, because it is one of the errors most generally propounded over the country. It has been repeated time and again in many, many newspaper articles and in speeches inside and outside this house. Both under the age-old law of the Roman Catholic church and under the written law of the province of Quebec, articles 163 and 164 of the civil code, every time a marriage is declared to be null—the Minister of Justice will correct me if I am wrong—if the so-called marriage was entered into in good faith by the two parties, even if one only was in good faith, the children are held to be legitimate. I am sure this will be confirmed by my hon. friend from Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), who is neither Catholic nor Protestant, but who knows the law.

Mr. JACOBS: I agree with the hon. gentleman, and as he notes, I can properly act as arbitrator for both denominations.

Mr. BOURASSA: They are held to be legitimate, not only morally and socially, but legally as well. In other words, although the marriage is annulled, or rather—because in these matters one has to be precise—although the marriage is declared to be non-existent, the children are held, for all intents and purposes whatsoever, to be legitimate. They inherit from their father or their mother just as legitimate children do. I know of no single instance in Lower Canada previous to confederation or in the province of Quebec since confederation where the slightest stigma has ever been attached to children born of such marriages, or rather of such unions declared by the tribunals or the church to be non-existent. I hope that will satisfy my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre so far as the state of law, and the state of mind also, in the province of Quebec are concerned.

But on all those matters I must repeat and go on repeating what I have said on previous occasions—it is a difference of education, it is a difference of temperament, if you like. In those matters we Catholics look primarily to the social aspect. I am not saying that we are right or wrong. I am stating a fact. We look primarily to the social aspect. We claim, as they did, not only in old France, but in England as well, up to the middle of the last century, that matrimonial laws are primarily enacted for the sake of society, and that such individual cases, sad as they may be, which may come in conflict with the general law, should not predominate in the minds of the legislature or of the tribunals over the social principle.

Now, if you take that state of mind, if you take that principle of legislation into consideration, you will readily understand how on the one hand we endeavour to maintain the laws of matrimony intact from the social point of view, while at the same time we endeavour to make it as clear as we can in law, in practice, in effect, that no stigma, no degradation should attach to those individuals who happen to have broken the laws and therefore have put themselves into a position resulting in the situation which my friend has described, when in good faith they thought they had complied with the law.

So I repeat, without attempting to bring any religious issue into the debates of this house, that we should hesitate before we pass any legislation, private or public, which will put the subjects of such legislation in a position entirely antagonistic to the social surroundings and to the social laws under which they had been born and brought up. Of course, I realize that this parliament cannot legislate from the point of view of any individual church in this country. My friend from Cartier may regret that we have not Jewish legislation here. My friends of the Anglican church may feel similarly. I may feel the same as a Catholic. But we have to take the conditions in the country as we find them. As far back as 1851 it was declared in the legislature of United Canada, I will not say with unanimity, but under the influence of a French majority, that the conditions of Canada being as they are, all religions, all churches and creeds must stand on a footing of equality before the law. That may be objectionable from a purely philosophical or religious point of view, but it is true and unavoidable from the point of view of fact. But while I take it as an admitted principle of our polity that no legislation should be passed under the dictation of any church, as detrimental to any other church, I claim that we should avoid, either in private or in public legislation, hurting the feelings or impairing the social position of any church in this country, when the decision we make affects only the members of that church. That is a principle which was recognized by parliament in the past.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In this particular case one of the parties comes seeking a divorce. That action, I presume, would not be countenanced by the church.

Mr. BOURASSA: Of course not.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: But can we refuse to receive this petition even though the person seeking the divorce may be a member of the Roman Catholic church?

Mr. BOURASSA: Here again my hon. friend will realize the difficulty—but it is a difficulty which we must face—the difficulty of harmonizing the individualistic point of view, which I respect, of those people born and brought up in what I might call the tendencies of Protestantism, with the point of view of those born and brought up in the faith of Roman Catholicism. My hon. friend is impressed—and I appreciate his point of view—with the individual position of the woman asking for this bill. I have endeavoured however to direct the attention of the house to the social aspect of the case as it relates to the position of the four children concerned in this legislation, who have no word to say in law or otherwise, nor anyone to represent to this house what their situation will be after the marriage is dissolved. In the assumption that these four children will remain members of the Roman Catholic church when they come of age and when they enter into social relations with people of their creed, I submit that they will be placed in a most awkward position. Moreover, if either the woman or the man, heretofore the wife or the husband, should choose to marry again, against the rules of their church, taking advantage of this piece of legislation, once more you will place this Catholic family in a most awkward position. And you do it, I repeat, when there is no one entitled, legally or morally, to state the views of the four children. I have said on a previous occasion, and I repeat it now, that all through this broad question of marriage and divorce, I am more concerned with the fate of the children than with the fate of either the man or the woman. They are supposed to know what they have done and what they are doing; they are supposed to stand the consequences of their action. This

woman is supposed to have known what she was doing when she asked for the divorce, and the husband is supposed to have known all the circumstances; he was free to come before parliament and oppose the petition of his wife. I am not in this instance discussing the principle of divorce itself; I am bringing forward once more the rights of the children. In this as in all other cases of this nature, who are the protectors of the children? By what right can this parliament or any body of men or any tribunal declare that four children, incapable of expressing their will, incapable of acting legally, shall be put in a position which will hamper them in the future if they desire to go on living socially with people of their creed? I am prepared to take the same position with regard to divorces granted to people of the Anglican faith, though of course I admit it may be perhaps a little indiscreet on my part to stand up in support of the position taken by the bishops of that church, when no representative of that church in this house does so. One does not like to be over zealous. But I am simply stating this fact to show that I am not taking this position merely from the Roman Catholic point of view; I am arguing from this standpoint: that when we deal with people belonging to one single individual church we have no right to pass legislation repugnant to the principles of that church. I take that stand, just as I would take the position that if any member of a particular church asked us to pass legislation or to refuse legislation in keeping with the principles of that church, but in a matter touching which the adherents of another faith were concerned, I should say that, given the principles and the practice of polity which must prevail in a mixed country like ours, we cannot afford either to grant or to refuse legislation from the sole point of view of one church when individuals belonging to another church are affected.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: A question was put to me only a few days ago by a correspondent in Montreal, a woman who thinks that she ought to obtain a divorce. She thinks the circumstances are such that were she a Roman Catholic living in the province of Quebec she could have her marriage declared null and void, but being a Protestant it is impossible for her to obtain relief along that line. Yet, living in Quebec, she finds it very, very difficult to obtain a divorce. Now, I put that problem to my hon. friend. Is there not a real difficulty for Protestant minorities living in Quebec?

Mr. BOURASSA: I cannot discuss the case because one would have to know the circumstances. The situation in the province of Quebec is this. Both under civil law—what it is good for at present, I do not know, nor does anyone know—both under civil law and under the canonical law of the Roman Catholic church, divorce is not admissible What is possible is a declaration of nullity, if according to the evidence, it is found that at the time of the marriage there was some impediment fatal in law, canonical or civil—because, I repeat, there is a discrepancy between the two—in that case the marriage is declared to be null. The marriage must have been celebrated by what is now called a substantial form of marriage, which is the law in every country with slight differences. It is the law of every province in Canada, of the United States, of every country, that there must be some essential form, rudimentary if you like, in the solemnization of marriage, and there must have been a form of consummation. If these conditions do not exist, then a declaration of nullity will be granted by a court of law in the province of Quebec.

The other procedure is separation. Both under canonical and civil law separation, or what is called in English, divorce a mensa et thoro, can be granted by the court, which has jurisdiction to declare under what conditions as to property the two parties will separate, to which of the two parties the children shall be confided, and what will be paid by one of the parties to the other for the maintenance of the children. That is all I can say to my hon. friend now on that point.

In the case now before us I want first to place before hon. members of this house, and especially those from the province of Quebec, the position with regard to the principle of this legislation. They may do as they like in the matter, but I desire to place the principle before them and to refer them to the debates which took place in this house in connection with a previous divorce case. I do not like to mention names, but my friend the Minister of Justice will remember the case. Two parties in the province of Quebec applied for a divorce some time shortly after the war, I was not then in the house; I am told it was about 1919.

However, apart from the question of principle there is a question of fact in this case. The husband and wife separated long before action was taken, which happens in nearly all these cases; the children lived with the father for some time and then returned to live with the mother. This divorce was recommended by the judicial committee of the senate on the sole evidence of one of the children, a girl of fifteen years of age, who at the request

of her mother testified as to the adultery of her father. That was the sole testimony in this case, and I would ask the legal members of this house if any court of law would render judgment, even in a trivial case, upon the testimony of a child fifteen years of age, as against one of the parents?

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman; anyone looking at page 10 of the evidence will find that the statement just made by the hon. member is not quite correct. I refer to the following:

By Mr. Kelley:
Q. What did your husband tell you when you asked him about living with this woman?—A. He just told me that he was living with this woman for about two years.

There is not only the uncorroborated evidence of the child but also the admission of the husband.

Mr. BOURASSA: I said previously that the testimony of an interested party is not testimony at all, and I repeat that the only witness apart from the petitioner was the fifteen-year-old girl.

Mr. STINSON: There is the man's own admission.

Mr. BOURASSA: Yes, but the man did not appear and the woman simply said her husband admitted doing a certain thing.

Mr. STINSON: She is a competent witness.

Mr. BOURASSA: I am not discussing this matter from the legal point of view; I am now addressing myself to the people who are not desiccated by law and have preserved some sense of humanity. Here is a poor woman who finds herself in the position of asking for a divorce; she thinks she is entitled to a divorce. That is her business, with which I am not concerned. She testifies against her husband, who does not appear. They never appear in these cases, apparently; most of them only appear when the police agent is sent to catch them under the proper or improper conditions which are required to make a case.

Mr. JACOBS: They also appear at the second wedding.

Mr. BOURASSA: Yes, both or either of them. The other witness is the girl, who says that she lived for months with her father. I shall not enter into a discussion of the details of this case; they are sufficiently repugnant, but the girl admitted that as long as she lived with her father she never spoke about the matter because he had forbidden her to do so. Then she went to live with her mother, and when the mother asks for a divorce the girl comes before the committee of the senate and gives her evidence. I remember having read in books of history that many times tribunals have refused to listen to such testimony; they have refused to put a child in the cruel position of having to testify against her father or her mother, but evidently this parliament is above such considerations. One of these days we may expect to have babies testify before the committee of the senate that they were born of adultery.

I am not a lawyer—like Sir Charles Tupper I was on the point of saying, "thank heaven!" —but I must say that the idea of deciding a case in law, whether civil or criminal, in such a manner revolts my feelings of humanity. Someone, I think, has interjected that this is a Roman way of thinking, but in my opinion it is a human way of thinking. Whether we are pagans or infidels or whether we belong to any sect imaginable, I cannot put it into my clumsy head to think that bringing a child born of lawful or unlawful union, to decide on the fate of either its father or mother, is the right kind of justice. I cannot put it in my clumsy head to think that a so-called representative body of a so-called civilized country should pass that sort of legislation.

To complete my idea, in a sense I regret that these two circumstances should be connected in this case; I would far rather have seen them separated. There is the principle to which I directed the attention of the committee in the beginning, the moral inability of this parliament to pass legislation contrary to the basic law of any religious community so long as only members of that community are concerned; secondly, the point of fact which I have just made. By mere accident they are connected together in this case and, therefore, I thought I would bring them to the attention of the committee. As regards the previous cases, and the cases which will follow, I leave it as it is for the time being. But on this bill, I hope we will get some pronouncement on the part of the representatives from the province of Quebec, because their silent attitude would stand in such contrast to the attitude taken upon the occasion to which I have referred, that it would give the people cause to doubt what has become of the sense of social duty of some of our representatives.

Mr. MARCIL: Mr. Chairman, I wish to repeat what I have already said. The people of Ontario and the people of Quebec have never accepted divorce. The question of divorce has never been submitted to the people, and I know if the province of Quebec were asked to express their view on any proposal accepting the principle of divorce it

would be turned down by an overwhelming majority. And I know that in Ontario there is a very strong public opinion against divorce, which is evidenced, as mentioned by the hon. member for Labelle, by the pronouncement made by the Bishop of Ottawa and the Bishop of Kootenay at a meeting of the synod of the Anglican church of Canada. Divorce has been recognized as a misfortune; it has become a peril and a menace to our social existence. We must not follow in the footsteps of the United States where last year there was one divorce for every four marriages, or in the footsteps of the state of Nevada, where there there were two divorces for every marriage.

At the time of confederation divorce courts were in existence in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and had the fathers of confederation meant to impose divorce upon Quebec and Ontario they would have included a clause to that effect in the British North America Act; but that was not done. I have before me a volume which deals very succintly with the constitutional aspect of divorce. It is entitled, Parliamentary Divorce Practice in Canada, and the author is Frederick D. Hogg, of the Ottawa bar. I should like to read an extract or two from this volume, as follows:

Under the constitution of the Dominion of Canada the subject of divorce comes within the powers with respect to legislation, conceded to the parliament of Canada.

Section 91 of the British North America Act declares, that the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects enumerated in this section and included among these specifically mentioned subjects is that of divorce.

This power to deal with divorce conferred upon the Dominion parliament by the constitution, is not exercised to its fullest extent and the Dominion has not enacted legislation with reference to divorce, applicable to Canada as a whole.

By section 129, of the B.N.A. Act,

"All laws in force in Canada, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick at the union shall continue in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick respectively as if the union had not been made, subject nevertheless (except with respect to such as are enacted by or existing under the Act of Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland) to be repealed, abolished or altered by the parliament of Canada or by the legislature of the respective provinces according to the authority of parliament or of that legislature under this act."

Then the author continues with his comments:

Under this section the whole body of laws in force at confederation in the uniting provinces is continued, subject to the legislative authority granted by the act, to the Dominion and the provinces respectively. Any alteration therefore of the existing laws regarding divorce can be made only by the Dominion parliament.

Parliament has not yet repealed, abolished or altered the statutes in force in the several provinces at the time of their entry into confederation so far as any law in existence on the subject of divorce is concerned and does not exercise its right to exclusive authority over divorce.

The courts of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in which there was legislation with respect to divorce at the time of confederation, have always entertained applications for divorce.

At the time the province of Prince Edward Island entered into the Dominion there was power in that province itself, to deal with the questions of marriage and divorce, this power having been given to the province by 5 William IV, Chapter 10, which conferred the right upon the governor and the executive council to grant divorce.

This jurisdiction was extended to the western provinces under the provisions of the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act.

Divorce has never been accepted by the people of Quebec or by the people of Ontario, and in granting these bills of divorce we are making an exception for the relief of certain parties. To people who believe in divorce this is naturally very acceptable in some cases, but where people do not believe in divorce a very extraordinary position is created, as has been pointed out very eloquently by the hon. member for Labelle. If a man or a woman is a Roman Catholic and wishes to remain in the Roman Catholic church, he or she is debarred from divorce, and a divorced person cannot be remarried within the pale of the Catholic church. That is the law of the church, not only in this country but throughout the world, and it has been the law for centuries. It is true that a marriage may be declared null in the province of Quebec, but that is brought about by means of an ecclesiastical tribunal, such as existed in England for many centuries and such as exists at the present time in Rome and other parts of the world. This ecclesiastical tribunal hears evidence ab initio, as the expression is, to discover whether there was any impediment to the marriage either by reason of kindred or because of other obstacles which should be surmounted before a marriage could be performed. This religious tribunal presents a finding which is subject to appeal to another religious tribunal within the Dominion of Canada. If that is not satisfactory there is another appeal to the Rota at Rome, which is the outstanding tribunal of the Roman Catholic Church. These decisions do not declare in favour of divorce, but declare whether or not the marriage ever existed. In the province of Quebec legal and civil effect is given to the findings of the ecclesiastical

court, and that is the end of the matter as far as Roman Catholics are concerned. The course generally followed in Quebec, and I presume in many other countries—it was followed in England for generations—was that parties who did not agree between themselves would apply to the court for separation as to bed and board. A finding is always made for alimony to the wife and for the maintenance and care of the children. Nothing of that kind is done by the federal parliament, and that is our strongest objection against divorce. It is unnatural and immoral and, with no disrespect to the opinions of those who believe otherwise, it is contrary to what I would call the well being of the state, because it saps the very foundation of home life. With that going on, what will become of the state in a very short time? The other day I cited some figures showing that in the United States in a period of fifty years prior to 1925, 6,500,000 people, including the children, had been affected by divorce. If we continue this state of affairs, where shall we find ourselves later on?

I shall not deal particularly with the case under discussion, but the hon. member for Labelle has disclosed a most extraordinary condition of affairs. He has pointed out that evidence was adduced by a minor, a young girl of fifteen years of age, who was the chief witness in the case and who was called upon to testify against her father. If that is the procedure which the people of this country wish to uphold in the parliament of Canada, I have never seen anything like it, although I have sat in this house for thirty-two sessions. Such a procedure is contrary to public polity and to the interest of the state.

As I said a moment ago, we do not want and we have never asked for divorce in Quebec. It is imposed upon us, and the unfortunate people in the present case, if they secure their divorce and wish to remarry, must leave the Catholic church; they cannot remain within its fold because they will be debarred from remarriage. For all these reasons I am glad that the opportunity has been offered me once more to direct the serious attention of the members of parliament to the remedy which must be applied to put an end to the most extraordinary state of affairs that exists at present with regard to divorce, and I hope the legal minds of the house will find a solution when next session comes round.

Mr. EVANS: Certain views which have been expressed this afternoon regarding the case before us make one wonder what a federation, or a confederation, as we call it, consists of; and a feature of the inconsistency of our position as a parliament has been well brought out by the hon. member for Labelle. We have before us a case of a woman belonging to the Catholic church and yet no Roman Catholic in the house will sponsor the bill. The inconsistency lies in this parliament insisting on granting divorces for certain provinces while some provinces deny the right of parliament to grant divorces to those who belong to particular churches, to interfere, as I believe the hon. member said, with the civil and religious rights and social status, chiefly of the children. It was not made very clear by the hon. member whether he intended that those civil and religious rights of Quebec should extend to the other provinces of Canada.

Mr. BOURASSA: No.

Mr. EVANS: His actions are not consistent with his words, then, because not long ago I remember quite well his declaring in the house in an impassioned speech that the western provinces had no right to their own natural resources without the rights of the minorities in those provinces being safeguarded in connection with the separate schools. I am wondering how, under such circumstances, parliament can be a parliament for the whole of Canada. There does not seem to be any consistency in such a situation. But it all amounts to this: Is it not time now for parliament to enact a law that will give the right to Ontario to deal with its divorce cases? As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre pointed out the other day, it is quite within the competence of the government at this session of parliament to introduce a bill to provide for that. Why not do so here and now before parliament prorogues and end all this inconsistency and confusion?

Mr. BOURASSA: I am sure my hon. friend from Rosetown does not want to be unfair, and I want to be absolutely fair to him. May I say this just as a matter of personal explanation, although I think it is quite out of order. I never suggested in any way, shape or form that any piece of legislation should be enacted by parliament on any question whatever—I am generalizing it—because of the rights of certain minorities. What I have stated and what I repeat is that parliament, having pledged itself in writing and in law to certain things, cannot undo those things without redeeming its pledges to whatever parties are concerned, whether they are majorities or minorities. That is all there is to the question of the return of the natural resources.

Mr. EVANS: I wish to say in answer to that, that in 1926 when the agreement between Alberta and the Dominion government had been entered into and approved by both parties, it was a speech by my hon. friend on the floor of the house that prevented its being carried out.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Let us discuss divorce.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the seetion carry?

Mr. BOURASSA: Is it in order for an hon. member to take his seat and vote after the question has been put?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, in committee.

Section agreed to: yeas, 43; nays, 14.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported on division.

MARION RUTH LAIDMAN

The house in committee on Bill No. 98, for the relief of Marion Ruth Laidman.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to, on division.

On section 2—Right to marry again.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children in this case?

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto): No.

Section agreed to, on division.

Bill reported, on division.

MINERVA ELLIOTT

The house in committee on Bill No. 88, for the relief of Minerva Elliott.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. BOURASSA: Just to illustrate the system, let me say that there is not one single word of proof in this case. I have looked at the evidence, and it is all based on presumption. The woman lives in Toronto, she does not give evidence herself of the actual adultery of her husband. She speaks of a previous case where the woman had committed suicide, and then the parties adjusted their differences, and afterwards separated again. She was asked why she had not got a divorce before. She said she had no money; but for this case she had the money or somebody else found the money for her, and she hired three detectives in Montreal to make out the case. They shadowed the man from place to place, and to give those who are familiar with the city of Montreal an idea of the accuracy of their testimony I would point out that one of the detectives says in his evidence that he had followed at night a man who was supposed to be the husband, in the company of a woman. On page 11 of the evidence the detective says:

He had parked his car on Bleury street where the Viger station is.

Now I ask anybody who is familiar with the city of Montreal what geographical connection there may be between Bleury street and the Viger station. That station is distant from Bleury street about the distance of the Central station at Ottawa from, let us say, the end of Rideau street near the bridge; so that this man, followed by this detective, one of the witnesses in this case, upon whose testimony that high judicial body of the senate has pronounced judgment, parked his car in front of a hotel on a street half a mile distant from that hotel. Three detectives were employed in the case; one of the other two admits that he did not see anything, and the other one followed the man and the woman to a certain door, but actually there is not one single witness of the act supposed to have been committed.

An hon. MEMBER: The statutory ground.

Mr. BOURASSA: What is called the statutory ground, but of course, there is no ground and there is no statute. It simply forms part of the vocabulary of hypocrisy which has become established in order to explain to the good people of this country why we are acting as a tribunal on divorce, although there is no law to guide us, and although we break every law, natural or otherwise, in connection with the taking of evidence as it should be taken by any tribunal with a fair standing. Again, I leave this case to the committee. I suppose the bill will pass, as usual. It is the business of this representative body, which so often has denounced the abuses of the senate—it is the business of 245 elected members of this house to vote blindly for a decision taken by five judges—that was the number sitting in the senate divorce committee on this case—of the highest court of the land. I do not suppose any of them knew the city of Montreal. If we acted as decently as they do in the United States, in that low degraded country, even at Reno, if there was anybody acting in the public interest in these cases like the king's proctor acts in England, he would at least see that the law of evidence was respected and would follow the evidence in order to find out if the witnesses were sufficiently informed and were of sufficient good faith to be believed.

I know of a case where one of the witnesses who had come to testify against a woman—this was a case of the husband accusing the wife of adultery—met a member of this house after the session and told him, "Of course, all that was fabricated. If you give me so much I am prepared to go next year and testify the other way." That bill did not carry because of the political crisis of 1926, and it did not come up the year following because that member of the house, having received that information by the merest chance, went and informed the committee. The hired perjurer was afraid to come, but the year previous a decision was rendered by that high court of justice, the senate committee, upon the perjured testimony of that man who was paid to defame that woman. If that is justice, if that is accomplishing our duty by the people who come to this parliament seeking relief, very well; but every time I discover a case like that I will put it before the house, and when the house prorogues I intend to put it before the country. It is about time that we should realize at least what we are doing. I do not want to be too hard. I admit that most of us have done it without realizing what we were doing. I myself—I have confessed it before—for many years allowed divorce bills to go through without having the slightest idea of the circumstances involved. But now I have begun to scrutinize these bills a little more closely, though not half as much as I would if I could, and I am beginning to realize the absolute and unexaggerated truth of what I said the other day. I do not know of any so-called civilized country in which divorces are granted by courts under any law—lax as the American laws are with regard to the grounds for divorce—where at least some degree of concern is not given to the evidence and where somebody is not supposed to take up the case from the other point of view.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Might I ask if all this is not evidence in favour of the desirability of having these cases dealt with by the courts?

Mr. BOURASSA: Of course; but I go further. I think it is altogether in favour of the contention that this parliament should not deal with divorce, because in order to deal with every one of these cases with some kind of decency, with some kind of respect for the elementary principles of justice, equity and evidence, not one single item of public business could be attended to throughout the course of a six months' session; it would take the whole of our time to scrutinize these so-called private bills. Take the evidence involved in this bill. Three detectives were employed to gather evidence. I happen to know Montreal, and on the face of the evidence one of those witnesses either never was in Montreal or does not know anything about the city or thought he could impose anything on the committee. The idea of declaring he followed the husband and a woman to the point where they parked their car before a certain hotel on a street which is half a mile distant from that hotel! I do not believe one of those three detectives really followed the party. They saw what they thought was the man concerned in the case entering a certain room in the Place Viger hotel. That is all they saw. Is any man convicted before a court of justice because he has been seen entering a certain place and because he is suspected to have committed a crime with the person accompanying him? I put it to any lawyer in this chamber, would any tribunal pronounce judgment upon that kind of circumstantial evidence? In the previous case there was, for what it is worth, a declaration by the wife saying that her husband had admitted to her that he had misconducted himself; but in this case there is no such admission. What is declared to be an admission relates to acts committed long before and on which the decision is not pronounced. The acts upon which this decision is supposed to be pronounced are unknown to the petitioner, they are unknown to the three witnesses. The three paid agents of a detective agency simply testified that they followed up this man from place to place, and I have mentioned the discrepancy in the testimony of one of the detectives. Now, are you going to pronounce a divorce and, break the family tie upon such evidence?

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto): If the hon. member is going to review the evidence he must review it in full, and not take that part which suits his case. He neglected to inform the house that the man and the woman who was not his wife registered at the hotel as husband and wife.

Mr. BOURASSA: Is that a ground for divorce?

Mr. STEVENS: It is evidence.

Mr. BOURASSA: Is it evidence that something wrong has been committed?

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto): It is evidence of wrong intent.

Mr. STEVENS: Would you not think that is evidence?

Mr. BOURASSA: That is merely what we call in French "presumption of guilt."

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto): They stayed there the night.

Mr. BOURASSA: The clerk said they registered. One of the detectives said he went up to the door of the room. That is all. I do not say nothing was wrong. I simply ask: would a court of law base its judgment upon such evidence? But my further point is this, that we go on voting these bills without knowing what there is in the evidence upon which they are founded. If we as a jury take the trouble of looking into each bill what is the result?

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. BOURASSA: An hon. gentleman says "carried." I heard the interruption, but I do not know where it came from. Suppose you pleaded a case before a jury and one of the jurors said "verdict," what would be the attitude of the judge towards that juror? I admit that this, which is supposed to be the most important social tie in this country, has become an object of laughter. Then for heaven's sake let us cease talking about civilization, let us cease talking about the superiority of our morality as against that of the United States or Mexico or any other country, because upon this issue, which everywhere is considered as a basic principle of society, the principle upon which rests the family, whether the people in those countries are for divorce or against it, they treat it with some degree at least of apparent seriousness; but in this house it is treated with levity. I know the subject is playing upon the nerves of some hon. members. I regret it. I do not like to be disagreeable to anybody, but I think that some of us who have reflected a little on this question and have talked it over with thoughtful people outside this house cannot treat the subject lightly. We must not imagine that all the wisdom of this country is contained within the four walls of this chamber or of the chamber on the other side. There are a few thoughtful people outside parliament; in fact I think there are a good many, because perhaps they are less busy than we are and have a little more opportunity for reflection.

An hon. MEMBER: Let us hope so.

Mr. BOURASSA: Yes, let us hope so. Those people are simply beginning to take notice of this question; but we shall soon lose the respect and confidence of the thoughtful people of this country unless we at least scrutinize some of these bills, and show, by referring them back to the committee that is supposed to deal with them, that we are really concerned in this matter. Here is a case, I repeat, where there is no evidence, from the little I know of law, that would be accepted by judges as sufficient to justify judgment. It might justify suspicion; it might justify an assumption. But I have always understood that, under the British law, it is not possible to condemn a man or a woman upon a mere assumption of facts; there must be real evidence or such circumstantial evidence as to carry conviction to the minds of judge and jury. It is clear in this case that there is no such evidence; more than that, there is proof that at least one of the witnesses did not know anything about the city in which he was supposed to carry on his trade—that he was simply fabricating testimony to give to the senate committee.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I report the bill?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Bill reported on division.

FREDERICK RUTHERFOORD ZOPPI

The house in committee on Bill No. 86, for the relief of Frederick Rutherfoord Zoppi—Mr. Kay—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. SPENCER: Are there any children in this case?

Mr. KAY: No.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported on division.

AGNES VICTORIA LEADER

The house in committee on Bill No. 154, for the relief of Agnes Victoria Leader—Mr. Edwards (Waterloo)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: This bill we had before us the other day, and it is rather different from most of the others. We have heard it stated again and again in this house that infidelity or adultery was the only ground on which divorce was granted by this parliament. In this case, as I understood from the sponsor the other day, the ground is non-consummation. I want to point out clearly to this house and to the country that there are no statutory grounds. I heard a member of the

legal profession say the other day that a certain ground was statutory, but I think I am correct when I say that there are no statutory grounds; we are simply proceeding upon precedent. It is sometimes said that if we send these divorces to a court we shall be widening the grounds of divorce, but I suggest that the grounds are to-day as wide as they can be. We can grant divorce in this house on any ground whatever, and you cannot have it any wider than that. It is quite true that in practice the grounds have been limited to two, but that is only a matter of precedent. Even if we did transfer these cases to some other court that need not mean the widening of the grounds, but rather a delimitation of them, with this further advantage, that a court would be a great deal more careful with respect to the evidence—as my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has pointed out —than is the case in the senate. This is an important matter and we should have from the sponsor of the bill some intimation as to whether or not there have been precedents in regard to the particular ground on which this divorce is sought. I should like also to hear from the Minister of Justice. I asked him the other day whether he thought that in a matter of this kind this parliament was competent to deal with the facts.

Mr. EDWARDS (Waterloo): I have secured a partial list of the annulments granted by this parliament in former years. May I cite a few of the cases. In 1916, under chapter 81, an act was granted for the relief of Mabel Mills, on the same ground; in 1919, chapter 147, an act was granted for the relief of Claudius Henry Sherk; in 1919, chapter 136, Rose Kent Miller; in 1922, chapter 89, Nellie Berry; 1928, chapter 240, Elsie Irene O'Meara —all on the same ground. This is only a partial list of the annulments granted by the senate committee. I do not know much more about the case than the fact that these people came here in good faith and on the strength of these precedents; and their evidence was heard by the committee and annulment granted on the ground stated. The woman in this case works as a weaver in a knitting mill and she had to wait several years before she could obtain money to present her case. It would be a real hardship if the committee refused to pass the bill.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As a matter of fact this ground has been accepted by the senate in previous instances. I have here Gemmill on Divorce, and discussing the White case, 1888, the ground being the same, he says:

In this case the application was dismissed, the evidence being insufficient to support the preamble of the bill, but it stands as an example of the principle put forward by the author that parliament is disposed to grant relief upon grounds which were recognized in the former ecclesiastical courts of England as sufficient to declare a marriage null and void.

Following this precedent, parliament, I know, has in many instances granted divorce on this ground.

Mr. EDWARDS (Waterloo): I have a partial list of the annulments that have been granted but this list could be greatly extended.

Mr. BOURASSA: This case involves an important point of law; it is not a question of evidence. It has been said time and again in Quebec by people who would like on the one hand to reconcile themselves to the laxity with which parliament grants divorces and at the same time to make the Roman Catholic clergy in that province believe that they are opposed to divorce, that parliament grants divorces because Protestants want them and because under the laws of Quebec divorce is not obtainable. That has been a ground of defence; without going into the matter at length one might put it that way. But here is a case which comes within the purview of the principles suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) in a previous case, when he asked me in what position people would find themselves in Quebec with respect to divorce or separation. If the evidence in this case is correct, if the ground on which the divorce is being sought is true, then we are passing a bill of divorce in spite of the fact that either in Quebec or in Ontario, or for that matter in any other country, it is possible to ask for a declaration of nullity on the part of a regular court. Here is the very declaration in the bill.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): Was there not a case identical to this last year, in which two Catholics in Quebec were granted a divorce?

Mr. BOURASSA: My hon. friend is making the same mistake. There never has been and cannot be a pronouncement of divorce in Quebec, either under civil or canonical law; but in a case like this if the evidence which was presented before the senate had been presented before the proper tribunal in Quebec, and I think I am right in saying in Ontario and all the other provinces as well, showing that the marriage had not been consummated because of impotency, the tribunal would declare the marriage null. There is, however, this difference between canonical and civil law: the canon law is at once broader, and I think more sensible than the civil law, which

says that the impediment of impotency cannot be pleaded after three years of married life, while the canonical law, which was the old French civil law and which I believe to be the English law, provides that if the impotency is radical and organic and if it existed previous to the marriage, then there never has been a marriage and that impotency can be pleaded at any time as a ground for nullifying the marriage.

Those are the only cases so far as this impediment is concerned in which not a divorce but a judgment in nullity may be rendered by the civil courts of Quebec, and I am sure similar judgments have been rendered in Ontario and in every other country. So, in a case of this kind, there was no necessity whatever for the parties to come before parliament; they cannot claim what has been claimed by the upholders of divorce in this house, that they have no other remedy but to come before parliament asking for a divorce. They have their remedy before the courts of the province. The evidence proves that this case is one which should be adjudicated upon by the provincial courts, and the declaration of the senate itself, in the preamble of the bill—

Mr. EDWARDS (Waterloo): If my hon. friend will refer to page 5 of the bill it will be seen that these parties were married in September of 1918 and that they separated in February of 1922, so they could not come before the civil courts.

Mr. BOURASSA: Of course I do not know the Ontario law, and there may be a limitation, but the preamble to this bill states:

...and whereas by her petition she has prayed that, because of his physical incompetence to consummate the said marriage, their marriage be annulled . . .

My hon. friend says he does not know, and I do not know, the law of Ontario in this regard, but I do know that the ground upon which this divorce is recommended is one acknowledged under every civil law of which I have knowledge as being a ground for nullifying marriage. In other words, this is not a case for divorce but a case for a declaration by the courts, and if the laws of Ontario or Quebec are not broad enough to meet a case of that kind why should not the laws be amended in the proper way? Why should we, by private legislation, infringe upon a power which was supposed at the time of confederation to be vested in the provinces? That would raise a very interesting issue which I am sure will have to be taken up before

long, as to whether or not this parliament or the provincial legislatures are competent to legislate on such questions as this. If we pass over this matter, let us see in the future that parliament grants divorces only on one ground, which has been stated time and again during the various sittings devoted to these bills. Here is a case where it is not even intimated that the so-called statutory ground, which never has been defined by statute and which is not even mentioned in the criminal code of Canada, exists; according to the evidence and according to the preamble of the bill itself this so-called statutory ground is not present in this case.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the British statute of 1857.

Mr. BOURASSA: But that British statute is not in force here. If we want to put it in force let us say so; that would be far better and far less hypocritical than to go on granting divorces from year to year with no law to guide us as to the grounds for divorce or with regard to the taking of evidence. Then we have the organic impotency of this parliament to deal with the civil effects resulting from its decisions in these cases. Here we have a case where divorce is asked on a ground which is supposed to be covered by provincial laws, and we are unable to implement our decision, as is the case in respect to all these bills, looking to the effects which will result.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported on division.

ISABEL HONOR GILDEROY

The house in committee on Bill No. 186, for the relief of Isabel Honor Gilderoy—Mr. Garland (Carleton)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. SPENCER: Are there any children in this case?

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): One female child, in charge of the petitioner.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported on division.

HARVEY BADEN POWELL HANEY

The house in committee on Bill No. 194, for the relief of Harvey Baden Powell Haney —Mr. Garland (Carleton)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. SPENCER: Could we have some information regarding the children?

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): There is one child, at present in charge of the petitioner, the father.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported on division.

HELEN STEELE

The house in committee on Bill No. 197, for the relief of Helen Steele—Mr. Jelliff—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—Right to marry again.

Mr. SPENCER: Could we have some information regarding this bill?

Mr. JELLIFF: My recollection from reading the evidence is that there are three children concerned; one is a married daughter with whom the petitioner is living at the present time and the other two are sons of the ages of twenty and twenty-two respectively, living with the father. I do not imagine that the question of parental care is a very vital one in this instance.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported on division.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—REPORTED

Bill No. 94, for the relief of Edyth May Shields.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 127, for the relief of Sophia Love.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 138, for the relief of Harry Freeman Switzer.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 178, for the relief of Adele Cawthra Rogers.—Mr. Matthews.

Bill No. 179, for the relief of Madelaine Virginia Lumsden.—Mr. Bothwell.

Bill No. 180, for the relief of Edgar Charles Buchanan.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Bill No. 196, for the relief of Ivy Georgina Lloyd.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 198, for the relief of John Campbell.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 200, for the relief of Annie Forbes Sangster.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 202, for the relief of Joseph Nicholl. —Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 203, for the relief of Charles Stanley Cuneo.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 204, for the relief of William Allan Griffith.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 205, for the relief of Sydney Bishop. —Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 208, for the relief of Marjory Lavinia Bradford.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 209, for the relief of Patrizio Nardini.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Johnston from committee of the whole reports that the committee have considered certain bills. When shall the report be received? Now.

Mr. BOURASSA: I intend to give notice of amendments on the third readings of a couple of these bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bills be read a third time?

Mr. STEVENS: Next sitting of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Next sitting of the house.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 201 for the relief of Ethel Evelyn Farrow.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 210 for the relief of John Alfred Neary.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 211 for the relief of Charles Storey. —Mr. Lennox.

NEW WESTMINSTER PENITENTIARY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): On May 14, 1928, an order was passed for the return of certain papers in connection with the New Westminster penitentiary, but that return has not yet been brought down. I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he does not think it is about time we were getting that return.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I will look into the matter, and if the return is ready, I shall be pleased to lay it on the table. But may I call the hon. member's attention to the fact that I do not think he has the right to criticize me, because, under the rules, a motion for a return drops after the session is over. If the motion has not been renewed this session, my hon. friend cannot get the papers as of right, although I will give them to him.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is very kind, but I believe the minister is not quite correct in his statement of the rule.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, I am correct. I will show my hon. friend Bourinot, Beauchesne and all the other authorities. I was reading them yesterday.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The minister is good-natured to-day. In view of the delay there has been, will he bring the file up to date?

Mr. LAPOINTE: What is it about?

Mr. McQUARRIE: It is in connection with an investigation which was held some time ago by Inspector Jackson into the affairs of the New Westminster penitentiary. There was a transcript of the evidence. I might read the order:

> Order of the house for a copy of the transcript of evidence taken by Inspector Jackson on his recent investigation of certain charges against Lieutenant-Colonel H. W. Cooper, late warden of the British Columbia penitentiary at New Westminster, and into the administration of the said penitentiary; also a copy of all letters reports, or other documents or memoranda leading up to the said investigation, or during the course thereof; and also a copy of all letters, reports, documents or memoranda subsequent to the said investigation, including all correspondence passing between the Minister of Justice and the said Cooper.

Will the Minister of Justice be good enough to bring the report up to date?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was under the impression that those papers had been brought down. Perhaps it was in the senate.

Mr. McQUARRIE: They were not brought down in the house.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, but I think they were in the senate.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I should be glad if he would bring them up to date, and in addition to that I should like to get, if possible the file of the Civil Service Commission—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Ah, that is different.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Similar files have been brought down several times during the source of the debate on the Post Office estimates.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have no power over the Civil Service Commission. I shall be glad to transmit the wish of my hon. friend.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I think the Secretary of State is the proper officer, if he will bring down the file in reference to the appointment of Inspector Jackson and all matters in connection with the same case.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: I can speak only for myself.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I think the Minister of Justice is in error in saying that papers called for by an order of the house should not be brought down if parliament prorogues before they are tabled. I quite agree with him that if the motion has not been converted into an order before parliament prorogues, the motion lapses. But when an order of the house has been passed, the question is then only one of the officers of the department preparing the documents. Frequently we have had evidence of these having been brought down during the recess and the papers lodged in the proper place. An order of the house does not lapse merely because parliament prorogues. I think the hon. member is confusing for the moment the order with the notice which is placed upon the order paper and which is not converted into an order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I am not confusing them. They are very wide apart.

Mr. BENNETT: I know we have acted upon the opposite principle.

REGULATION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC

PAPERS RELATING TO CONVENTION BETWEEN UNITED KINGDOM AND UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): On the 23rd of April the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) asked for some correspondence between His Majesty's government in Great Britain and His Majesty's government in Canada and also between His Majesty's government in Great Britain and the government of the United States respecting a convention signed in January, 1924, in relation to the liquor traffic. His Majesty's government in Great Britain has no objection to the tabling of the correspondence between the governments of Canada and Great Britain; but as regards the correspondence between the governments of Great Britain and the United States, the British government is of the view that much of it is highly confidential and should not be tabled. I am, therefore, not at present in a position to table the correspondence between Great Britain and the United States, but I am now tabling the correspondence between Great Britain and Canada in reference to the convention.

CANADA'S GOLD RESERVE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): A few days ago the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) inquired as to the exchange rates. In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to any authoritive powers vested in the Dominion government to ameliorate exchange rates by the exportation of gold, I desire to make our position clear:

First: Exchange rates are determined by commercial business, and so forth, transacted between countries.

Second: Banks are the media for conducting external as well as internal financial business, and not the government.

Third: The gold reserves held in our vaults belong to and are held for account of the several banks to the extent of the amount of available Dominion notes which they primarily obtained from the treasury on deposit of gold with the treasury.

Fourth: The banks are required by the Bank Act always to keep on hand 40 per cent of their cash reserves in Dominion notes, thus eliminating to that extent the amount of Dominion notes in their possession to call for gold from the treasury.

Fifth: The banks have gold supplies in their own vaults not under control of the treasury, except such gold as they may from time to time deposit in the central gold reserves towards protecting any surplus issue of their own bank notes over and above the amount allowed them under the provisions of the Bank Act.

Sixth: The banks are free to export their gold holdings without reference to the Dominion treasury, together with as much gold held in trust for them by the treasury as they are able to obtain by taking out of circulation and handing back to the treasury Dominion notes previously obtained by them on deposit of gold with the treasury.

Seventh: The Dominion has not parliamentary authority to deal in the buying and selling of gold for commercial purposes. If commercial business transacted by the people through the banks requires the shipment of gold, it becomes the duty of the banks to export or import gold to meet such requirements as their business transactions with the public demand.

Eighth: The Dominion treasury is obligated by the act governing government savings banks deposits to keep on hand gold to the extent of 10 per cent of such deposits made with the government. Such gold forms no part of the reserve held by the treasury in trust for the banks.

Ninth: The treasury has from time to time bought from Canadian mines gold consigned to the Royal Mint for refining purposes. All such gold has been paid for out of current revenues received from taxation and other government services. Such gold is held by the treasury in place and instead of the cash to our credit which was taken from our cash deposits with the various banks, and the gold so held is available for use on government business only and is utilized when required for such purposes. For example, such gold may be at any time deposited with the banks in Canada for the credit of the Receiver General, or may be shipped to our financial agents in any country, but only for the purpose of meeting government obligations. We have large commitments from time to time in New York and London, England. When exchange is against Canada to an extent over and above the cost of shipping gold, if our supply of this free gold permits, shipment will take place, but such shipments, being for government account in New York and not for sale in New York of Canadian funds, would have no effect on exchange rates other than perhaps what might be designated as a slight sentimental effect.

The above sets out the position of the federal treasury and the obligations of the banks in regard to exchange transactions. If the federal treasury needs funds at any time for government obligations in New York we are obliged to buy exchange through the banks precisely in the same way as is done in ordinary business practice, unless we can advantageously make use of any holdings we may have of free gold which has been bought from the mines, and so forth, with cash taken from our revenue accounts.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think that that statement answers the question that was asked. Was not the question as to the extent to which gold is held against Dominion notes issued by the country?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, although that other question is involved. Just the same, I do not think the minister's statement is an answer to the question I asked the other day.

WAYS AND MEANS

BRITISH PREFERENCE—REQUIREMENT OF BRITISH OR EMPIRE LABOUR CONTENT

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Mr. M. N. CAMPBELL (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the house some matters arising out of a discussion between the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) and myself on Tuesday last, a discussion which centered around the regulation that was imposed in connection with the British preference on the 1st of February last. Before dealing directly with the question at issue, I desire to summarize the events leading up to it.

The Minister of Finance in his budget speech in 1928 announced that this regulation was being put into effect, and he stated that it was brought in with the object of fostering imperial trade. It was pointed out at that time that the regulation would have precisely the opposite effect, that instead of fostering inter-imperial trade it would be an impediment to that trade. The Minister of Finance did not take any serious objection to that. On February 29, 1928, some statements were made in the house by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Dunning) on the authority of the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Railways and Canals on that occasion said:

> As to the criticism which has been uttered with respect to the intimation by the Minister of Finance that in future it was proposed to ask that all goods coming in, taking advantage of the British preference, should have a 50 per cent British or empire content, I desire to say just this: the Minister of Finance gave that intimation in no sense intending thereby to limit the British preference in the slightest degree.

Further on he said:

> Some hon. gentleman in the far corner—I forget who it was—insinuated the possibility that the raising of the limit to 50 per cent might have the effect of debarring British goods. I can assure my hon. friend on the authority of the Minister of Finance that there is no intention to permit it to be used for any such purpose, and if as a result of experience it is found necessary to provide a different percentage of content for different classes of goods, as other British dominions have done, it is quite within the competency of the government to work out the solution along those lines.

Later, on March 13, 1928, the Prime Minister in the same budget debate, referring to the regulation in question, said:

> May I say to this house; if we discover, in connection with the enforcement of a regulation of that kind, that the consumers of this country are in any particular losing the benefits which the British preference was intended to give, we shall not hesitate speedily to make such changes as the circumstances may demand.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Further on, the Prime Minister said:

> I wish to say that if that situation arises it is not the intention of the government to make the existing 25 per cent British content one per cent higher than it is at the present time.

The agitation from this corner of the house I believed had some effect; at any rate, the regulation was not put into effect at that time. Indeed, after the statements made by these ministers some of us were rather surprised that the regulation ever went into effect. However, it was made effective on the 1st of February last.

May I say that it appears that this regulation was actually asked for by the textile manufacturers? That would seem to prove to me, at any rate, that these gentlemen knew that it was in their own interests. I am not objecting to that, of course, but it would rather indicate that that regulation was never intended to foster inter-imperial trade. The Canadian Textile Journal in an editorial on November 29 last stated:

> Manufacturers and producers will welcome the announcement from Ottawa that after February 1 goods to enjoy the British preference entering Canada will be required to be 50 per cent of empire material and labour, instead of 25 per cent as at present.

Quoting further from the same editorial:

> This increase in empire content was foreshadowed by Hon. James A. Robb in his last budget and is due to the repeated demand of Canadian producers.

My complaint in this regard is that it never was intended to foster inter-imperial trade. That is my impression, at any rate, and certainly a wrong impression was created in this house and in the country, I believe, by the words of the Minister of Finance when he introduced his budget.

May I itemize some of the commodities that are affected by this regulation? First, fur. The raw fur used by British manufacturers comes largely from Russia, and as in nearly all cases this raw fur is more than 50 per cent of the value of the finished article, naturally these goods would be debarred from the benefit of the British preference. Then there is copper. I admit that the minister has perhaps more ground for the regulation in connection with copper than in connection with any of the other commodities. Copper is produced in Canada, in Australia and in other parts of the British Empire. But at the present time the Canadian copper producers have no worry with regard to marketing their product; as I understand it, they are

much behind their orders. So even in respect to copper this regulation might well be delayed. The British manufacturers contend that while they do use Canadian copper, they find it almost impossible to make an affidavit as to the exact content in any particular line of copper goods. That is, to comply with the regulations they have to make an affidavit that all the copper in a particular manufactured article is empire copper. It is very difficult to segregate the lots of copper that come from different parts of the world. Then take velvet. Raw velvet, I understand, comes from Japan, and again as in most of the manufactured goods, the value of the raw material is more than 50 per cent of the value of the finished article. Of course, when that is so, the manufactured goods are debarred from the advantages of the British preference.

Then there is the question of mercury. Last Tuesday I read a letter from the British federation of industries which showed the effect that this regulation would have on mercury and its compounds. The letter pointed out that not only is mercury in its original form not commercially procurable in the British Empire, and therefore would be debarred under this regulation, but that there are many compounds of mercury. Mercury enters into many drug compounds, and these would all be affected to a very large extent. But the most important commodity, and the one that will be affected most seriously by this regulation, is cotton. As hon. members know, almost all of the cotton used in the British mills comes from the United States, and naturally, all other things being equal, it would be easier for the Americans to manufacture their cotton and ship it in here than it would be for the British manufacturers. The only thing that helps the British manufacturers to compete here is the British preference. If they are denied that advantage, it seems to me, while it might help our textile manufacturers to a limited degree, it would divert a good deal of the trade to the United States. I will deal with that later on.

On Tuesday I read considerable correspondence that has passed between the British High Commissioner and the Department of National Revenue, and also between the British federation of industries and the same department. The Minister of Finance, in answer to a question of mine to be found in Hansard on page 2314 said:

> Mr. Robb: It is the 50 per cent clause the hon. member is referring to?
>
> Mr. Campbell: Yes.
>
> Mr. Robb: The 50 per cent requirement of British labour and material. We have discussed this matter with the British board of trade and I think they are quite satisfied with the arrangement. There is a member of the Canadian customs staff in England at the present time and if they desire to have this 50 per cent clause checked up he is available to do that work and we would consider the matter on his report. So far nothing has been brought before us to indicate that any companies are having trouble coming within this regulation. The broad general statement has been made that some of them could not come under it, but as yet there has been nothing submitted to us.

Further on I made this statement:

> Mr. Campbell: If I understood the minister correctly he said that the British authorities were satisfied with the 50 per cent regulation?

To which the minister replied:

> Mr. Robb: We have heard no complaints.

Then on page 2316 the minister in answer to a statement of mine, said:

> Mr. Robb: What justification has my hon. friend for saying that the minister has not dealt with the complaints?

Further on he said:

> I understand that the officer is now on the way home. I imagine when he returns, we shall have the report, but I repeat that while my hon. friend has read from a long list of statements which have come from overseas, he has not made out any case that British importations have been stopped.

And again he said:

> There may be cases where it is not obtainable, but these cases will be adjusted when the report of the officials of the department investigating the matter comes before us. That report has not yet been presented.

On the following morning, May 8, I noticed an article in the Citizen which I will read for the information of the house:

> Considerable concern has been aroused in the office of Sir William H. Clark, British High Commissioner, by comments, made by Hon. J. A. Robb, Minister of Finance, on the new 50 per cent empire labour and material preferential regulations in the House of Commons budget debate last night.
>
> Questioned on the minister's statements, R. H. Hadow, first secretary in charge in the absence of Sir William on his western Canada trip, said this morning that he found it difficult to reconcile Mr. Robb's statement that the report of the Canadian government investigator in England had not yet been received with the official information given the high commissioner's office that the report was made on April 26 to the minister of national revenue.
>
> Mr. Robb's statement that no further complaints had been received since the Canadian government investigator began his investigation among British manufacturers early last March is explained by the high commissioner's office in that all complaints were made direct to Major L. A. Wilmot, Canadian customs service agent in London, England, who made the investigation.

"When is Major Wilmot expected to make his report to the government?" Mr. Hadow was asked.

"Our information," the first secretary replied, "is that Major Wilmot was in Ottawa on April 26 and made his report then to the Minister of National Revenue."

"What about the minister's statement that no complaints have been received from British manufacturers for some months past?"

Withold Direct Complaints

"That is easily explained," Mr. Hadow rejoined promptly. "The British manufacturers were told by this office that the question was being investigated by an agent of the Canadian government and were directed to make all their representations to him. Thereafter, in order not to prejudice the situation nor to embarrass the Canadian government, all direct complaints to the Canadian government were withheld until Major Wilmot completed his enquiry. But, while no complaints may have reached the Canadian government during this period, as Mr. Robb informed the house, at the same time a continuous stream of complaints was reaching the government's investigator in the old land. Not until May 2, after this office was informed Major Wilmot's report had been made to the government, was any further complaint addressed direct to the Canadian government. On that date, however, this office, in a communication to the government, reaffirmed its previous objections to the new regulations and stated that already British export trade was suffering severely from the impossibility of complying with the regulations which were put into effect on February 1 last.

In view of this statement, I think it was a little unfair for the minister to speak as he did on May 7, unless this had not come to his notice. The article proceeds:

"Major Wilmot, in making his investigation, visited Manchester and other British industrial cities; he interviewed many manufacturers, and met many representatives of the British federation of industries; he was afforded every opportunity of visiting British factories to see for himself the difficulties under which the manufacturers are operating in attempting to comply with the new regulations."

"What about Mr. Robb's observation that Sir William Clark had to frankly confess that Great Britain does not comprise all of the British Empire?"

Sort of Suggestion

"That seems to be a suggestion that British manufacturers could use more Empire materials if they wished," Mr. Hadow concluded. "After careful investigation, British authorities were persuaded that certain types of short staple cotton used for certain manufacturers at present exported to Canada were not obtainable in commercial quantities in the British Empire, and that the new regulations, despite the utmost readiness of the British manufacturers to comply as far as possible in the interests of inter-imperial trade, will result in the exclusion of a large quantity of British goods from Canada."

May I read two letters I have received since the date of this debate? These letters are from representatives of British firms in Canada, one being from Messrs. Sproul, Smith & Co., manufacturers' agents, 33 Melinda street, Toronto, Canada, dated Thursday, May 9, 1929:

Milton N. Campbell, Esq.,
Member of Parliament,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Sir: I beg to refer to the statement attributed to Hon. Jas. A. Robb, Minister of Finance, in the House of Commons on the 7th instant regarding the 50 per cent British labour and/or material requirements for United Kingdom goods entering the Dominion.

If he has been correctly reported I understood him to have stated as follows:

"Not long ago an official of the Department of National Revenue was sent to England to investigate complaints by British manufacturers that the new regulation would work a hardship upon them. Since he left we have heard no more complaints, and we have had no evidence that the British manufacturers cannot comply with the 50 per cent requirement."

"I will repeat that an official of the Department of National Revenue went to England to investigate and that he is now on his way home. Sir William Clark told us that some raw materials were not obtainable in Britain, but had to confess frankly that Great Britain did not comprise all of the British Empire. Australia imposes a requirement of 75 per cent, New Zealand 50 per cent, and even Great Britain imposes a requirement of 75 per cent on certain goods. We do not think it unreasonable to ask that British-manufactured goods seeking the preference from Canada should have 50 per cent of British labour and material."

Permit me as the Canadian representative of one of the largest Lancashire manufacturers of grey cotton goods to profoundly disagree with the above. The assertion that since a representative of the Department of National Revenue was sent to England no complaints by British manufacturers that the new regulation would work a hardship upon them have been received is, in a sense, true, but to my knowledge many complaints have been made to the government by the Canadian representatives of British manufacturers and probably also by some of the British manufacturers themselves, but as these complaints are at present being investigated by the Customs department, it is possible that they were not within Mr. Robb's notice at the time his statement was made.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CAMPBELL: When the house rose at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was reading a letter which I had received from Messrs. Sproul, Smith & Company, manufacturers' agents, Toronto, and I will start in again at the point where I left off when you interrupted me at six o'clock.

The fact that Australia imposes a requirement of 75 per cent, New Zealand 50 per cent, and Great Britain 75 per cent, is beside the point as all of these countries have lists of

exempted goods and all that is being asked for now is that exemption lists should also be provided for in the case of British goods entering the Dominion. It is a well-known fact that there are certain raw materials which are not obtainable within the empire: for example, the cotton used in the manufacture of greys is only grown in the United States of America, the cotton grown in the empire only being suitable for fine qualities of cotton cloths.

Grey cottons are an essential requirement to all classes of the community and they must be obtained somewhere. Hitherto supplies have come mainly from the United Kingdom but if the 50 per cent requirement as regards this class of goods is insisted upon it means that in future requirements will be met from United States sources, or to put it more plainly, the government will simply be taking a certain volume of trade from the United Kingdom and handing it over to the United States of America. This, bearing in mind the present attitude of the United States government to Canadian products as expressed in their present tariff proposals, is unthinkable, and I earnestly hope, not only from a personal but also from an imperial standpoint, that it will be found possible to provide for an exemption list.

Then again I have a letter from the Toronto office of Messrs. Wm. Anderson & Company Limited, under date of May 9, as follows:

Milton N. Campbell, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I have noted, with interest, the statement made in the House of Commons on May 7th, 1929, by the Honourable J. A. Robb, in which he said: "That since the official of the Department of National Revenue was sent to England, no more complaints have been heard regarding the proposed new reguation and that no evidence has been forthcoming that British manufacturers cannot comply with the fifty per cent requirement." In the same newspaper I note, with satisfaction, that you challenged the minister regarding this statement and I am enclosing a copy of a letter addressed to the minister regarding this matter.

There is not the least doubt but that if the new regulations are applied without regard to exceptional cases such as the fabrics we have mentioned in our letter to the minister that they will affect very adversely the importations of these classes of British textiles to Canada and will greatly facilitate the importation of goods of similar construction from the American mills.

Attached is a copy of a letter which this firm sent to the Minister of Finance on May 9, as follows:

Hon. J. A. Robb, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In the Toronto Globe of May 8th, 1929, you are reported as having made the following statement: "Not long ago an official of the Department of National Revenue was sent to England to inspect complaints by British manufacturers that the new regulations would work a hardship upon them. Since he left we have heard no more complaints and we have had no evidence that the British manufacturers cannot comply with the fifty per cent requirement." Your statement, if correctly reported, is surprising, in view of the fact that so far as I know nothing has as yet been done to meet the position which arises in the case of certain goods in which my firm is interested, along with many other British manufacturers, and regarding which they made representation some time ago to the Department of Overseas Trade, London.

I refer to goods similar in construction to the sample attached hereto.

I may say that attached to the letter is a sample of this grey cotton, what the housewife would call unbleached cotton.

This material is entirely British made of American cotton. The yarns are spun and the goods are woven in England; the raw material only is not of empire origin and is not available within the empire. The fair market value of such a cloth, as attached, is approximately four hundred and seventy-five pence for one hundred yards and the value of the cotton used in this cloth approximates two hundred and sixty-two pence, and it will, therefore, be seen that although the entire process of manufacture is British we cannot certify that the goods have fifty per cent British labour and material. This cloth is typical of a considerable number of fabrics manufactured in quantity in Great Britain, which under the new regulation would apparently not enjoy the advantages of the British preference, thereby facilitating the importation of such fabrics from the mills of the United States.

It is respectfully suggested that such articles as this are worthy of special consideration and I find it difficult to believe that it is the intention of the new regulation to deny the British preference to goods in which the whole process of manufacture is British and the raw materials for which are not available within the empire.

I would point out that the various firms who have registered complaints with the minister and the British High Commissioner's office are not objecting to the regulation as such, but are asking that exemptions be allowed for certain classes of goods not commercially procurable in the empire, as has been allowed by New Zealand, Australia and also by Great Britain herself.

I direct the attention of the house to the probable effect this 50 per cent requirement will have on Canada's trade. I find that for the year ended December 31, 1928, we had what is commonly called an unfavourable trade balance with the United States of $333,000,000; that is, we bought from the United States of America goods to the value of $333,000,000 more than we sold to them. I find that for the same period we had what is commonly called a favourable trade balance with Great Britain of $257,000,000; that is, Great Britain bought from us goods to the value of $257,000,000 more than we bought from her. The question of the drop in the value of the Canadian dollar in New York has been raised recently in the house, and the minister read a statement this afternoon

dealing with that question. I think it was the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) who pointed to the fact that the Canadian dollar was below par in New York and that considerable shipments of gold had been made, apparently to balance the exchange. I do not think the assertion will be questioned that the drop in the value of the Canadian dollar is caused in this case by the unfavourable balance of trade. The present tariff bill before the House of Representatives at Washington will make it increasingly difficult to market our farm products in the United States and will increase and intensify that condition, and if nothing is done to correct it there is very little doubt that it will end by our selling less to the United States while the probable effect of this regulation will be that we will buy more from that country. Under those circumstances, we might look for a further drop in the value of the Canadian dollar, necessitating the shipment of further amounts of gold to the United States.

Some days ago I quoted from a speech delivered by Sir Herbert Holt to the shareholders of the Royal Bank. I do not think anyone will accuse Sir Herbert Holt of being a free trader or of being even a low tariff man. In pointing out the trend of events in the United States and the danger of a market being refused to our Canadian farmers, he mentioned that it might be necessary for Canada to increase the British preference and to make better treaties with the more favoured nation countries in order to market our farm products which he, at that time, anticipated the United States would refuse to accept. I have in my hand a Canadian Press despatch from Toronto, dated May 8. This is a press interview with the Hon. J. S. Martin, Minister of Agriculture of Ontario, and it says in part:

> The only recourse of the Ontario dairymen, Mr. Martin said, will be to make cheese and butter of the cream which is now being exported to the United States. It will be necessary, he continued, for them to concentrate on the British market with cheese and butter. The British market would be the only one open to them, he said.

I have another Canadian Press despatch from Montreal, dated May 8. This is an interview with the Hon. J. Edouard Caron, former Minister of Agriculture for the province of Quebec, and it states in part:

> He urged an increase in Canada's production the better to meet domestic needs and urged a trend toward developing the British market should any export trade be sought.

It seems to me that it is a most dangerous thing for the Canadian government to do anything at the present time which might prejudice or jeopardize that very important trade with the mother country which has proven so profitable to us. My complaint is based on two grounds: First, that the effect of this regulation will be to put additional impediments in the way of British trade—trade which we should encourage and foster in every way possible at the present time in view of the tariff attitude of the United States. My second objection is on a moral ground. I do not want to accuse the minister of deceiving the house, but I think he has either deceived the house or he has been deceived himself in introducing a regulation like this. I prefer to think that the minister did not understand it. In view of his statement, given through the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) and the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) which I read this afternoon, I am inclined to think that the minister had not given very close study to this matter but had simply accepted the recommendations of the textile industry and had brought forward this proposal without considering its actual effect. My submission is that the effect of this regulation will be to raise the tariff on certain British goods. It is not being raised in the straightforward, honest, old fashioned way by means of a revision of the schedules upward, but it is being raised by indirect means and the effort has been made to create the impression in the house and throughout the country that the tariff on British goods is being lowered and that the government is doing something to foster and develop inter-imperial trade.

Hon. W. D. EULER: (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, as the subject under discussion affects the Department of National Revenue, I would like to make a very brief review of the situation as it stands to-day. I take it that the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell) criticizes not only the principle of the 50 per cent requirement of British content in order to obtain British preference, but also the manner in which it is working out. If he is criticizing the principle, I think he is just about one year too late as the matter was introduced during the last session of this house.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I criticized it much more forcibly during the debate on last year's budget.

Mr. EULER: If he is criticizing at this time its working out he is premature, because very little has been done so far with regard to the matter.

The theory of the 50 per cent requirement of British content, as announced by the Minister of Finance last session, is to help empire trade. This is questioned by the hon. member for Mackenzie, but if a further application of this 50 per cent requirement also helps Canada and Canadian production, because Canada is part of the empire, then, for myself, I would say that it should give no cause for regret. I take it that the British preference is intended for British goods, and I would make this statement: Goods are not British if they are not of British origin or British workmanship to a very substantial percentage. I do not think 50 per cent is at all too high a requirement, and if goods imported from Great Britain are not at least 50 per cent of British material or British workmanship then, I would say that they are not British and are not entitled to the British preference. I believe there are many instances where goods, largely manufactured in continental countries, have been imported into Great Britain and, after some further processing have been exported as British goods and have received the British preference, when as a matter of fact that preference went largely to manufacturers in other countries. I think the hon. member gave a very unfortunate example when he mentioned the matter of furs. He thought it a matter of regret that the manufacturers of furs in Great Britain could no longer go to Russia to buy their furs. When Russian furs are brought to Great Britain and manufactured there they do not contain 50 per cent British content and, therefore, could not take advantage of the British preference. Surely we are not required to go so far as to pay a bonus to the producer of furs in Russia in order to compete against Canadian furs. If the British manufacturer of furs wants to export them to Canada, surely as a part of the empire, we are entitled to some consideration as a fur producer, and he might very well buy his furs in that portion of the empire which produces them.

The hon. member also mentioned mercury. That criticism is entirely pointless, because mercury is actually on the free list and cannot be affected at all by this requirement. He claims that the proper working out of the application of this requirement would help United States industry. I do not know, but I might just as well assume that it might help Canadian industry and this is desirable. I believe this 50 per cent requirement will encourage empire trade. We have not completed our investigations and it is for that reason I say that the criticisms of the hon. member are premature. Our investigations have only just begun, but investigations so far show that the British manufacturer—and I do not blame him for this—is now purchasing in foreign countries a good many of his raw materials which he certainly can purchase in the British Empire because the 50 per cent British content applies to the whole British Empire. Surely it is not unfair, if he is to get a preference as a British manufacturer, that the thing should be reciprocal, and that the British manufacturer should purchase as much as possible from other parts of the empire. If we are going to continue as we have been doing and he is permitted to purchase where he pleases in foreign countries —and of course this is his privilege—then nothing is changed and we have the old condition that goods come in here as of British manufacture, get the British preference, and yet have perhaps not more than 25 or 30 per cent of actual British content.

When we put the requirement into force a few months ago, the Minister of Finance and I were interviewed with regard to the matter by the British High Commissioner, Sir William Clark. At first his protest was in the direction of a complaint that the application was a little too rapid and that more time should be given. We made some concessions in that regard. Later on a complaint was made regarding certain outstanding commodities which would be very seriously prejudiced in connection with their sale to Canada if we applied the 50 per cent provision. Those three commodities were cotton, copper and chemicals. It was stated that with regard to cotton, certain raw materials must of necessity be purchased from the United States; that the kind of cotton necessary for the particular commodities which they exported to Canada could in many instances be procured only in the United States, and that the cost of the raw material, the cotton, was in itself frequently greater than 50 per cent, so that it would not be possible to have in the finished article a 50 per cent British content by way of labour or raw material. It was suggested, as my hon. friend said, that an exempted list should be formed which should not come under the 50 per cent regulation. As regards cotton, our investigations have not been completed, but we have ascertained some facts. The cost of cotton, as everyone knows, fluctuates. If it is 10½ pence per pound, then the manufactured goods will be able, I think to come under the 50 per cent British content.

Mr. KENNEDY: Why was the investigation not made before the change was made in the preference?

Mr. EULER: I will come to that.

Mr. KENNEDY: That is the point.

Mr. EULER: I will try to present it to my hon. friend in a moment. As I was saying, if the price of raw cotton is 10½ pence per pound, all dried and finished piece goods can qualify. I think the price is lower than that at present. Grey cottons come very close to the 50 per cent requirement, and many already qualify. Cotton yarns, coarse, may not qualify, but we have not yet sufficient information to reach any decision.

With regard to copper, our investigation has not yet been completed, but in the course of a year or so the British manufacturer should make no complaint if he does not get the benefit of the British preference by reason of the fact that he does not buy his refined copper in the British Empire, because within a year or not more than two years there will be refined in Canada all the copper that will be necessary for manufacture in Great Britain.

With regard to chemicals the criticism does not seem to be very important for the reason that many chemicals are already on the free list and cannot be affected by the 50 per cent requirement, and in the case of commodities affected, the difference is very small, almost negligible. The difference between the British preference of 15 per cent and the general tariff of 17½ per cent is only 2½ per cent. Linseed oil is mentioned in the list about which some complaint has been made. It is quite possible to buy linseed or flaxseed in the Dominion of Canada. I want to point out that the whole arrangement ought to be reciprocal and I think it ought to appeal to the good sense of the house, that if this provision is intended for the benefit of the empire, Canada itself, being a part of the empire, certainly ought to expect to derive some benefit from it as regards purchases of raw materials from this country. Let me give some of the reports received from certain cities and districts. Belfast states that linen goods will not be affected. Dewsbury, in which many textiles are manufactured, states that they are not affected. The south of Scotland states that their products would not be affected even if the percentage were to be raised considerably. Leeds states that there are no instances in which local industries will be hampered.

When we have placed the legislation on the statute books and have applied the regulation, surely we are not going to call it a dead letter from the outset just because we have a few complaints from some interested parties. I am finding no fault with those business men in Great Britain who feel that they may not be quite free to purchase their raw materials outside the limits of the empire. When Sir William Clark made his representations, we said that we had an open mind on the question whether it was desirable in the interest of the Canadian consumer or in the national interest that we should make an exception with regard to, let us say, cotton, copper or any other material, but we were not ready at the very outset, before giving the new regulation a trial, practically to wipe it out. We said: We want to give it a trial and make investigations before we make any changes. As a result of that, the representative of the Department of National Revenue in Great Britain, Major Wilmot, was instructed to make investigations whenever a complaint was lodged. Unfortunately, Major Wilmot, very shortly after the instructions were issued to him, resigned his position and returned to Canada, but he had some opportunity to make investigations and he presented what we must term an interim report, which is certainly not complete.

Mr. CAHAN: In the investigation made, did the department ascertain what percentage of empire cotton is available for British manufacture as compared with the whole which, I understand, largely comes from the United States?

Mr. EULER: I am afraid I cannot give the hon. gentleman definite information with regard to that, but the British representative was very clear on the point that, as regards many cotton manufactures, they must purchase the kind necessary from the United States. Just what percentage of their total output that would comprise, I am not in a position to say. We are, however, now sending another man and perhaps two men to England to make investigations as they are required. I might also say that the representative we had there, Major Wilmot, had considerable difficulty in making those investigations. For example, I understand he asked certain manufacturers who were complaining, to come to a gathering, to bring with them their costs, and I think in only one instance did the manufacturers do so. Surely it is not unfair for us to expect them to show what their costs are if they expect consideration of their claim with regard to the British preference.

With regard to the criticism made of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) in connec-

tion with the report that was sent in on the 26th of last month by the representative of the Department of National Revenue, there can really be no criticism of the Minister of Finance in that regard. That report, quite naturally, was sent by an officer of the Department of National Revenue to the Department of National Revenue itself. It required considerable examination, and when the Minister of Finance made that statement he had not seen that report.

Mr. ADSHEAD: In connection with the cotton industry, will not the regulation with reference to the British preference have this effect. If a low class of cotton does not come up to the 50 per cent requirement, will not the effect be to increase the importations into this country of a higher class of cotton on which a great deal more labour has been done? In other words, instead of getting a low class cotton, shall we not get a higher class on which more labour has been expended ?

Mr. EULER: I cannot say definitely how it will work out, but I think in Canada we use high class goods in any event.

Mr. CAHAN: Can we make cottons in Canada as cheaply as they sell in Great Britain?

Mr. EULER: I would be very glad indeed if all these goods were made in this country. The point I want to make is this: There can be no real cooperation such as ought to exist between the various parts of the empire unless all parts of the empire cooperate. For my part I should think that wherever it is possible for the British manufacturer to buy his raw materials in Canada—we are interested in Canada primarily—we should see to it that he does so, or at least that he buys them in some portion of the empire before he can take advantage of the preference. But if he prefers to buy his goods in the way of raw materials in some other country, that does not prevent him exporting his goods to Canada, only he will be under the handicap of having to pass a little higher customs barrier. For my part—I am perhaps speaking only for myself—I would say that if a manufacturer in Great Britain, with whom we want to do as much business as possible, buys his goods in a foreign country when he could have purchased them in some part of the British Empire, he has no complaint whatever if he does not get the benefit of the British preference if his goods do not come up to the requirement of at least 50 per cent Canadian content. We should expect to get some business from those from whom we buy.

Finally I would say that the question is not settled. We are just beginning; we are making our investigations. We appreciate the desire of the British manufacturer to have just as soon as possible some sort of certainty with regard to the whole matter. There has been some delay, and I have given the reason for it, the fact that our officer on the other side has resigned. That will be corrected just as soon as possible, and in the meantime I think I am right when I say that the protests and complaints which have been made have been made only pending investigation. The matter is still open, and if we find upon investigation that adjustments should be made, they will be taken into consideration.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would ask the minister if Major Wilmot's report will be made available to the members?

Mr. EULER: Reports of that nature are confidential.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (Peace River): A short time ago we had a budget debate, and I am not going to refer to it beyond making that statement.

In all matters respecting changes in the tariff, whether in connection with the British preference, the general tariff or the intermediate tariff, I have been under the impression that it was understood that the matter would first be investigated by the tariff board, and that then the government would act. That procedure has not been followed in this case. The Minister of National Revenue tonight says: We are going to investigate, and it is unreasonable for members sitting in that corner of the house to ask the government to move in changing the present position of the British preference until the government has investigated the matter. So the position of the government really is this: We will not reduce the British preference without an investigation but we will increase it without an investigation. Now if it is necessary to investigate in one case, it ought to be necessary in the other. This is a case where the government has definitely moved in the opposite direction from its pledges to the country, without investigation, and it is rather striking that the minister who gets up to explain the position of the government tonight is the minister that did not make any statement at all about the matter last year when the government was appealing for support and particularly appealing to the house to vote against the amendment moved in this corner of the house in connection with the British preference. The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) is a well-

known protectionist. I am not blaming him for that, but what I do protest against is the government promising one thing and then acting in a contrary manner in the house.

Mr. CAHAN: Before the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) sat down I was going to ask him a question. He spoke of the lack of certainty now in the minds of the British manufacturers. There is no uncertainty now as to the British manufacturer's position. He knows his own costs of material and of manufacture.

Mr. EULER: He has no uncertainty as to where he stands. He knows he must come up to the 50 per cent British content, but he does not definitely know whether we will make any exemptions or not.

Mr. CAHAN: That is, he does not know whether the minister and the government will change their minds in the near future. I intended to follow that up with another question. The minister referred to possible changes. Would the minister state what are the general principles upon which future possible changes will be based? What are the principles which guide the government in making changes of the character under consideration?

Mr. EULER: In general terms I might say anything that we consider to be in the general public interest.

Mr. CAHAN: Of the empire or of Canada?

Mr. EULER: For my part, I would consider Canada first.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): May I just say a word regarding this apparently semi-controversial question of the British preference?

The idea of increasing the requirements as to labour and content is not a new one in British countries nor in the countries with which we have trade agreements. The mother country introduced that idea not so very long ago after they introduced their Safeguarding of Industries Act, and with that I shall deal in a moment. Australia, New Zealand and some of the other self-governing dominions also increased their requirements as to British labour and content. Some of the countries with which we have treaty agreements also increased their requirements, but I have yet to learn, indeed, I would be very sorry to learn, that any junior in any of the departments of Canada in any country of the world should attempt through the press or parliament to attack the policy of the government to which he was accredited. I think we shall get along better and further by reasonable co-operation and going carefully into the merits of each case as represented to us through the proper diplomatic channels. We have succeeded to some extent in improving the Canadian position through that method. I have nothing to add to-night to what was said when the budget was brought down and when we were in committee last session—to what was said by the Prime Minister, by the Minister of Railways and Canals and by the Minister of National Revenue. We recognize that there are some items that may require to be revised, but I admit to this house and to the country that surely it is reasonable that those who are enjoying the British preference should submit evidence that they are entitled to a revision of the 50 per cent requirement.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Might I ask the minister if Australia, Great Britain herself and New Zealand do not publish a list of exemptions?

Mr. ROBB: I am very glad my hon. friend has brought up that question. He has referred to furs and apparently it is a question of Russia against Canada. My colleague, the Minister of National Revenue, has dealt with that.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It is not a question of—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. ROBB: I did not interrupt my hon. friend. He has referred to copper. Now, the difference in our method as compared with that of some other countries is that we widen out the preference to the whole British Empire. We say that these products may come from any part of the empire. Surely my friend will not deny that copper is produced, and will be produced in increasing quantities, in Canada, not only in British Columbia, Manitoba and Ontario, but also in the province of Saskatchewan whence my hon. friend comes. In that province there are very good prospects of copper development. Copper is produced in large quantities in Rhodesia.

Now, my friend has referred to drugs. That question has been dealt with by the Minister of National Revenue, who has shown that the particular drug which my hon. friend referred to is on the free list anyway and could not be affected by this requirement. Indeed if my hon. friend looks at the tariff he will discover that in regard to drugs not on the free list there is very little difference in the

rating as between the British preference, the intermediate and the general tariff schedules because of the alcoholic content.

With respect to cotton, I say very frankly to the house that there are some classes of cotton goods in regard to which when the price of raw cotton is high the Lancashire workers might not be able to qualify; but as my hon. friend from East Calgary (Mr. Adshead) very well pointed out—and I know from his accent that he understands the cotton business—they will qualify in their better goods. I submit that this is in the interests of the people of Canada.

Mr. CAHAN: Will the minister allow a question? Is he not making his policy in regard to cotton depend upon the price of cotton in the United States and the fluctuating market there?

Mr. ROBB: Not necessarily. As I pointed out when raw cotton is very high there might be an insufficient percentage of labour content in the finished article, but when raw cotton is at a reasonable price the Lancashire manufacturers can qualify on most of their goods.

Now, the government have not been unreasonable in introducing this legislation. It was advertised to the world in the budget speech of last year that Canada proposed to increase the empire labour and material content to 50 per cent, and the house may be surprised to know that up until March 31 there had been no change in the percentage requirement; that is, up until a few weeks ago goods came in under the old 25 per cent regulation. Let us compare our procedure, more than one year's notice, with the procedure in the mother country. I am not sure that my hon. friend from Mackenzie is voicing the views of the government of the United Kingdom, because they recognized that when a change was to be made it was on the principle of "whatsoever thou doest, do quickly." When the British government changed their tariff on optical instruments, they gave Canada a preference of 33⅓ per cent, and we built up quite a good trade with the United Kingdom in cameras and goods of that description. The British government appointed a committee to look into the importations of these goods from Canada. In their report the committee point out that the quantity of these goods coming from Canada had increased from £2,103 in 1921 to £387,870 in 1925. Then the report proceeds:

> This might in the future be prevented, we think, both in the case of cameras and other optical instruments, by raising the proportion of the value of the goods within the schedule which is required to be the result of empire labour from 25 to 75 per cent.

Mr. CAHAN: Did they make that change?

Mr. ROBB: Yes. The report proceeds:

> We have carefully considered the question of the sufficiency of the present rate of duty, and having regard to the inadequate protection given by the present rate of duty in respect of many of the articles in question, we are of the opinion that there is much to be said for an increase from 33⅓ per cent to 50 per cent.

The recommendation that the duty should be increased from 33⅓ per cent to 50 per cent was embodied in the United Kingdom budget of 1926-27 and was effective from May 1, 1926.

The recommendation that the proportion of the value of goods of empire origin be raised from 25 per cent to 75 per cent was made effective on March 1, 1927, and notice to that effect was given by the Board of Trade on February 1, 1927. Britain gave only one month's notice. I am not finding any fault with Great Britain, they were looking after their trade, but hon. gentlemen will observe that in this case Canada was specially singled out because Canadian trade was coming in under those conditions.

My hon. friend has referred to Australia. In the first place let me observe that the Australian tariff is a very much higher tariff than the Canadian. I am not advocating adoption of the Australian tariff. I think the Canadian tariff is very much more suitable for this country than the Australian. The Australian tariff is very much higher than the Canadian. My hon. friend has said that Australia gives a list of exemptions. That is true. But the Australian requirement is 75 per cent. Let me quote to the house from an official document of the Commonwealth of Australia dated at Canberra, December 8, 1927:

> The minister shall determine what are to be regarded as raw materials and in such determination may include partially manufactured Australian materials.
>
> (b) To goods, not wholly produced or wholly manufactured in the United Kingdom in the terms of paragraph (a), provided they contain at least 75 per cent of United Kingdom labour and/or material in the factory or works cost.
>
> (c) Notwithstanding anything contained in the preceding paragraphs, to goods of a class or kind not commercially manufactured in Australia provided they contain at least 25 per cent of United Kingdom labour and/or material in their factory or works cost.

The limitations are there; there are exemptions but they must prove that these goods are not manufactured in Australia. My information is that the exporters are very much handicapped in that when the goods arrive there, there may be an industry employing say four or five men and the customs authorities say, "These goods are of a kind manufactured in Australia and therefore the higher duty must be paid." I submit to my hon. friends that the Canadian tariff is very

much more favourable to the British Empire, as well as to to Canada herself, than the tariffs of some of these other countries which have been cited.

I was greatly interested in the argument of my hon. friend for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell) as I listened to his discussion of cotton. The hon. member argued that the Lancashire mill was unable to obtain cotton of a suitable kind within the British Empire. I will admit that perhaps there is not sufficient cotton available in the Soudan and other British countries—and they produce cotton in Australia. But I could not understand his reasoning when he argued against the United States doing business direct with Canada. His whole argument was that our cotton should be shipped from the United States to England, there manufactured, and brought back to Canada. If I am doing him an injustice in thus interpreting his argument I shall have to apologize.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The minister is hardly putting it in a fair light. I said that the ultimate effect might be—I did not say it would be, but that it might be—to divert trade with Great Britain to the United States and thus increase the adverse balance against this country.

Mr. ROBB: But my hon. friend forgets that the Canadian mills bring in raw cotton for manufacture in Canada, and there are thousands of good Canadian citizens employed in manufacturing cotton. If my hon. friend were to argue that the Canadian was paying too high a duty on United States cotton yardage then I could understand how he might appeal to the people in his part of the country. But he forgets that the Canadian mills buy their raw cotton from exactly the same source as do the mills in the United Kingdom, and here in Canada it is entirely Canadian labour.

Mr. CAHAN: And the minister wishes to give it a chance to compete.

Mr. ROBB: Well, we have been giving it a chance; but we have been enlarging the British preference. Let me say this in conclusion. If it can be shown that in any case British industry cannot qualify properly, in respect to goods obtainable within the British Empire, we are prepared to consider the question; but we submit that it is fair to the Canadian people that evidence be adduced to our officials that they cannot qualify under the 50 per cent requirement.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

[Mr. Robb.]

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose, an amendment was under consideration.

Mr. MANION: When the committee rose at six o'clock the other evening I was discussing a certain matter which I shall now conclude in a few minutes. I was pointing out on that occasion that there was a somewhat inequitable tax on some of the shares in different classes of stocks, not only mining but industrial stocks as well, and I submitted the point for the consideration of the Minister of Finance. I pointed out, for example, that under the new method 1,000 shares of Noranda at $54 would be $54,000, upon which the tax would be $30, whereas 1,000 shares of Kirkland Lake at $1.02 would represent $1,020, on which the tax would be $10. I have said that the tax is inequitable. Take the case of Kirkland Lake. The tax on the sale of the same number of shares, according to these values, is eighteen times the tax on the Noranda deal. Take another, and you will find a still greater inequality. I have given as an example 1,000 shares of Noranda at $54, amounting to $54,000, with a tax of $30; on 1,000 shares of Columbus Kirkland at 1½ cents —this is one of the smaller penny stocks— we have $15 with a tax of $1. A tax of $1 on $15 applied to the valuation of Noranda would increase the tax on Noranda over one hundred times. Obviously, therefore, the whole tax is inequitable. The small man or small purchaser—the minister objects to my using the words "small dealer," although he is a dealer inasmuch as he is dealing in stocks; for I was not speaking of the broker but of the man who bought and sold the stock—is overtaxed, and that is where the minister is wrong; it is here that he should reconsider the matter. This is not a reduction but an increase, the minister having made a change after bringing in the original budget; and in practically every change in taxation the small man seems to suffer. In my opinion there should be worked out a tax proportionate to value, a tax which would be fair to all dealers, and which would be imposed upon people according to their ability to pay. I do not consider this a tax of that kind. The minister took something off the tax on mining machinery, but he puts it back on mining stocks; in other words, he removes with one hand the burden on mining machinery and with the other puts a heavier tax on the stocks. I think the facts I have submitted to the minister are correct, and they show that the tax is inequitable; the minister is taxing the smaller man more heavily, the

man who purchases the cheaper stock. I submit that the whole scheme should be rearranged without injustice generally and making it more equitable to all classes.

That is the sum and substance of what I wish to say, and I shall not take up any more time at present. However, I think the minister should give this matter further consideration and bring in an amendment, if not to the present budget certainly to the budget next year.

Mr. LANG: Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with the hon. member for West York, the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard and the hon. member for Fort William in protesting against the proposed tax on the sale and transfer of shares, which is now before the committee. I do so because I have looked into this proposal to quite an extent since it was brought down on March 1, and I find that the more it is looked into the worse it gets. Certainly it is not a fair or just tax; it works inequalities however you look at it; it places the burden upon the small investor and takes it off the large investor. Recently, in considering this question, it struck me that if the Minister of Finance believes the proposed tax to be an improvement over the tax which has been in effect for some years past surely the present tax would be worth looking into also, because if the present tax is worse than this proposal it certainly must be terrible. I wish to discuss this question first from the standpoint of the tax at present in effect in order to find out why the minister wants a change and, if a change is necessary, to see if we cannot find a more equitable tax than that proposed at present.

In order to appreciate the effect of this tax it will be necessary to consider the present structure of the companies listing shares on the stock exchanges throughout the country. In that connection I happened to notice an article on the mining page of the Toronto Star of last Friday, which gives the structure of 117 of the companies whose shares are most dealt in through the stock exchanges of Toronto. The article begins as follows:

> Following is a compilation of the market value as of May 4 of the outstanding share capital of the most active mining securities listed on the Standard stock and mning exchange of Toronto:

Then follows this statement showing the capitalization, the present sale value, the par value and so on of the shares of these 117 companies. With the consent of the committee I would like to place this list on Hansard without going through it, and then I desire to deal with some of the companies in order to show how the present tax works out:

Company	Capital	Shares issued	Par value	Price May 4	Value May 4
Abana	3,000,000	2,675,775	1.00	2.10	5,619,127
Aconda	3,000,000	2,400,000	1.00	.10	240,000
Amity	2,000,000	350,000	1.00	.34	129,000
Amulet Gold Mines	3,000,000	2,500,000	N.P.V.	1.73	4,325,000
Ankerite	2,000,000	1,519,506	1.00	.18	273,511
Area Mines	2,000,000	2,000,000	1.00	.15	300,000
Arno	3,000,000	1,985,000	1.00	.31	615,350
Algonquin	2,000,000	1,000,000	1.00	.01	10,000
Apex	2,500,000	2,500,000	1.00	.03	75,000
Argonaut	5,000,000	4,666,667	1.00	.02	83,333
Atlas	5,000,000	5,000,000	1.00	.01	50,000
Baldwin	5,000,000	2,654,996	1.00	.06	159,299
Base Metals	3,000,000	2,000,000	N.P.V.	3.60	7,200,000
Barry Hollinger	3,000,000	3,000,000	1.00	.31	930,000
Bathurst Mines	4,000,000	1,000,000	N.P.V.	.19	190,000
Bedford Mines	2,000,000	1,604,985	1.00	.56	898,790
Bidgood Con	3,000,000	2,200,000	1.00	.31	620,000
Big Missouri	5,000,000	2,700,000	1.00	1.55	4,185,000
Buckingham	4,000,000	2,304,672	1.00	.05	115,233
Bunker Hill Exten	5,000,000	3,500,000	N.P.V.	.11	385,000
Cambro Kirkland	3,000,000	2,000,000	1.00	.15	300,000
Capital Rouyn	4,000,000	4,000,000	1.00	.04	160,000
Castle Trethewey	2,000,000	2,000,000	1.00	.35	700,000
Central Manitoba	4,500,000	4,405,467	1.00	.50	2,202,733
Chaput-Hughes	5,000,000	3,027,490	1.00	.08	242,199
Clericy Cons	4,000,000	2,027,140	N.P.V.	.15	304,071
Coast Copper	1,000,000	200,000	5.00	.54	10,800,000
Coniages	4,000,000	800,000	5.00	1.60	1,280,000
Coniaurum	6,000,000	1,080,000	5.00	.30	324,000
Consolidated Smelters	12,736,575	509,463	25.00	430.00	219,069,090
Crown Reserve	3,000,000	2,336,277	1.00	.03	70,088
Can. Lorraine	3,000,000	2,700,000	1.00	.02	54,000
Capitol	4,000,000	3,525,000	1.00	.06	211,500

Company	Capital	Shares issued	Par value	Price May 4	Value May 4
Col. Kirkland	5,000,000	5,000,000	1.00	.01	50,000
Corona	3,000,000	2,600,000	1.00	.02	60,000
Dom. Kirkland	2,000,000	2,000,000	1.00	.01	20,000
Dupprat	5,000,000	3,180,000	N.P.V.	.04	127,200
Dome Mines	1,000,000	953,334	N.P.V.	10.15	9,676,340
Dunkin Mines	4,000,000	1,500,000	1.00	.07	105,000
Falconbridge Nickel	5,000,000	2,750,000	N.P.V.	12.00	33,000,000
Federal Kirkland	4,000,000	2,800,000	1.00	.04	112,000
Goldhill Mines	4,000,000	2,840,311	1.00	.05	142,015
Goodfish	6,000,000	3,000,000	1.00	.04	120,000
Goldale Mines	3,000,000	2,874,257	1.00	.11	316,167
Graham-Bousquet	3,000,000	2,550,000	1.00	.14	357,000
Granada Rouyn	5,000,000	2,550,000	N.P.V.	.18	778,613
Grover-Daly	3,000,000	3,000,000	1.00	.03	90,000
Golconda	2,000,000	1,500,000	1.00	1.70	2,550,000
Grandview	1,500,000	2,749,000	.50	.50	1,374,500
Harker	5,000,000	4,000,000	1.00	.15	600,000
Hilltop	5,000,000	3,941,905	1.00	.03	118,257
Hollinger Cons	25,000,000	4,920,000	5.00	7.30	35,916,000
Howay Gold	5,000,000	4,730,000	1.00	1.28	6,054,400
Hudson Bay M. and S	2,500,000	2,500,000	N.P.V.	18.60	46,500,000
International Nickel	17,000,000	13,758,208	N.P.V.	54.00	742,943,232
Jackson Manion	5,000,000	2,000,000	1.00	.16	320,000
Keeley	2,000,000	2,000,000	1.00	.56	1,120,000
Kirkland Hunton	4,000,000	3,000,000	1.00	.02	60,000
Kootenay Florence	6,000,000	5,330,000	.20	.15	799,500
Kirkland Lake	5,000,000	5,000,000	1.00	1.03	5,150,000
Lake Shore Mines	2,000,000	2,000,000	1.00	26.80	53,600,000
Laval Quebec	5,000,000	3,960,000	1.00	.05	198,000
Lebel Oro	1,500,000	1,350,000	1.00	.04	54,000
Macassa	5,000,000	3,175,000	1.00	.20	635,000
Malartic Gold Mines	3,000,000	2,800,000	1.00	.48	1,344,000
Mandy Mines	3,000,000	2,500,000	N.P.V.	1.28	3,200,000
Manitoba Basin	5,000,000	3,000,000	N.P.V.	.45	1,350,000
McDougall	2,000,000	1,770,000	1.00	.50	885,000
McIntyre	4,000,000	798,000	5.00	18.50	14,763,000
McKinley Darragh	2,500,000	2,247,692	1.00	.20	439,538
Mining Corp	8,300,250	1,660,050	5.00	4.25	7,055,212
Mint-Ore	3,500,000	2,255,000	1.00	.10	225,000
Moffatt Hall	5,000,000	3,488,141	1.00	.12	418,576
Moss Mines	4,000,000	2,678,293	1.00	.60	1,606,975
Murphy Mines	3,000,000	2,200,000	1.00	.23	506,000
Millcrest	3,000,000	2,439,500	1.00	.02	48,790
Newbec	5,000,000	3,904,707	N.P.V.	.42	1,639,976
Night Hawk	5,000,000	4,500,000	1.00	.08	360,000
Nipissing	6,000,000	1,200,000	5.00	3.25	3,900,000
Noranda	2,250,000	2,168,566	N.P.V.	54.50	128,186,847
Northern Canada	5,000,000	2,500,000	N.P.V.	.65	1,625,000
Osisko	2,000,000	1,572,156	1.00	.66	1,037,622
Old Colony	6,000,000	4,000,000	N.P.V.	.35	1,400,000
Pawnee Kirkland	3,000,000	2,999,000	1.00	.05	149,950
Pend Oreille	1,000,000	1,000,000	1.00	6.10	6,100,000
Peterson Cobalt	2,900,000	1,689,947	1.00	.12	202,793
Pioneer Mines Corp	5,000,000	2,523,129	1.00	.45	1,135,408
Premier Gold Mines	5,000,000	5,000,000	1.00	1.80	9,000,000
Ribago Copper Corp	4,000,000	2,022,006	1.00	.03	60,660
Por. Crown	4,000,000	2,813,055	1.00	.02	56,260
Potterdoal	5,000,000	3,977,456	N.P.V.	.02	97,549
Preston	3,000,000	2,500,000	1.00	.02	50,000
Robb-Montbray	6,000,000	4,700,000	1.00	.04	188,000
Sudbury Mines	3,000,000	1,600,000	1.00	.04	24,000
San Antonio	4,000,000	2,200,000	N.P.V.	.12	264,000
Sherritt-Gordon	6,000,000	4,881,794	1.00	8.40	41,007,069
Siscoe	4,000,000	3,780,000	1.00	.78	2,948,400
Stadacona	5,000,000	3,950,000	N.P.V.	.10	395,000
St. Anthony G. M	3,000,000	1,000,000	1.00	.29	290,000
Sudbury Basin	2,000,000	1,665,505	N.P.V.	.55	14,240,067
Sudbury Contact	2,000,000	1,300,000	1.00	.06	76,000
Sunlock	1,000,000	1,000,000	1.00	2.75	2,750,000
Sylvanite	3,300,000	3,299,500	1.00	1.60	5,279,200
Teshota	3,000,000	1,500,000	1.00	.24	360,000
Teck-Hughes	5,000,000	4,767,144	1.00	9.35	44,572,796
Thompson-Cadillac	2,000,000	1,895,334	1.00	.18	341,160
Towagamac	1,000,000	1,000,000	1.00	2.10	2,100,000
Treadwell Yukon	1,500,000	1,500,000	1.00	13.00	19,500,000
Tough-Ooakes	3,000,000	600,000	5.00	.04	24,000

Company	Capital	Shares issued	Par value	Price May 4	Value May 4
Ventures	10,000,000	6,346,705	N.P.V.	9.50	60,293,697
Vickers	1,500,000	1,000,000	1.00	.75	750,000
Vipond	2,500,000	2,000,000	1.00	1.07	2,140,000
West Dome Gold	7,000,000	4,870,905	N.P.V.	.04	194,836
Wright-Hargreaves	5,500,000	5,500,000	N.P.V.	1.80	9,900,000
Waite-Ackerman	2,000,000	2,000,000	N.P.V.	3.85	7,700,000
Wiltsey-Cough	3,000,000	1,561,400	1.00	.22	343,508
Windfall Rouyn	3,000,000	2,220,500	1.00	.06	133,230
Total					$1,607,709,667

Let us take Abana, the first stock on the list. The shares of Abana, a mining company in northern Quebec which has become well known during the last year or so, have a par value of $1. On May 4 the selling price per share was $2.10. Under the present system a tax of three cents is collected on shares to the par value of $100, so that on the sale of 100 shares of Abana the tax of three cents would be collected, although the actual selling price would be $210. I use this illustration in order to point out that the present tax is not an ad valorem tax—according to value; it is a tax on the par value of shares. At present Abana is selling for more than twice the par value, and the $1.10 additional is not taxed at all.

Then let us take Aconda, another mining company in northern Quebec. This is a cheap stock which has been on the market for some time. It has a par value, or a fictitious value, of $1 per share and on May 4 the selling price was 10 cents per share. On the sale of 100 shares of that stock the tax of three cents would be collected, yet the selling price of 100 shares would be only $10. My whole point is that the tax in force now is most unfair because it is not a tax according to value. That is the only fair way of imposing a tax of this kind, but this tax is imposed on a fictitious value placed upon the shares when these companies are formed. Under these conditions it is no wonder that we are trying to get something more equitable, and probably the Minister of Finance is trying to find some method which will bring in more revenue.

Now we will consider Argonaut, another cheap stock. This is a mining company in northern Ontario whose shares have been dealt in for a number of years, although it shows very little activity at present. The shares have a par value of $1, but on May 4 the selling price was only two cents per share. On 100 shares of Argonaut the tax of three cents would be collected, but the actual selling price of the 100 shares would be only $2. In other words, when you deal in Argonaut at 2 cents per share, on 100 shares you pay a tax on $98 which does not exist at all. This illustrates very clearly the inequality of the tax.

Now let us take some of the higher priced shares and see how this tax works out. Consolidated Smelters is one of the good, safe, big mining stocks of which every person knows. These shares have a par value of $25, but on May 4 last they were selling for $430. In order to collect a tax of three cents the sale of four shares of this stock would be necessary, making a total par value of $100, but the actual selling price of four shares on May 4 would be $1,720, so $1,620 would not be taxed at all. That shows the inequality of this tax in another way.

Falconbridge Nickel, another of the good mining stocks in Ontario, affords a further illustration of how the present tax works out. When this tax was framed seven years ago, in 1922, I suppose the government thought they were imposing a tax on value; they imposed a tax of 3 cents on every $100 of par value of shares of stock sold or transferred. Apparently some time after that the Department of National Revenue realized that there were some shares which had no par value and I have been told that for some time they did not know what to do because the act did not cover that class of share. I have no doubt that for a number of years no tax was collected on stocks of no par value, which is of considerable importance when we realize that out of a list of 117 companies the stocks of which are being traded in at present there are quite a number of stocks of no par value.

In going down this list the first stock of no par value that I come to is Falconbridge Nickel. On May 4 the selling price of that stock was $12 per share. No matter how many of these no par value shares were traded in, they were taxed on their selling value, a 3 cent tax on every $100 worth. I cannot understand why the government do not realize, when they present a proposal to change the method of taxation, that an ad valorem tax would be the absolutely fair way of taxing these shares. It is hardly fair to such stocks as Falconbridge Nickel when it is considered that there are other high priced

stocks which are paying taxes on a certain par value when they are selling as high as twenty-five times the amount of their par value.

The next stock I should like to mention is Lake Shore. The Lake Shore mine is in northern Ontario, up in the Kirkland lake district, in the riding which I have the honour to represent. This stock has a par value of $1 per share. That means that when there is a transfer of 100 shares of Lake Shore stock the government receives a 3 cent tax. On May 4 that stock was selling at $27 per share, just twenty-seven times its par value. On a sale of one share at $27, $26 of that amount would be exempt from taxation. I know these Lake Shore people quite well and I am sure that they do not desire the government or anyone else to discriminate in their favour, as is the case with the present tax and as will, in another way, be the case with the proposed tax.

Another of our gold stocks which is selling above par is Teck-Hughes. This stock also has a par value of $1 per share and it is selling around $9 per share, nine times its par value. Under the present tax, on every sale there would be $8 per share which would not be taxed. It is no wonder that the Minister of Finance was not receiving the income he thought he would from this 3 cent tax. Had it been made an ad valorem tax and not a hotch-potch, graduated sort of thing such as he is proposing, it would work out quite fairly. Let the tax be a 3 cent tax on $100 of value, as it has been since 1922, but on the value of the shares sold. If that were done every person would be satisfied and happy because no one would be discriminated against and the government would be receiving a revenue at least four times as great as it is under the present tax; and the tax would remain at the same rate.

The next stock I should like to mention is that of Sherritt-Gordon, a recent development in northern Manitoba. I had given very little attention to this matter previously but when I picked up the Toronto Star on my way home on Saturday and read this article it started me thinking. This Sherritt-Gordon mine is not producing as yet, but it is expected that it will be within a year or two. The stock has a par value of $1 and is selling to-day at about nine times that value. On every share of Sherritt-Gordon stock which is traded in on the market about $8 is exempt from taxation. The Minister of Finance is losing for the people of Canada the tax which he would be receiving on that extra $8, if it were an ad valorem tax.

[Mr. Lang.]

Another stock is the Sudbury Contact. This is one of the new companies, formed within the last year or two in the Sudbury district near some of the big producers. It has not been successful so far; the initial money for development purposes has, I suppose, been pretty well spent and I understand it has not yet found any quantity of ore. Sudbury Contact has a par value of $1 a share, but on May 4 it was selling at 6 cents a share. Let the committee think how that affects the little fellow who is having a hard time to finance and get along. A sale of 100 shares of Sudbury Contact, which has a par value of $1 a share, pays a tax of 3 cents to the government, just the same as the high priced share that is selling at $27. On this stock, selling at 6 cents a share, the tax, which is 3/100 of one per cent of the par value, amounts to one-half of one per cent of the actual value. Wherever you have a low priced share selling under par, at half par, quarter par or 10 per cent of par, then it has to pay a tax which should never be imposed upon it. It is absolutely unfair and unjust and it places the burden on the one who finds it hardest to pay. On the other hand, as regards every share of stock that is selling at over par, where the mine is getting into good shape and producing and where the public wants the stock because it has merit, under the present tax the government does not receive any revenue at all on every dollar that the stock sells over its par value.

Another stock is the Treadwell Yukon, one of the great mines of Canada. It has a par value of $1, but it is selling on the market now at $13 a share. On every share of that stock that is traded in at $13 a share, $12 escapes taxation. Surely if the committee will just think seriously for a moment about the sort of taxation that we have had on the sale of shares of stock, and the sort of taxation that is proposed, it will realize that the one is just as crazy, foolish and unfair as the other. It is the simplest thing in the world to remedy this situation; it is staring us right in the face in the present tax that we have. All that is necessary is, instead of cutting out clause 58 as is proposed, simply to delete the word "par". It says that a tax of 3 cents is to be imposed on every $100 of par value. Just leave that word "par" out, and let it read that there is a 3 cent tax for every $100 of value of shares traded in. In that way we shall have a fair and equitable tax, a tax that will bring in, as I say, at least four times as much revenue to the public treasury as the tax in its present form will do.

I do not know that I should take up any more of the time of the committee. Surely it must be evident to any person who wants to give thought to the matter, that there is a fair and equitable way to raise revenue on a tax of this kind and that it can be done without the imposition of an onerous tax or one that will bear heavily on anyone. I am not a bit afraid that the Minister of Finance or the government will make it too heavy a tax as long as it is left where it bears equally upon all the people concerned. If it should ever happen that as great a percentage of taxation should be proposed on the higher priced as on the low priced shares, I know enough pressure would be brought to bear upon the Minister of Finance and the government from quarters that have had nothing to say about this tax, to ensure that such a step would not be taken. So far as I am concerned, the government can go just as far as they like in regard to this tax so long as they make it equitable, fair and just, bearing equally upon all; and that can be done only by its being made an ad valorem tax as I suggest, simply by deleting the word "par" from clause 58. Who in the world ever thought of imposing a tax on par value when the prices of the shares do not represent par value? Par value is simply a unit of division of the number of shares stipulated in the formation of a company. Naturally the big fellows do not worry about this tax; the little fellows apparently have not many people to look after their interests and they cannot raise much of a protest. But surely when the matter is brought so plainly to the attention of the committee, little more need be said.

I have under my hand a table something along the lines of those given by the hon. member for West York and the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard with regard to the proposed tax. I do not know that it is necessary to give the figures, because I cannot conceive of any sane people going ahead with a tax such as is proposed when it is so evident that a fair, reasonable, just and equitable tax can be imposed and a greater revenue obtained for the people of Canada. I will, however, give a few of the figures, because I have spent a little time in working out the table. Suppose a mining company wishes to raise $50,000, which is the amount very often raised for the initial development stages; in order to do that, if the shares sell at 5 cents each, one million shares must be sold. In very many cases 5 cents is the initial price of the shares. Under the new proposal—which never will go into effect, but if it did—the tax on that $50,000 would be $1,000. Suppose that $50,000 is raised by the sale of 500,000 shares at 10 cents a share. The government would then receive in taxation $500. The government takes a tax of $1,000 when $50,000 is raised by selling a million shares at 5 cents a share, but only $500 when $50,000 is raised by selling 500,000 shares at 10 cents a share. Suppose the $50,000 is raised by the sale of 100,000 shares at 50 cents a share; the government tax would then be only $100. So that on $50,000 raised by selling stock at 5 cents a share the tax is $1,000; at 10 cents a share, it is $500; at 50 cents a share, it is $100. The government are taking less in taxation all the time, although the same amount, $50,000 is raised in all three cases.

Suppose 50,000 shares are sold at $1 a share. The government would then take $125. That seems wrong; there is another jump in the tax, which further demonstrates its lack of equity and fairness. Suppose 50,000 shares are sold at $1.10 a share. The amount raised would be $55,000, and the government tax amounts to $500. Truly a wonderful system, if it ever went into effect!

Suppose $50,000 is raised by the sale of 25,000 shares at $2 a share. The government tax on that would be $250. Not so bad, but still not so good; there are others better than that. Suppose $50,000 is raised by the sale of 12,500 shares at $4 a share. The government tax on that would be $250. Or take the sale of 5,000 shares at $10 a share. The government tax on that would be $100. That is pretty fair. At $20 a share, selling 2,500 shares, the tax would be just $50, although it is a $50,000 deal just the same. The government would take $50 on that $50,000 deal and $1,000 on a $50,000 deal when the shares sell at 5 cents a share. At $125 a share, selling 400 shares and raising $50,000, lo and behold! the government tax now is only $16, although it is a $50,000 transaction just the same as in the first case, where the government got a tax of $1,000 when the shares were selling at 5 cents each.

That is how it work out, Mr. Chairman. Surely this committee is never going to allow a tax of that kind to be placed upon the people of this country. If there were no other form of taxation that would be fair, equitable and just, one might say that we could not get away from this tax, that we have to raise the revenue; but when the tax can be imposed in such a way as to bring in a much greater revenue, a tax that will be fair to all, and that will not increase the burden on the buyer of the smallest shares,

a tax that will take the burden off the little fellow and place a fair share of it upon those who are buying the higher valued shares, we should adopt that method. It is so simple that you would think anyone could see it. Simply place an ad valorem tax on the transfer of shares. Why in the world don't we do it that way? I feel sure that if the Minister of Finance considers this matter a little further, he will withdraw the proposal now before the committee; that he will impose an ad valorem tax, a tax that is fair to everybody, a tax on values, an equitable tax according to the size of the transaction. Let that be done, and I care not whether the minister raises the tax higher than 3 cents on every $100 of value in the transaction. I am satisfied that if he will leave the tax at 3 cents on every $100 of value in the transaction—not on the par value, because that would be foolish—it would work out well if the method I suggest were adopted. The only shares that have been paying an ad valorem tax have been the shares of no par value stocks, and the Department of National Revenue, in administering the tax on the no par value stock based it on the value of the transaction, as should be done in every case. As the act stood it provided simply for a tax on shares according to their par value, and there must have been some scratching of heads in the National Revenue department when they were figuring out how to tax shares of no par value, because there is nothing in the act to give them any authority to do so, so far as I can see. The act simply says, "three cents on every hundred dollars of the par value of the stock sold." This works out unfairly. It can be made fair, and I feel sure it will be.

I have a large amount of other material here which I would have gone into had I thought it necessery. I feel confident that there will be a great sigh of relief not only in stock brokers' offices but among all classes of Canadians if this particular tax is levied in a way fair and equitable to those concerned, and it seems to me that my suggestion is the only way in which it can be done. It is not simply few places that are interested in this tax; it is not merely our mining constituencies that are affected, but the people throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion realize what an important factor in our national life is the wonderful development that is now taking place in our mining and oil industries. Therefore we should not fool around any longer with a hotch-potch, graduted, unfair sort of tax such as that now under consideration. If the Minister of Finance is afraid there would not be a sufficient revenue from the tax I have suggested, let him instruct his accountants to figure out the returns from such a tax, and I venture to say he will find that, a three cent tax on every hundred dollar value of all share transactions will bring him a revenue four times as great as the revenue derived under the tax at present in effect or to be derived from his present proposal. This proposed tax would be obnoxious to the people and it would be unfair. I am sure the only reason that we have not realized the unfairness of the tax at present in effect, is that none of us were thinking about it or talking about it. As a matter of fact I never thought of looking into it until I read an article in the Star on my way home last Saturday. I was under the impression that the present tax was an ad valorem tax such as I have suggested. The only part of the tax on an ad valorem basis is the tax imposed on no par value stock, simply because there was no other way of taxing such stock.

Mr. ESLING: It is good to hear a voice from the other side of the house, Mr. Chairman, in agreement with us. The minister and practically every other member on the government side has received protests against this proposed resolution, from almost every part of the Dominion. The main argument against is its lack of balance and absolute disparity in application. It is unreasonable and inconsistent. While the people generally have accorded a generous acknowledgment of the Finance minister's good judgment and intention, in this case they are very much dissatisfied, and I suspect that he himself is not very enthusiastic about this resolution, nor can any of those associated with him be keen for its adoption.

To be as brief as possible I shall present my argument by way of illustration. I will take the difference in tax paid by an ordinary investor as compared with a trust company. We will take a trust company, for instance, which invests the sum of $250,000 in 500 shares of the value of $500 each. The tax is merely $20 at 4 cents per share under the new rate. Or that trust company may invest the same sum of money—and I think this is a point that should be considered—it may be the same sum of money, but if it is used to purchase a different kind of shares, it becomes subject to a different rate of tax. If that same trust company invested its $250,000 in 1,000 shares at $250 each, instead of paying $20 tax they will pay $40. Now we will take a man who has $1,000 to invest. I am sure this will appeal to the general public, and I imagine

it must appeal to the Minister of Finance as unjust. This man buys two shares of Smelters, we will say, at $500 per share; his tax is 8 cents. If he buys 4 shares, we will say, of Canadian Pacific Railway stock at $250 a share, his tax is 16 cents. But this man may say, "I think I will not buy those high-priced shares, I will get some of the low-priced shares." So he invests $1,000 in 10 cent shares, and his tax will be ten dollars. If he puts his $1,000 into 8 cents shares, his tax will be $12.50. If he invests in 4 cent shares his tax will be $25. If he uses his $1,000 to buy 2 cent shares, his tax will be $50. It is inconceivable that such an unreasonable tax should be proposed, and I am confident that it would be difficult for any member on the other side of the house to justify to his constituents a vote in favour of this resolution. I am sure that most of the ministers have received protests against this tax. It is to be hoped that for the welfare of the mining industry the hon. Minister of Finance will withdraw this proposal and bring in something of a more reasonable nature.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Will the hon. member permit a question? I am not so conversant with mining stocks as he is, apparently. Under this arrangement is it not a double tax, a tax on the par value and on the actual amount involved in the transaction?

Mr. ESLING: Not under the new resolution.

Mr. ARTHURS: The minister would be well advised if, in accordance with the argument put forward by my hon. friend (Mr. Lang), he placed the tax on the actual selling value of the stocks to be taxed. The minister has gone on the supposition that this is a tax against the stockbrokers; as a matter of fact it is not a tax against the stockbrokers or the Toronto stock exchange or any other such institution. This is a tax against the actual mining operations in the country. If, as pointed out by several members to-night, a company decides to put stock on the market at $1 a share at par, it has a great deal less to pay than the company which decides to put on the market stock valued at $1 per share which it sells at 5 or 10 cents. Every dollar collected by this government in the first instance is collected from the actual assets or receipts of the company itself. Ordinarily speaking, a company starting in business requires a capital of from $50,000 to $100,000, and in order to raise that money it must sell stock on terms that are agreeable to the brokers and to the public. Usually these stocks are sold at a very small figure per share—10 cents or less. In that case, according to the original tax proposed by the minister, one-tenth of all the funds goes to the treasury of the Dominion—one-tenth of all the funds secured; and probably one-fifth more goes to the broker. The result is that the money actually secured for the development of the mine is small indeed. The minister would be well advised to withdraw the item and in the meantime to reconsider the matter, which is of vital importance to the development of new mines not only in Ontario but in practically the entire Dominion. Could he not try to secure some equitable means of levying the tax on the market value of the stock at it is sold?

Mr. ROBB: The tax as originally introduced was complained of, particularly by the mining brokers. There was very little complaint except as regards those stocks included in paragraph (e):

> One cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price of three dollars or less per share.

Now there is before the committee an amendment which it occurs to me, after listening to the arguments of some hon. gentlemen, has probably been overlooked. That amendment now provides:

> (e) one cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over one dollar per share, but not more than three dollars per share;
>
> (f) one-fourth of one cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over fifty cents per share, but not more than one dollar per share;
>
> (g) one-tenth of one cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price of fifty cents or less per share.

Mr. ARTHURS: According to the amended schedule the tax on stocks selling at 10 cents would be $1 per $100.

Mr. ROBB: There are three parties to this legislation before the committee. There is the prospector, there is the investing public and there are those concerned with revenues of the country, and I submit that the readjustment as presented is not unfair to the development of mines, while it is fair to the public and to the government revenues. Hon. gentlemen must observe that when stock is first allotted there is no tax whatever on the original transfer; it is only when they begin trading and selling the stocks to the public that the tax is imposed.

Mr. ARTHURS: Not according to the original act.

Mr. ROBB: Well, I will quote it to my hon. friend if he has any doubt in the matter. Section 61 of the Special War Revenue Act reads:

> The first delivery by a corporation or company of such shares, or debenture stock, in order to effect an issue, or the first issue of a bond, or a sale or transfer of any bond between any recognized dealers or brokers shall not be subject to the tax imposed by this part.

That is to say, the first delivery is exempt.

Mr. ARTHURS: That is the delivery to the brokers.

Mr. ROBB: The same thing applies to stock.

Mr. ARTHURS: Not according to the act.

Mr. DUNNING: It applies to stock as well.

Mr. FRASER: Does it apply to common stock?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. MANION: What the minister has quoted does not change our argument. We were not arguing—at least some of us were not—on that point but in regard to the sale of stocks on the market.

Mr. ROBB: I repeat, there is no tax on the first transfer, and I submit that this tax is a reasonable one.

Mr. ARTHURS: I have not before me the act to which the minister has referred nor have I the details of the proposed change. But my impression is that while the original transfer from the company to the brokers is not taxable, the transfer to the public is; and it must then be an additional charge to the company so far as the stock is concerned.

Mr. ROBB: As soon as they begin speculating then certainly the nation has a right to take some share of the profits. If I were representing a mining section of the country I might take a onesided view of the matter. But this is in the interests of the mining industry, and in support of that statement I shall quote the opinion of the Northern Miner.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the editor's opinion.

Mr. ROBB: Well, he should know what the opinion is in that part of the country. And as a matter of fact any opinion expressed in an editorial column is largely the editor's opinion. I quote:

[Mr. Arthurs.]

> While the business of company promotion by brokers has lagged lately, reducing the prospector's claim market, fortunately he has never been in such good position to sell first-class discoveries. Dozens of big mining organizations will listen eagerly to his story if he has a good one to tell, and will send engineers hopping by plane to examine. If his show stands up money is waiting, on the nail. Easy going, long distance deals are completely out of fashion. The prospector can get quick action if he is willing to deal with the big companies. Competition for good ground is so keen that he is sure of good terms. . . On the whole, it has probably been a good thing for everybody that the promotional game has been slack. Buyers have had a chance to catch their breath and promoters a chance to realize and act upon the new conditions. The public was overloaded with half-baked propositions. . .

The Monetary Times of January 11 quotes Mr. Norman Urquhart, president of the Standard Stock and Mining Exchange of Toronto, as follows:

> Another development which deserves mention and which has come with the increasing confidence in the mining industry is the improved cash position of new companies making application for stock listing privileges, compared with less than two years ago. To-day 60 per cent of the companies making an application have from $100,000 to $200,000. This ensures fewer mining failures than formerly because of lack of capital to carry on and indicates how much easier it is to raise money for preliminary development.

Then I have here another statement made by one of the most prominent bankers in the city of Toronto, where I suppose more mining shares are sold than in any other city of Canada. This statement was made by Mr. Bogart, general manager of the Dominion Bank, in his annual report:

> With respect to mining, entirely too many stock issues are made at a premature stage of development—some with no claim to recognition whatever are traded in daily—and it is a great pity that the mining industry, which in proper hands is making fine headway, should have to suffer through unworthy exploitation, and it does Canada no good abroad. The Ontario government and some sections of the press do what they can to protect the public, but there should be stricter regulation of the sale of stock and closer supervision of those who sell it.

Mr. FRASER: What was the date of that observation?

Mr. ROBB: It was made at the annual meeting of the bank on December 31, 1928.

Mr. MANION: That was before the imposition of this tax.

Mr. ROBB: But this is pretty good advice. I submit to the house that as compared with other countries our tax is not unreason-

able. If you go over to London, England, to sell these mining shares, here is the tax you will pay:

Not exceeding £5, one shilling.
Exceeding £5 but not exceeding £10, two shillings.
Exceeding £10 but not exceeding £15, three shillings.
Exceeding £15 but not exceeding £20, four shillings.

And so on up to ten shillings.

Mr. STIRLING: Is that on the par value?

Mr. ROBB: That is per share.

Mr. FRASER: How can you compare the old country with Canada?

Mr. ROBB: I will be finished in a moment, and then my hon. friend can talk until eleven o'clock if he wishes. I submit that this is not an unreasonable tax but that it is fair as compared with the sales tax the miner must pay on his clothing and equipment when he goes out to prospect for these mines. I have had some experience in municipal life as well as in this federal parliament, and I have never yet known a tax which everyone considered fair.

Mr. McRAE: I am sure the opinion of the Minister of Finance is in keeping with the opinion expressed by the presidents of the prominent financial institutions, but I submit that the mining industry of this country never would have been developed under these opinions. As is well known, this great mining development has not been brought about on a strictly financial basis but by the optimism and the hope of the Canadians who have invested their money in these companies.

I listened with a good deal of interest to what the Minister of Finance said with regard to the transfer of these stocks, but it is not quite clear to me that he has covered the point which I know a number of hon. gentlemen have in mind. In the financing of mining corporations certain stocks have been underwritten, and it is not clear to me as yet whether or not the transfer from the underwriters is a transfer on which a tax may be collected. I submit to the committee that that is an original transfer, and, as such, should not be taxed.

Mr. MANION: I do not wish unduly to delay this item, but I have just one further observation to make. I have no quarrel with the minister's statement, but at the same time it does not alter the fact that on a sale of stock to the value of $54,000, for example, there is a tax of $30 and on a sale of $1,020 there is a tax of $10. In other words, the tax on the one is eighteen times greater than the tax on the other, taking these stocks according to their market value. In the other case which I mentioned, the sale of Columbus-Kirkland to the value of $15, there was a tax of $1, while in the other sale amounting to $54,000 the tax was only $30, or according to value more than one hundred times on the small transaction as compared with the large one. That is the attitude I have taken; that is the attitude taken by the hon. member for South Timiskaming and by other hon. members on this side of the house. We protest against the inequality of the tax on the small buyer and seller as compared with the tax on the man who can buy $50,000, $100,000 or $200,000 worth of stocks.

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend referred to a purchase of shares, worth $500 each, to the amount of $500,000. The tax on such a transaction would be $40, whereas if shares worth $1.01 each were purchased to the amount of $500,000 the tax would be $5,000; in other words the tax on the lower priced share would be about 125 times greater than the tax on the higher priced share. That is not fair.

To a certain extent the minister has alleviated the situation; that we admit. As it stood previously it was impossible, but I should like to point out that in addition to the inequality of the tax there is another serious feature. In British Columbia at least the mining development since the war has been due largely to what my hon. friend from North Vancouver described as the optimism of the public. There the people have gone into the underwriting of legitimate propositions put forward under the best mining engineers in the country and they have purchased shares in these companies. As the matter now stands, however, if they find that owing to the tax, the brokerage and so on they must get about $1.05 for a share for which they paid $1.01 in order to get their money back it will deter people from purchasing these shares, and unless the shares are marketable people will not purchase them. If a man is considering going into a new proposition the first requisite is that the shares must be marketable, and I think these are the two main points we have in mind. First we believe that this tax does not work out equally—perhaps that is the most serious feature—and in the second place, these shares must be made marketable. If the tax is too high the shares will be marketable no longer, and if there is inequality in the tax people will hesitate before undertaking to purchase these stocks.

Mr. ROBB: According to a statement prepared by the department I find that in 1926-27 the Ontario government tax on shares amounted to $223,096.27. Quoting only the

Standard exchange, which I imagine does practically all this business in Toronto, in the same year the federal revenue was $47,393.01. In 1927-28 the Ontario tax was $399,116.98; while the federal mining tax was $121,114.70. I have a statement showing the number of shares of stock sold on the Standard mining exchange on March 15, 1929, and the tax which would be applicable under the schedule which we are now divided on. There were 324,900 shares at 50 cents or less, which gives a revenue of $324.90. There were 186,500 shares over 50 cents but not over $1, which, at a quarter of a cent per share, would give $466.25. There were 114,900 shares over $1 per share, but not over $3, which, at one cent per share, would give a revenue of $1,149. There were 150,900 shares valued at over $3 but not over $20, which, at 2 cents per share, would give $3,018. There were 29,300 shares valued at over $20 per share but not over $100, which, at 3 cents per share, would give a revenue of $879. It will be observed that there is a turnover of 324,900 shares of what might be called speculative stocks. I submit to the house that this is a very fair tax and that it does not work out as the hon. member for Fort William has pointed out.

Mr. McRAE: I am afraid I have not made my point clear. In these mines the venture, if we can call it such, is underwritten and the underwriters take a certain percentage of the shares. I should like to know whether the shares in the name of the underwriters will be considered as original shares and not taxed in the event of a transfer.

Mr. ROBB: I am not able to answer the hon. member because the Department of Finance does not administer this act.

Mr. ARTHURS: That is an essential point.

Mr. ROBB: When the act was framed it appears that the minister was given power to deal fairly with all cases. I have already quoted section 61 of the act, but I will quote it again. It is as follows:

> The first delivery by a corporation or company of such shares, or debenture stock, in order to effect an issue, or the first issue of a bond, or a sale or transfer of any bond between any recognized dealers or brokers shall not be subject to the tax imposed by this part.

Mr. ARTHURS: That is only dealers or brokers; it does not cover the point raised.

Mr. ROBB: That is what they tell me in the department. Section 62 reads:

> The governor in council may make regulations for the purpose of determining what constitutes a sale or transfer under this part.

I am not just sure what the regulations are.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think this government should impose this tax. I do not think the federal government should impose any tax in connection with enterprises which are dependent entirely upon the provinces. The crown in the right of the Dominion does not own, nor has it any royalty in, the minerals in the provinces of British Columbia and Ontario, so why should we levy a tax of this kind? The provinces already tax these enterprises, and this means double taxation, which is wrong in principle. In my judgment the minister is making a great mistake in proposing to tax these mining ventures. Nearly all of them exist where the crown has no right to the mines or minerals. The federal government have no title and no royalty in Quebec, so why should they impose a tax? They have no title or royalty in Ontario, so why should they impose a tax? The same is true in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and British Columbia, and within a few months will be equally true in Manitoba. Why should the Dominion impose taxation on the transfer of mining shares when the provinces are already being overtaxed to provide the cost of the very trails which lead up to the mines, the schools in which the children of the miners receive their education, the other facilities which have to be maintained for the life of the community itself? I submit that this is an unfair tax against ventures which are already taxed by the provinces. It simply means that taxation by the Dominion will be superimposed upon the existing taxation; it means taxation by a power which has neither title nor right to the products of the mines in any way, shape or form.

There is something more to be said about it. This tax works out in a most inequitable fashion. I shall not repeat the figures already given, but I should like to emphasize the point made by the hon. members for Parry Sound and North Vancouver. Under the statute as it now stands the first issue is free from taxation. That is the issue which divests the enterprise of its securities and places them in the hands of the underwriters, whether the underwriters be dealers and divide it up with others, or whether they maintain it for themselves. The purchasers who buy either from the underwriters or from one of the recognized dealers have to pay a tax, and the brokers provide for that tax when they sell to the public. That is the point which the hon. member for Parry Sound has been making. It is too late to suggest that this tax should not be imposed in view of the fact that this government has not given assistance to any industry with a view to aiding its

development. What has the government done to aid the pulp and paper industry, which belongs to the two provinces of Quebec and Ontario. Not a single thing which has contributed either to its success or to its failure.

Mr. POWER: The provincial governments contributed largely to its failure. The industry would have been better off had they left it alone.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Quebec South may be speaking with authority with respect to his province, but this is not a provincial legislature; it is the Dominion parliament. I do not propose to discuss whether they were right or wrong, but this government did not do anything to make the industry a success or a failure. They have not helped in the expansion of trade through the finding of markets—although the minister may say he did something in Australia and then by order in council shifted it on to New Zealand so that their butter could come here and kill our dairy industry. If he regards that as an achievement of which to be proud, he is entitled to the credit. Take our next largest industry, that of mining. Minerals to the value of $275,000,000 were mined in this country last year, and the Minister of Finance cannot point to a single thing which justifies his imposing a tax on this transfer of mining shares. The royalties of these mines belong to the crown in the right of the provinces, and the whole obligation of maintaining the enterprises engaged in developing them rests upon the provincial authorities. An important principle is involved here. Because it is said there is large speculation in mining stocks the government proposes to tax the transfer of such stocks, although the provinces alone have to do with them and the burdens connected therewith are theirs, not ours. The Minister of Finance has pointed out that the revenue received by the Dominion from the transactions on the Standard exchange amounted to only $47,000 or $48,000 in round figures, while the province obtained some $200,000. Why should not the province receive that? What interest has the Dominion of Canada in the mines of Ontario, Quebec or British Columbia?

It is the old story of overlapping taxation which came before the interprovincial conference two years ago. These mining ventures may be highly successful for some people and equally unsuccessful for others, but in the meantime, because they offer a target at which the government can direct a taxing power—the provinces have nursed this industry along until it has reached a point where it plays a very important part in the life of the country—they say: We are going to tax it. I do not think that is right.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Would that be any worse than imposing an export duty on their ores?

Mr. BENNETT: Who was talking about an export duty on ores?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): My hon. friend's friends are talking about it.

Mr. BENNETT: What ores? Newfoundland?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member was out of the room. I am glad to see that he has wakened up. He has wakened up at the wrong time, like Rip Van Winkle. We were not talking about export duties on ores.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): My hon. friend's friends have been talking about them for weeks.

Mr. BENNETT: Would my hon. friend just state who they were?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): The hon. gentleman (Mr. Stevens) who is sitting right beside my hon. friend now.

Mr. BENNETT: What did he say?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): He said that he would put a duty on the export of our minerals and would not let them ship them out of the country.

Mr. BENNETT: And what else? Let my hon. friend give the rest of it.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): He would make them refine and manufacture them here.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so. I think one might almost say in the words of Shakespeare: "I thank thee Jew, for teaching me that word," because it makes it perfectly clear the hon. member for Vancouver Centre said what I would expect he would have said, namely, that he did not believe in Canadian mineral products being sent in the raw state to the United States of America and then bought back by our own people at one-quarter of a cent higher price than their competitors in the foreign country paid for their own product.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): My hon. friend said just now that we had nothing to do with that.

Mr. BENNETT: I said that that was not what we were discussing to-night; that we were discussing the question of taxation on the transfer of shares. We discussed the other matter some days ago. I suggest to the minister that he abandon this taxation in its entirety, having regard to his buoyant revenues, and after the speech to which we listened to-night from the hon. member for South Timiskaming, who has given a great deal of consideration to the matter and whose province is developing a mining industry without any assistance from this government. Of course the Minister of Finance will say: "Have we not put mining machinery on the free list?" Well, the mines would be developed whether he did that or not, whether he obtained or lost the revenue. What has the government done to develop the mining industry? The tax should be imposed by the province which has to bear the burden, not by the Dominion government, which picks out this industry as a target at which to aim taxation.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend the leader of the opposition is arguing as if this were a new tax.

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. ROBB: It is a revision of a tax already imposed.

Mr. BENNETT: The other was a mere stamp tax.

Mr. ROBB: Well, this is a stamp tax.

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. BENNETT: It would not be classified as such.

Mr. MANION: It is a revision upwards, of course.

Mr. ROBB: I am in agreement with my hon. friend as to the desirability of getting away as soon as possible from this double taxation, but he will not deny that the federal authorities have the right to impose taxation anywhere in Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not for a moment doubt that right.

Mr. ROBB: We require the revenue. We cannot build railways into the mining districts to take out the ore unless we get revenue somewhere.

Mr. BENNETT: But the freight rates surely furnish that revenue. According to the Minister of Railways that is so; otherwise we would not be building railways.

[Mr. E. J. Young.]

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend has admitted that we have contributed towards helping the mines by reducing the duties on the implements of production required in the mines.

Mr. BENNETT: Implements of production not made in Canada.

Mr. ROBB: But apparently my hon. friend has forgetten that the government has built some railways into this section and proposes to build more. We must have revenue, and I submit that this is a fair tax. It is a revision of an old tax.

Mr. MANION: A revision upwards.

Mr. ROBB: If my hon. friend from Fort William is right, another year is coming and the matter can be considered.

Mr. MANION: I do not know why the Minister of Finance should link me up with that "another year". He has done that two or three times. I said that if he could not do it this year, he should do it next year. Let him put the responsibility on his own shoulders. He takes the attitude that this is a revision of the tax and he is a great boaster of revising taxes downwards. This is a revision upwards. As regards the Dominion government helping mining by building railways, the government that built railways to help mining was the Conservative government of Ontario. The Timiskaming and Northern Ontario was the railway that did a great deal towards the development of mining in this country.

Mr. MALCOLM: Who started the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario?

Mr. MANION: I do not know, but I know who completed it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. MANION: My hon. friends may laugh, but they do not know any more about who started it than I do.

An hon. MEMBER: Yes, they do.

Mr. MANION: The Conservative government was the one that built it, and the Conservative government of Ontario has done more for mining in this country than any other government. I think the minister would be well advised to change the tax this year. I repeat that if he does not do it this year, he should do it next year.

Mr. McRAE: I am rather astonished at the Minister of Finance mixing up his department with the Department of Railways. I think he might look after his own department and the Minister of Railways look after his.

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister of Finance to-night says that he is going to revise the tax upwards, and I suppose the people of Canada will have the pleasure of hearing him say next year: Yes, see how I have reduced the taxes! It is the old way. How long does he think the people will be fooled by that sort of guff?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the only word that describes it, and for the last five years that is what has been going on in Canada. The Minister of Finance introduces legislation year after year raising taxes and then reducing them, and he says to the people: Look how I have revised the taxes and lessened the burden of taxation! To-night he is going to revise this tax upwards. He says: Wait till next year. Next year he will say: Look what we did for the mining industry! We have reduced the tax 25 per cent. How long does he expect the people of Canada to be fooled by that sort of thing?

Mr. ROBB: Then my hon. friend will be able to say: I told you so.

Mr. BENNETT: We are taking proper steps this session to provide against a recurrence of such conditions. I suggest that the Minister of Finance explain to his colleague the Minister of Railways, who has been giving us all this talk about the self-supporting capacity of the railways, how they are going to take care of themselves, and how he has devised during long and tiresome nights a method of extending the railway system without loss of revenue; how he, the Minister of Finance, is helping to build railways with one-tenth of one per cent of a tax on mining stocks! That is the story my hon. friend is giving the country. The Dominion government got $47,000 out of this tax the year before last and the Minister of Railways is going to build a railway to Chibougamau. He was not able to pronounce the name the other night. That is good for the Minister of Finance, but I think he should have a quiet little talk with the Minister of Railways, because I am satisfied he will have to impose a good many taxes of that kind before he will be able to build his terminals at Montreal or extend his Gaspe and Oriental to Turkestan, because that is where it is bound for on its oriental mission.

Mr. LANG: Just another word. A number of hon. gentlemen have spoken since I first rose to discuss this question. The Minister of Finance has read some statements by bankers in Toronto, and something he saw in The Northern Miner. Those, speaking generally, were articles about mining and stock conditions in the country at the time they were written. None of them had any reference whatever to the present proposed mining tax They were written before the minister even thought about this tax, but even if they were written after the minister's proposal had been brought down, they had not in mind at all the mining tax that we have or any proposed tax; they had in mind only a condition that exists throughout Canada to-day.

The minister quoted some figures about the revenues of the provinces and of the Dominion under the present tax. I could not catch his figures, but I have some here that might interest the committee. Under the present tax which has been in effect since 1922, in 1927-28 the government collected on the transactions over the Toronto exchanges $615,000; in 1928-29, for the first nine months, the government collected $700,000, which amounts to approximately $950,000 for the year. The present tax, collected in the manner in which it must be collected, relieves from taxation entirely every cent of value over the par value of a stock, and if you go down that list of shares printed in the article in the Toronto Star, showing the 117 issues that are mostly traded in at the present time, you will find that the great volume of business, so far as money value is concerned, is in stocks that are selling away above their par value. In other words, the government is getting only 3 cents on every $100 of par value of the trading that goes on, when the great bulk of the trading, not in the number of shares, but in the dollar volume of business, is in shares that are selling from two to twenty times their par value. That means, so far as I have been able to judge in the short time I have been able to study this matter, at least two-fifths of the value of the business done over the Toronto exchanges is not taxed at all because it is made up of transactions in stocks selling over par. I have not a doubt in the world that half of the $900,000 that the federal treasury will receive in 1928-29 from this tax applied to the transactions on the Toronto stock exchanges comes from the smaller valued stocks that are taxed, not 3 cents on $100 of value, but sometimes 2 per cent of their value, so that it is a most unfair tax. Surely at this stage of the game, when with a stroke of the pen

we can rectify this condition and get started off right, we are not in such a hurry to wind up the business of the session that just because this proposal has been put before us by the Finance minister and he says, "I am going to put it through whether it is a fair tax or not," we are not going to accept such an unfair proposal. There is not a member of this house who dare stand up before a body of men who know anything at all about political economy and say that this proposal could by any possibility be a fair tax. It is absolutely unfair, and it cannot be made anything else. On the other hand, an ad valorem tax would be absolutely fair, it could be easily imposed, and be much more easily collected. Any accountant who wants to figure it out will find that if that 3 cent tax was on every $100 of value, instead of on the par value, it would create a revenue four or five times as great as now when it is simply based on the par value.

Why should we hasten through the committee a proposal of this kind? I thoroughly understood from statements made to me by the Minister of Finance that the tax that is in effect now was an ad valorem tax, but when I looked into the matter for myself I found that it was not an ad valorem tax or anything that looked like an ad valorem tax. The only part of it that is an ad valorem tax is the tax on no par value shares, and those shares were not taxed at all, I believe, for a number of years because the department did not know how to tax them. The act did not provide for taxing no par value shares, and finally the shares were taxed under the present Minister of National Revenue on the basis of value, and that is an ad valorem tax on shares of no par value. But on every other share of stock it has been an absolutely unfair tax, and it has placed an unjust burden on the small investor and on the smaller priced stocks which are used for raising money for the development of new industries, and particularly the mining industry. Surely this committee is composed of men with business ability enough, with common sense enough—for that is all it needs—to see the unfairness of a tax of this kind. You do not need any business training to see the unfairness of the present tax; all you need is common sense. Any school boy or school girl in this country who knows anything at all about taxation knows that a tax on value or an ad valorem tax is the one general way of imposing taxation that can be fairly distributed according to the ability of the taxpayer to pay.

I should like to hear from some lawyer as to the interpretation of section 58. I know the section provides for a tax of 3 cents on every $100, not of value, but of par value, of shares of stock transferred or traded in. Surely any person can see how unfairly it has worked out. It has been absolutely unfair and oppressive upon those who should not be discriminated against. So much for the present tax in effect since 1922; and if this proposed tax is put into effect we shall have for another year a tax that is every whit as bad as the tax we have had since 1922, every bit as unfair, every bit as unjust, inequitable in every respect, and a tax that in my judgment, and I believe, in the judgment of any person who will give it careful study, will not bring in any more revenue to the treasury than the present tax does, because just as soon as such a tax is imposed those affected are going to seek ways and means of evading it. That is what they did under the old tax to a certain extent. That probably was the reason why quite a number of companies were incorporated with no par value stock; the incorporators saw a possible chance of getting by without any taxation. I think the National Revenue department owe it to this house, when bringing down a change of this kind, to state how the old tax worked out, and when they discovered a way of imposing the tax upon corporations with shares of no par value. Of course, had such companies reorganized and converted their no par value stock into par value stock of $1, a company such as Noranda, whose shares are selling to-day at $54, would not be taxed on the extra $53 at all. A tax such as this is manifestly unfair, no person can make it appear anything else, and when it is so easy to impose an ad valorem tax I cannot understand why it is not done. An ad valorem tax of 3 cents on $100 would work out all right and would be fair to everyone. I do not intend to let this proposed tax go into effect so long as I can do anything to hinder it, because it will not be fair to the people of Canada, and therefore should not be imposed.

Mr. LAWSON: I am indeed reluctant to have anything further to say on this subject by reason of the length of time I devoted to it last week, but to-night the Minister of Finance has made two statements which I cannot allow to pass. One is obviously an error, the other is misleading. If I remember correctly, in the case cited by him to-night, he quoted figures to show that the province of Ontario had derived something like four or five times more revenue from the transfer of shares than the amount received by the Dominion treasury.

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps my hon. friend would like the figures on record?

Mr. LAWSON: $200,000 odd against $40,000. Is not that correct?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, in 1926.

Mr. LAWSON: On referring to the Dominion statute in force prior to this proposal I find it reads as follows—I am going to omit words which are unnecessary for my purpose—

> No person shall sell or transfer the stock or shares of any association. . . unless in respect of such sale or transfer there is affixed a stamp. . . of the value of 3 cents for every $100 or fraction thereof of the par value of the stocks or shares. . . sold or transferred.

An hon. MEMBER: Bonds.

Mr. LAWSON: I am not interested in bonds for the time being. The hon. Minister of Finance has given the returns, I understand, from the Standard stock and mining exchange. Now take the Ontario statute—

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend, if he is going to argue fairly, must continue and quote the exceptions provided in article 61.

Mr. LAWSON: I am not quarrelling with that. I am going to read the Ontario act to show that the statutory provision is exactly the same as in the Dominion statute.

Mr. BENNETT: The Dominion act is copied from the Ontario statute.

Mr. LAWSON: Under section 12 of the Corporation Tax Act of the province of Ontario it is provided:

> There shall be levied a tax of 3 cents, payable by the transferor, in money or stamps, for every $100 or fraction thereof of the par value upon every change of ownership consequent upon the sale, transfer. . .

Obviously if under the law of Ontario and the law of the Dominion the same amount of tax is imposed, then the Dominion treasury must have received the same amount of tax from that source as the provincial treasury, or else some department of the Dominion has been distinctly lax in its collection of revenue.

My other point is this. The hon. Minister of Finance stated that this was not the imposition of a new tax; it was a revision of the schedule. But may I point out to him that this introduces an entirely new principle in taxation, and I should like to hear some statement or argument from him justifying, not the quantum of taxation—that is the part to which all his statements have been directed —but the reason why a larger percentage of tax should be imposed upon the lower priced stocks than upon the higher. I should also like to ask the minister if he has any precedent for the imposition of a stock transfer tax on an ascending ratio as the value of the stock descends. I have had occasion from time to time to examine the transfer tax laws of the provinces and indeed of some of the states, and if there is any precedent for a tax based upon an increasing ratio on the lower priced stock, I should be interested to know.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. LAWSON: Mr. Chairman, I should very much like to know if the Minister of Finance will attempt to justify the imposition of a higher percentage of taxation on the sale price of the lower priced issues than upon the higher. Why is it not equitable in an ascending ratio, if anything, on the same basis as the income tax?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The point raised by my hon. friend appears to be one that is worthy of attention. I should like the minister to give us an explanation. If he cannot explain it let him say so frankly, but if he can why not let us have the explanation?

Mr. ROBB: Explain what?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Give an answer to the hon. member.

Mr. ROBB: We might argue all night. We have submitted the matter to examination and we think the tax is fair, considering the business that is done and the nature of that business. Hon. gentlemen talk about the tax on certain high priced stocks; they forget that we derive an additional revenue from such stocks in the way of income tax. I submit that this tax will meet with the approval of the country.

Mr. LAWSON: Seventy-four per cent of the mining stocks traded in in Ontario on the Standard stock and mining exchange are selling at under $3.

Mr. JACOBS: Does that include wash sales too?

Mr. LAWSON: So far as I know, and I have some experience, they do not have wash sales in the province of Ontario. The statutes of the province of Quebec, in which my hon. and learned friend is interested, specifically provide that a tax shall be payable on wash sales. The Minister of Finance has pointed out that these higher priced issues bear a heavy tax inasmuch as they produce revenue from which the Dominion secures income tax. But as I pointed out the other night, 74 per

cent of all stocks traded in on the Standard stock and mining exchange were stocks selling under $3; yet the gold and silver mines alone in the province of Ontario last year paid in dividends some $12,000,000. Surely that money coming into the hands of investors is taxable for income tax purposes just as much as the higher priced issues.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Lost.

Amendment agreed to on division: yeas, 52; nays, 44.

The CHAIRMAN: There is another amendment.

That the resolution amending the Special War Revenue Act be amended by striking out paragraph seven and substituting therefor the following:

7. That any enactment founded on paragraphs two and three of this resolution shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of May, 1929, and that any enactment founded on paragraph four of this resolution shall come into force on the first day of July, 1929.

Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution as amended carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Lost.

Resolution as amended agreed to on division: yeas, 47; nays, 40.

Resolution reported.

On the motion for first reading of the resolution:

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think a resolution can be read after eleven o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that is correct.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would like to ask, as a matter of information, whether this last vote is legal, since it was started after eleven o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: As a matter of fact it was started just at three minutes to eleven o'clock.

Mr. McGIBBON: I must take exception to that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was watching the time closely and when I resumed the chair the hour was striking.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

END OF VOLUME II.